

Spring 4-18-2021

2021-04-16 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate, "2021-04-16 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2021). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 187.

https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/187

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlangen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

DAYTON, OHIO

MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

April 16, 2021

Zoom, 3:30-5:30 p.m.

Senators Present: Joanna Abdallah, Philip Appiah-Kubi, Paul Benson, Connie Bowman, James Brill, Ali Carr-Chellman, Lissa Cupp, Michael Davies, M.E. Dillon, Lee Dixon, Samuel Dorf, Jim Dunne, Deo Eustace, Sharon Gratto, Laura Hume, Mark Jacobs, Jake Jagels, Jay Janney, Katie Kohnen, Carissa Krane, Catherine Kublik, Sayeh Meisami, Brennan Mooney, Drew Moyer, Grant Neeley, Leslie Picca, Jason Pierce, Maher Qumsiyeh, Fran Rice, Eddy Rojas, Andrew Sarangan, Andrea Seielstad, Andrew Strauss, Tereza Szeghi, Kathy Webb, John White, Mary Ziskin

Excused: Trevor Collier, Jacob Troutwine

Presenters: Sam Dorf (V-P, ECAS), Carissa Krane (Chair, FAC), Lee Dixon & Sharon Gratto (Co-Chairs SAPC) Tereza Szeghi (Chair, APC),

Guests: Craig Looper II (Parliamentarian), Lucy Allbaugh, Amy Anderson, Philip Anloague, Deb Bickford, Christopher Brough, Susan Brown, Lawrence Burnley, Christopher Calvin, Anne Crecelius, Cathryn Curry, Corinne Daprano, Stephanie Dhuman Giron, Gloria Dodd, Liz Eichler, Harvey Enns, Youssef Farhat, Umesh Haritashya, Brittany House Conrad, Tracey Jaffe, Eric Janz, Susybel Kallsen, Molly Keane-Sexton, Micheline Kidwell, Ryu-Kyung Kim, Allison Kinney, Jane Koester, Joseph Krella, Erin Kunz, Melissa Layman-Guadalupe, Laura Leming, Bill Marvin, Ryan McEwan, Sabrina Neeley, Judy Owen, Donald Pair, Autumn Payton, Carolyn Phelps, Margaret Pinnell, Julia Randel, Lis Regula, Mary Sableski, Chris Schramm, Julie Simon, Thomas Skill, Yvonne Sun, Tiffany Taylor Smith, Kelly Thobe, Kimberly Trick, Joe Valenzano, Verb Washington, David Wright, Michelle Yingling, 1 call in guest

• **Opening Prayer.** Kathy Webb

• **Minutes.** March 26, 2021. Minutes approved by unanimous consent.

• **Announcements.**

- A reminder for the inclusive excellence pedagogy workshop that will be held Thursday, May 13.
- Consider completing the LTC survey to help them plan programming for next year.
- Fran Rice, Academic Senate secretary, will be retiring from UD April 30.

• **Academic Senate Composition Revisions. Sam Dorf.** The proposed constitutional amendment to change the composition of the Academic Senate was discussed. The proposal was distributed to all Senators prior to the meeting. Testimonials in support of the proposal were heard from Mary Ellen Dillon, Jen Dalton, and Ryu Kyung Kim. Special thanks to Carissa Krane, Jason Pierce, Mary Ellen Dillon, and Sam Dorf who helped develop and present the proposal to the faculty. Proposed changes to the constitution:

- Add two additional FT-NTT senators for a total of three. (no more than two from any individual Unit will be elected and at least one will be elected from The College of Arts and Sciences)

- Extend term limits of FT-NTT senators from one to three years
- Add a FT-NTT senator to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for a two-year term
- Change eligibility to serve as an Officer of the Academic Senate to tenured faculty only

With no further questions or discussion, the proposal was brought to a vote. Vote to approve DOC 2021-02 Constitutional amendment to change the composition of the Academic Senate; 29 yes, 2 no, 0 abstain. The proposal passed. This will be brought to the full faculty for a vote in the fall.

