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I. Minutes for 12_3_15 and 1_28_16 Minutes not approved because there was not a quorum for most of the meeting

II. Clinical Faculty Practice on Campus

--Corinne reported that she called Sue Wolf to confirm what she had said at 1_28 meeting was accurate. Corinne underscored two things re: accreditation of PA program.

(1) that PA faculty be treated comparable to other faculty on campus
   The ARC-PA (Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant) requires that “Principal faculty and the program director should have academic appointments and privileges comparable to other faculty with similar academic responsibilities in the institution” (Accreditation Standards for Physician Assistant Education, 4th Edition, Standard A2.04). The School of Education and Health Sciences (SEHS) Faculty Congress -- in its interpretation of “comparable privileges” -- defined this as the possibility for promotion.

   It was the decision of the SEHS Congress to recommend -- given other issues -- that clinical faculty not be tenured because “tenure-track positions require significant scholarly production. Professional programs also have a need for faculty whose effort and time can focus on field-based practice and teaching in addition to potential scholarly engagement for the benefit of their programs (SEHS DOC 2015-01 Proposal for Faculty Title Changes).

(2) The second thing Corinne clarified -- via her conversation with Sue Wolf -- had to do with what had happened regarding Sue’s report on progress that UD is making to meet the expectations of faculty in PA program being treated “comparable to other faculty.” Corinne underscored that full accreditation for the PA program is not currently in jeopardy. However, the PA program has received a citation related to ARC-PA Standard A2.04. This means that every 6 months the program must report to their accrediting body the progress that has been made to address this issue. An accreditation site visit for the MPAP (Master of Physician Assistant Program) will occur in Sept., 2016.
This is directly linked to the work FAC is doing and is supported by the “Proposal for Faculty Title Changes” document (SEHS DOC 2015-01) submitted to the Provost’s Office in May, 2016 by Dean Kevin Kelly. The proposal which was approved by the SEHS Congress on March 20, 2015 states that “the available faculty titles are insufficient for the professional instruction provided by some non-tenure track faculty in SEHS departments, substantially limiting the capacity of clinically-based programs to recruit, hire, and retain qualified faculty, and jeopardizes the accreditation of new programs, particularly in the health sciences” (Statement of Problem Affecting SEHS, p. 2).

FAC requests -- and Corinne will make the request -- for the exact wording of the citation.

Discussion ensued about confusion FAC had been functioning under. That is, that accreditation necessitated that clinical faculty both be untenured and promotable.

Conversation came back to the fact that accrediting body requires that all clinical faculty should be treated “comparable” to other faculty

Actionable item: Request for information and wording of citation be given to this committee

Corinne noted that the SEHS Congress spent a year on this issue of treatment. She also underscored that the PA program faculty have full representation on the SEHS Congress and assured this committee that what SEHS proposed (and ECAS used to charge this FAC with), was a reflection of a unified faculty. She noted that the SEHS Congress proposal was that clinical faculty should not have tenured lines and also that clinical faculty be promotable.

Specific criteria for promotion will be determined by each department and unit.

Professional lines/clinical lines -- include field based practice and teaching and potential scholarly engagement. But, these lines do not function on the notion that production of scholarship is part of their contribution to university life per se.

III. Current University T&P Policy

Carolyn reported on current practice re: University T&P policy

--From a procedural standpoint, it looks like the policy could possibly be used for evaluating clinical faculty. University policy is a Tenure and Promotion document. UD would need to make minimal changes for promotion of clinical faculty to include professional practice.

The discussion went in various directions at this point:

A committee member asked whether the University policy required a periodic evaluation by department and not just chair.

It was noted that the % of clinical faculty was currently very small but would be growing.
Discussion about the difference between clinical faculty and lecturers was discussed (again).

And, then, there was more discussion about the difference between permanent lecture lines and temporary ones.

Permanent lecture lines -- the line is permanent. The person is permanent.

Caroline asked Why?

Carolyn said it was because of the cost. Simply put: Lecturers teach more than tenure line faculty do. They offer more course coverage per dollar. Whether they do scholarship or not -- it is not part of their contract and what they get paid for.

Joel noted a concern: If committee continues to look at clinical and lecture appointments as parallel (which I think is a mistake), it doesn’t get us very far. In point of fact, the two are different and we should continue discussing as distinct.

What’s fairly consistent across them is scholarship -- that in one case, it is not done because it is not part of the field and in the other case, it is not done because the job doesn’t pay for it.

But, our decision on clinical appt. -- if we follow what SEHS has proposed, doesn’t carry over to a lectureship or redefine them in some way (automatically)

Lecturer is a teaching position -- clinical faculty are different. They are not teaching positions alone (and they are not paid to be only teaching positions)

This discussion has occurred in SEHS as well, Corrinne said.

We have been lumping non tenure lines into same basket.

Committee members came to the conclusion that whether or not there are clinical appointments within a department now, there could be in future. And, more importantly, it was up to each department and each unit to develop criteria for reviewing clinical faculty -- just as it was for reviewing lecturers. And the two, it was reiterated, are different positions.

Discussion of what needs to be done.

When this committee moves policy forward, we need to charge departments to develop criteria for promotion In other words, -- as with the revisions of T&P policies that happened a few years ago -- this committee/Senate can write in policy, these criteria for promoting clinical faculty will happen by x date, and the path forward has to be demarcated in A, B, C. way.
In terms of our discussion of what implications this has for lecturers, it should be noted that lecturers cannot simply be reclassified in order to gain promotable lines. Rather, a reclassification of title creates a new search.

Clinical titles require a search.

Subcommittee of Corinne, Joel, and Andrea will come to next meeting (2/17) with draft wording for clinical faculty titles for faculty handbook.