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Minutes for the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate
Meeting for 17 October 2013

In attendance: Shawn Cassiman, James Ervin, Ralph Frasca, Harry Gerla, Linda Hartley (chair), Emily Hicks, Carissa Krane, Kurt Mosser, Paul McGreal, Yong Song, Eric Taglieri, Abdullah Alghafis, Patrick Donnelly (ex officio), Katie Willard

Absent: Joe Watras, Tony Saliba

Guest: Barbara De Luca, Associate Dean for Graduate Education and Research

Meeting called to order by Dr. Linda Hartley at 12:00. It was announced that spring 2014 FAC meetings would be at the same time on the same day. The next meeting of the FAC will be on Nov. 7.

1. The first order of business was to approve the minutes of 3 October 2013. Kurt Mosser moved to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

2. Linda Hartley announced that there was a meeting this week of the Intellectual Property, Committee, a subcommittee of the FAC. The Academic Senate has requested that the FAC review policies concerning intellectual property. The subcommittee will begin the review on behalf of the FAC.

3. Professional Title Designations: Clinical Professor, Research Professor and Distinguished Service Professor
   a. Clinical Appointment to the Faculty: The discussion of the review of faculty titles began with comments by Barbara De Luca putting forth the concerns of the School of Education and Health Sciences. She stated that the current definition (in Faculty Handbook) does not satisfy the present needs of the University. There are individuals presently employed who carry the title but do not meet the definition. Moreover, there are other individuals who are listed as lecturers who satisfy the current definition of clinical faculty, but do not carry the title. In addition, there is no process or criteria for awarding rank at clinical professor. The ability to award rank would provide an additional performance incentive. The School of Education and Health Sciences would like permission to award rank. Information is being collected on how other institutions handle these non-tenured positions. Chair Hartley requested that the School of Education and Health Sciences provide this committee with suggested definitions of clinical faculty and research professor. The definitions should clarify the difference between lecturer and clinical professor and also provide some clarification on promotion within a faculty title. Dr. De Luca indicated she would compile recommendations on job titles and forward them to the committee for consideration before the next meeting. It was also pointed out that the current document does not describe the position of visiting professor.
   b. Research Professor: The title of research professor is requested for individuals engaged in grant raising activities. This would provide a performance incentive and might aid the School in promotional efforts. Dr. De Luca indicated that SEHS may be interested in such
a title as well. Without the SOE represented today, the discussion of adding the Research Professor title will be moved to the Nov. 7 agenda.

c. Distinguished Service Professor: Harry Gerla, in a response to a previous request by this committee, offered a change in the definition which precluded retired faculty from carrying the title.

Linda Hartley pointed out that the current description of Distinguished Service Professor does not mention service. Does the title apply to faculty, other than administrators, who provided distinguished service to the university? There was an ensuing discussion as to whether service should be added. Pat Donnelly thought there would be value to adding it. There was a general consensus that the wording should be changed to encompass service and that the title description should be reworded to include this.

Yong Song questioned whether the title should be lost at retirement, as other honorary titles are retained. Pat Donnelly indicated that the current practice is that this title is retained in retirement. The proposed revision by Harry Gerla would be a change in policy. There was some disagreement as to whether honorary titles typically are taken away at retirement. However, the title description should clearly indicate whether or not the title is to be retained in retirement. Harry Gerla indicated that in the case of Distinguished Service Professor the title is replaced by Professor Emeritus/Emeriti. There was no clear consensus on this issue.

H. Gerla volunteered to revise the definition of Distinguished Service Professor prior to our next meeting.

4. SET discussion:

Linda Hartley presented the most recent draft of Guidelines for Administration of SET (Oct. 16, 2013) prepared by the SET Committee. Also presented were proposed updates to the Faculty Handbook (Section 8.H Student Evaluation System). The SET Committee has conducted an extensive review of the literature and has intended to develop policies for student evaluation of instructors based upon best practices. Information on the time table for the implementation of the new system was presented. Linda Hartley suggested that additional consideration must be given to how the new policies will be applied to faculty who are currently under review. Harry Gerla suggested that the wording in the document should be changed so as to clearly indicate which policies were mandatory as opposed to merely recommended. Carissa Krane raised additional concerns with regard to how the evaluations will be reviewed and compared. The committee agreed to review these documents for discussion of the FAC on Nov. 7.

Respectfully submitted by,

Ralph Frasca