• **FAC: UPTP Revisions Update. Carissa Krane.** Feedback received after the March Academic Senate was presented. There was general support for the following sections of the revised UPTP: ○ Multiple pathways from promotion to professor

- Recognizing a wide range of activities, which further the mission of the university; units/ departments/institutes have the responsibility to determine the weight given to each category of evaluation
- Definition of tenure

Not so positive feedback was also received:

- Now is not a good time to talk about this; we are still in a pandemic
- Some expressed strong opposition to specific sections and indicated that it will not pass without removal of certain sections
- Wished these changes were made earlier; activities that were not counted when they went up for promotion/tenure would now be counted

Requests for inclusion in the document that were not included and are up to units/departments/institutes to decide:

- Detailed promotion and tenure criteria
- Details on the evaluation of inclusive excellence
- Definition of positional roles and responsibilities
- Details on the professional development requirement
- Make the policy consistency with letter of hire
- Guidance on SET

Comments on each of the 4 issues:

1. Commitment to inclusive excellence requirement

- No support to include as a requirement for P&T
- Support the requirement, but not in two out of the three areas, let the units/ departments/institutes decide
- Support for inclusive excellence with no qualifiers
- Inclusive excellence expectation is too low; instead of "commitment to" should be replaced with "proficiency in". This should be a fourth area of P&T. This should be demonstrated in all three areas
- No support until I know how it will be evaluated
- Issues with trust with Unit processes that would be used to define

expectations 2. Coupling of Promotion and Tenure

- Decoupling would help with faculty retention
- If early promotion was offered, it would likely be based on scholarship, not teaching or service. If there is a difference between promotion and tenure, what additional criteria would be used for tenure?
- If decoupled, someone who was promoted could be denied tenure

- If there are additional expectations for those earning early promotion to achieve for tenure, what are those expectations and are they person dependent?
- Issues with equity if early promotion without tenure is supported
- Most people who are interested in early promotion really want early tenure
- An option for early tenure and promotion was added to the revision

3. Requirement for anti-bias training and professional development in DE&I for all P&T reviewers:

- Opposition to this:
 - training is not needed for the evaluation of faculty; I know how to evaluate faculty colleagues
 - "training" should be replaced with "professional development" since faculty don't like to be trained
 - negative experiences/questionable efficacy of existing anti-bias training ▪ who will develop, how often would it be required, consistency across units. This would essentially require all tenured faculty to participate.
- Based on colleague experiences and stories, there is an expressed need for this training.
- UD Inclusive Excellence Academy is developing a university-wide bias and inclusive excellence professional development curriculum
- SOE already offers "Evaluating for Equity" workshops with both synchronous and asynchronous components for all faculty involved in P&T reviews

4. Framing of P&T within the university's mission and identity –the introduction

- The intent was not to develop a new mission and identity statement
 - Purpose is to embed tenure/promotion within the mission and identity of the university
- The revisions support and value the multiple ways in which faculty contribute and support the existing dimensions of faculty evaluation as well as inclusive excellence

There was also a request to include a legacy clause for implementation

- Haven't addressed this yet, it would be dependent upon the timeline for approval and voting
- Same strategy would be used when the current document was transitioned in 2006
- Special consideration for promotion to professor since that can be over a longer period of time; current recommendation is if someone has already been promoted to associate, faculty would have the choice as to which promotion criteria are used when going for promotion

A straw poll was taken on the four areas of concern:

1. Commitment to inclusive excellence requirement. There was a strong preference to include inclusive excellence as an expectation of P&T, but there wasn't strong support for including inclusive excellence in two out of three requirements or in three out of three.
2. Coupling of Promotion and Tenure. There was a preference for coupling promotion and tenure.
3. Requirement for anti-bias training and professional development in DE&I for all P&T reviewers. A strong majority supported the training requirement.
4. Framing of P&T within the university's mission and identity –the introduction. A strong majority approved the language in the introduction.

Discussion:

- Support the coupling of tenure and promotion.
- The language in the poll about DE&I and anti-bias training was more acceptable than the

- wording in the policy.
- Coupling promotion and tenure means faculty go up for both at the same time, but does it mean that if approved for one, you are automatically approved for the other? It doesn't talk about how the review and the decision should be done or how you go in for both at the same time.
- Promotion and tenure are decided at the same time under one vote.
- The way the section on promotion and tenure is written it leaves open the possibility for two votes instead of one vote.
- How do you respond to faculty whose work didn't count in the past, but now will be counted in the P&T process?
- Clarification about the position of SBA. SBA is not opposed to inclusive excellence, but does not support it as a requirement for tenure & promotion.
- DE&I is in every aspect of the university, faculty are being hired based on this. It doesn't make sense that DE&I is not included in the tenure process.
- We hire people saying that DE&I matters to the university that this matters to them. ○ Some demonstration of a commitment to that should be at the heart of who we are. ○ Has FAC done benchmarking and can show similar policies from universities similar to us? ○ There's an extended appendix in the UPTPTF of 2019 that has benchmarking on every aspect of the proposal. Since then, there have been scores of additional institutions that have integrated inclusive excellence as an element of P&T. A list of additional resources can be shared.
- There are some parallels to the hiring for mission retreats required for faculty and staff. Required training is not completely new and it is of importance.
- The School of Engineering already has this in their P&T policy.
- This policy is something faculty implement, if there are things in the policy that are hurting our colleagues, they need to be addressed.
- Suggest not tether DE&I to two of the three components, instead allow the units to decide where and how this is demonstrated.

Continue to provide feedback using the anonymous feedback form or reach out to any FAC member.

- **SAPC: SET Report. Lee Dixon & Sharon Gratto.** SAPC was charged to review the recommendations from the SAPC final report "The digital student evaluation of teaching" submitted March 1, 2020, review other relevant feedback and documents and propose revisions to relevant policies. The report focused on how the instrument should be used in evaluation of teaching, P&T and in merit, not on the instrument itself. The committee recognized the need for the instrument and the need to gather feedback from students. The committee recommended SET should be given during class time. SET should be used in a formative way, not summative. Comments and scores need to be used together, not just the scores. Multiple methods should be used to evaluate teaching. Faculty should be protected against harassing comments that violate university policies. Faculty should demonstrate how they use SET to improve teaching and learning in each of the classes they taught.

Discussion:

- It is not clear what inappropriate comment would cause consequences for the student. This might diminish the impact of SET. Student might wonder what they can say or not say.
- Faculty should be able to flag comments and discuss with dept. chairs to identify comments that should not be used during the evaluation process. The policies referred to in this document already have disciplinary actions in place for violators; writing hate

speech on campus will result in disciplinary action. Those types of comments should not be allowed on SET. Students should not be afraid to share their views, even if they are harsh. Students need to be able to speak their truths.

- Additional mandatory SET training won't make a difference. Students are busy, and it's impressive they complete SET. SET scores are essential to hearing the student voice, I am opposed to any policy that weakens the value SET scores have on P&T decisions. Weakening the anonymity of SET would destroy students' honesty in their responses.
- Across campus, every hate speech instance is investigated, except when it happens to faculty on SET. From research, using SET scores alone don't really indicate or evaluate the quality of teaching.

Due to time limitations, discussion was closed.

- **APC: CAP 5-Year Review Update. Tereza Szeghi.** The first five-year review framework was delayed due to the pandemic. This year, ECAS charged APC to continue their work on revising the framework. To help inform their work, existing CAP documents and data were reviewed. The committee reached a consensus to use a staggered approach and review a few elements of CAP each year for the next five years. It is anticipated this approach will yield greater insight and have a greater impact for improvement than an attempt to evaluate all of the CAP elements in one year. Key features:

- Staggered approach over 5 years
- Slated to begin in AY 2021-22
- Framework is subject to change as the process moves forward

In the final year, an overview of all the information would be completed. APC would evaluate how CAP is working and make recommendations for improvement to implementation and to the review process to better strengthen the program.

Discussion:

- Is the committee looking for a formalized assessment system? Response: The framework provides for recommendations of different systems of assessment or a supplemental system that would provide stronger feedback. The current systems don't always provide the data needed for assessment.

- **Committee Reports**

- **APC-Teresa Szeghi.** APC has been focused on completing consultations and revisions pertaining to the CAP 5-Year Review framework, and offered an overview of our proposed framework during the April 16 Academic Senate meeting. We aim to finish our final revisions promptly so that APC can vote to approve the framework on April 16 and to bring the revised version to the April 30 Academic Senate meeting for a vote (with a visit to ECAS before the 4/30 Senate meeting). We also reviewed and approved nominations for the CAP Leadership Team on April 16.
- **FAC-Carissa Krane.** See attachment
- **SAPC-Lee Dixon & Sharon Gratto.** See attachment
- **ECAS- Leslie Picca.** Since the March 26th Academic Senate Meeting, ECAS has continued to meet weekly. ECAS continues to prioritize discussion and consultation on: (1) revisions to the Academic Senate composition to increase FT-NTT representation; and (2) revisions to the University P&T Policy. Action items from ECAS includes: review of the proposal to

convert CJS from a program to a department (sent to SAPC for review); discussion with SAPC co-chairs Lee Dixon and Sharon Gratto on the SAPCSET Report and SET Proposal; and discussion with Enterprise Online Learning (EOL) Task Force co-chair Tom Skill on the EOL report and recommendations. ECAS also briefly discussed the tenure calendar for 2021-22, particularly how it may be impacted by the 6-week calendar delay in 2020-21 due to COVID. Concerns expressed appear to be focused in one academic unit where the conversation will continue.

- ECAS also discussed the Wellbeing Education Certificate Proposal, submitted to ECAS on March 31. As consistent with DOC 2018-02 (Undergraduate Academic Certificate Programs), which references DOC 2014-04 (Actions pertaining to degree programs and academic departments, 3.2 Determination of University-wide impact), the approval of this certificate would benefit from review by one of the Senate standing committees, particularly as the certificate applies to more than one educational unit. After consultation with APC, FAC, and SAPC, it is not feasible for any of the committees to review this proposal in time to meet the deadline for a vote at Senate in 2020-21. The committee work is prioritized based on (1) university/educational impact & existing charges, and (2) timing when proposals are received.
- ECAS held extensive discussion on 2021-22 Academic Senate voting for ECAS and Senate Officers, and how best to interpret DOC 2007-05, the Constitution of the Academic Senate to ensure elections are fair, equitable, and consistent with Senate policy. ECAS also discussed the timing of the 2021-22 ECAS vote; last year, the ECAS elections were conducted in advance using the University Elections Committee given the challenges of voting via Zoom. ECAS discussed the benefits of advanced voting as it allows Senators the time and space to reflect upon their vote. However, after further deliberations, ECAS has determined that, consistent with the Academic Senate Constitution (Article VI, E. 2), the elections need to take place at the conclusion of the April 30th Senate meeting.

• **Adjournment** 5:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted: Fran Rice

DOC 2021-02

PROPOSAL TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

TITLE: Constitutional amendment to change the composition of the Academic Senate.

SUBMITTED BY: Executive Committee of Senate

DATE: April 16, 2021

ACTION: Legislative

Proposal: A Constitutional amendment to change the composition of the Academic Senate.

Rationale of the proposal: The rationale for this change is to recognize the expanding numbers, roles and responsibilities of Full Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty (FT NTT), the increased role of FT NTT faculty in the delivery of the Common Academic Program, which is governed by the Academic Senate, the role of FT NTT faculty in programs and initiatives critical to the Mission of the University of Dayton and overseen by the Academic Senate (i.e. experiential learning, academic and vocational advising, and research mentoring), and a recognition that FT NTT faculty should have greater input on the evaluation of and assessment tools used in their own promotion (i.e. Lecturer Promotion Policy, University Promotion Policy for Clinical Faculty/Faculty of Practice, and other related policies).

The Constitutional Amendments add two additional FT NTT senators, extends term limits of FT NTT senators from one to three years, and adds a FT NTT senator to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for a two year term. An additional amendment would limit eligibility to serve as an Officer of the Academic Senate to tenured faculty only. Below are listed the articles of the Constitution affected by this proposal followed by the revised articles (in italics).

Topic: Composition of the Academic Senate

Current: Article IV.A. Membership The Academic Senate shall consist of thirty-nine (39) members. All members shall be voting members. These members shall be determined as follows:

Proposed: Article IV.A. Membership The Academic Senate shall consist of forty-one (41) members. All members shall be voting members. These members shall be determined as follows:

Current: Article IV.A.1. Faculty. All faculty who are tenure-track and tenured (excluding Assistant and Associate Deans and Assistant and Associate Provosts) shall be eligible to serve as unit representatives on the Academic Senate. There also shall be one part-time faculty representative and one full-time non-tenure track representative. There shall be twenty-four (24) members drawn from the above according to the following formula:

College of Arts and Sciences – eleven

Humanities - five (at least 1 must be from fine arts)

Natural Sciences – three

Social Sciences – three

School of Business Administration – three

School of Education and Health Sciences – three

School of Engineering – three

School of Law – one

Librarians (University Library, Marian Library, Law Library) – one

Part-time faculty member – one

Full-time non-tenure track faculty member – one

Proposed: Article IV.A.1. Faculty. All faculty who are tenure-track and tenured (excluding Assistant and Associate Deans and Assistant and Associate Provosts) shall be eligible to serve as unit representatives on the Academic Senate. There also shall be one part-time faculty representative and two full-time non-tenure track representatives. There shall be twenty-six (26) members drawn from the above according to the following formula:

College of Arts and Sciences – eleven

Humanities - five (at least 1 must be from fine arts)

Natural Sciences – three

Social Sciences – three

School of Business Administration – three

School of Education and Health Sciences – three

School of Engineering – three

School of Law – one

Librarians (University Library, Marian Library, Law Library) – one

Part-time faculty member – one

Full-time non-tenure track faculty member – three (no more than two from any individual Unit and at least one from The College of Arts and Sciences)

Topic: Election of University Faculty Representatives

Current: Article IV.B.4. The term of office for all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members shall be three years. Each year the following members will be elected as indicated:

1st Year 2nd Year 3rd Year Humanities - 2 Humanities - 2 Humanities - 1 Natural Sciences - 1 Natural Sciences - 1 Natural Sciences - 1 Social Sciences - 1 Social Sciences - 1 Social Sciences - 1 Business - 1 Business - 1 Business - 1 Education - 1 Education - 1 Education - 1 Engineering - 1 Engineering - 1 Engineering - 1 Law - 1 Law - 0 Law - 0 Library - 0 Library - 0 Library - 1 Part-time - 1 Part-time - 1 Part-time - 1 Full time non-tenure track - 1 Full time non-tenure track - 1 Full time non-tenure track - 1

Proposed: Article IV.B.4. *The term of office for all full-time faculty members shall be three years. Each year the following members will be elected as indicated:*

1st Year 2nd Year 3rd Year Humanities - 2 Humanities - 2 Humanities - 1 Natural Sciences - 1 Natural Sciences - 1 Natural Sciences - 1 Social Sciences - 1 Social Sciences - 1 Social Sciences - 1 Business - 1 Business - 1 Business - 1 Education - 1 Education - 1 Education - 1 Engineering - 1 Engineering - 1 Engineering - 1 Law - 1 Law - 0 Law - 0 Library - 0 Library - 0 Library - 1 Part-time - 1 Part-time - 1 Part-time - 1 Full time non-tenure track - 1 Full time non-tenure track - 1 Full time non-tenure track - 1

Topic: Length of Term for Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Current: Article IV.B.6. The full-time non-tenure track faculty shall elect a representative in an election held each Spring term. The term of office shall be for one year. The term shall begin after the last Spring semester meeting of the outgoing Senate.

Proposed: Article IV.B.6. ~~*The full-time non-tenure track faculty shall elect a representative in an election held each Spring term. The term of office shall be for one year. The term shall begin after the last Spring semester meeting of the outgoing Senate.*~~

Topic: Eligibility to Serve as an Officer of the Academic Senate

Current: Article VI.C.2. The President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of the Academic Senate shall be elected by the Senate from the elected members of the University tenured and tenure track faculty serving on the Executive Committee, excluding the Deans' representative. Elections shall be held after the last Spring semester meeting of the outgoing Senate and prior to May 16th.

Proposed: Article VI.C.2. *The President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of the Academic Senate shall be elected by the Senate from the elected members of the University tenured faculty serving on the Executive Committee, excluding the Deans' representative. Elections shall be held after the last Spring semester meeting of the outgoing Senate and prior to May 16th.*

Topic: Composition of Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

Current: Article VI.E.1. Composition of the Executive Committee

The Academic Senate shall have an Executive Committee, which shall be constituted as follows:

- a. One University Faculty representative each from Business, Education, Engineering, Humanities, Law, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Libraries.
- b. The Provost.
- c. One Dean.
- d. One undergraduate student and one graduate student (including Law).
- e. The President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of the Academic Senate shall represent their respective constituencies as delineated in paragraph E-1-(a) preceding.
- f. The officers of the Academic Senate shall be the officers of the Executive Committee.

Proposed: Article VI.E.1. Composition of the Executive Committee

The Academic Senate shall have an Executive Committee, which shall be constituted as follows:

- a. One University Faculty representative each from Business, Education/Health Sciences, Engineering, Humanities, Law, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Libraries.*
- b. The Provost.*
- c. One Dean.*
- d. One Full-time non-tenure track faculty.*
- e. One undergraduate student and one graduate student (including Law).*
- f. The President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of the Academic Senate shall represent their respective constituencies as delineated in paragraph E-1-(a) preceding.*
- g. The officers of the Academic Senate shall be the officers of the Executive Committee.*

Implementation: Approval from the Full Faculty, the President and the Board of Trustees

With approval of the Senate, members of the Executive Committee will present this amendment to the full faculty for approval during the Fall term of 2021. Open hearings will be held in the last week of August and the first weeks of September, followed by an election at the end of September 2021. Elections will be conducted on-line through the balloting system used for the election of

representatives. If the amendment is approved by two-thirds of at least a majority of the University tenured/tenure-track faculty, it will then be submitted to the President and Board of Trustees for approval at their October 2021 meeting.

If the amendment is approved, it is proposed that in the Academic Senate elections of 2022 the Full Time Non-Tenure Track Senate candidate with the most votes will serve a three-year term, the candidate with the second most votes will serve a two-year term, the candidate with the third most votes will serve a one-year term. If none of the three top vote-earning candidates is from the College of Arts and Sciences, the highest vote-earning FT NTT Faculty member from the College of Arts and Sciences will serve the initial one-year term. If all three top-voting candidates are from the same unit then the next top-earning candidate outside of that unit will serve the initial one-year term. After the initial election, the University Elections Committee will ensure that future elections for FT NTT Senators will preserve distribution outlined in this Constitution.

1 To: Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (ECAS)

2 From: Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

3 Date: March 8, 2021

4 RE: Proposed Revisions to DOC 2006-10 University Promotion and Tenure Policy

5 On March 8, 2021, the Faculty Affairs Committee voted to move the attached draft of the University Promotion and 6 Tenure Policy (UPTP) to ECAS and other venues for broader discussion. The need for this work stemmed from 7 concerns expressed by faculty regarding the practical misalignment that exists between promotion and tenure 8 criteria, annual merit review, workload, and the logistics of how and where their time is actually spent on behalf of 9 the university. The history of the iterative consultative process for review and revision is summarized below.

10 • 2006: DOC 2006-10: University Promotion and Tenure Policy revisions passed by vote of the Academic 11 Senate, tenured/tenure-track faculty, Provost Council and Board of Trustees (Passed in 2007). 12 • 2016: Strategic Visioning process identified disconnect between strategic initiatives and P&T evaluation 13 criteria 14 • Fall 2017: University Promotion and Tenure Task Force (UPTPF) Formed in Fall 2017 15 • 2017-2019: Campus-wide consultation on Promotion and Tenure

16 • January 2019: UPTPF Report submitted to the Academic Senate

17 • Spring 2019: Unit/Division/Department discussion of UPTPF report

18 • Spring 2019: Policy Review on Promotion & Tenure (PRoPT) and Campus Engagement on Promotion & 19 Tenure Policies (CEPT) groups formed

20 • January 2020: PRoPT draft revisions to UPTP discussed at the Academic Senate 21 • January-March 2020: Campus-wide open forums held to discuss revisions to UPTP proposed by 22 PRoPT/FAC 23 • Fall 2020-Present: FAC charged with using the information gathered from working groups, campus-wide 24 consultation, Academic Senate to finalize revisions to UPTP using the February 14, 2020 Version of the 25 UPTP circulated by ECAS for broad consultation

26 • FAC consulted with Office of ODI, PRoPT chairs, and reviewed feedback from consultative open forums 27 held in early 2020, as well as the UPTPF, Academic Senate minutes, and Academic Senate breakout 28 session notes, and discussed revisions of the UPTP to align with feedback, concerns, comments and 29 suggestions made throughout the many levels of consultation

30 • February 2021: FAC provided a summary of the topics extensively discussed by FAC in response to the 31 consultative process, and requested feedback from Senators and Guests.

32 • March 2021: FAC voted to move the March 8, 2021 version of the UPTP out of committee and to ECAS 33 and other venues for broad consultation within Units/divisions

34 • Next step: Broad consultation with the Academic Senate and faculty through Unit/Division level 35 discussions

36 The substantive revisions made to the UPTP by FAC in response to the composite of the iterative consultative steps 37 are summarized below:

38 • Introduction: Revised the introduction to include mission-centric language, the purpose of promotion and 39 tenure, and the rationale for the elements of evaluation.

40 • Section I.A.1-3: Revised Definition of Tenure

41 • Section I.B.2.a: Clarified language for Tenure and Promotion from Assistant Professor to Full Professor 42 •
Section I.B.2.b: Clarified language for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, and 43
Unit/Department/Institute responsibility for developing transparent evaluation processes for pathways for 44 promotion;
removed the 2/3 high level of achievement, 1 adequate in response to feedback and discussion, 45 leaving it open for
Units/departments/institutes to decide.
46 • Section I.C.2: Revised the wording of the requirement that Units/Departments/Institutes develop evaluation 47
criteria for other areas of impact
48 • Section I.C.4: Added Inclusive Excellence as an expectation for tenure and promotion; 49
Units/Departments/Institutes develop evaluation criteria
50 • Section I.C.7: Added a requirement for Anti-bias and DE&I training for all involved in evaluation of 51
applicants for tenure and promotion and removed the “every two years”; Provost office will coordinate 52 • Section
I.E.2.d: Added an option to add additional members to the University Promotion and Tenure 53 Committee to
enhance diverse representation on that committee
54

1

55 **8 March 2021 Submitted by FAC** 56

57 ***DRAFT* University Promotion and Tenure Policy with Markup vs. DOC 2006-10 University**
58 **Promotion and Tenure Policy (final approval of DOC 2006-10 in 2007).**

59 **Introduction**

60 Promotion and tenure decisions are among the most important made at the university and as such 61
should be made with great care. Indeed, the quality and nature of faculty accomplishments in 62 scholarship,
teaching, and service largely determines the quality and reputation of the institution as a 63 whole and its
ability to further its mission. Promotion and tenure decisions are extremely important to 64 the life of the
institution as they not only recognize the faculty member’s existing body of work, but 65 also make
judgements about the future contributions by the faculty member to the university. As such, 66 promotion and
the awarding of tenure are mechanisms by which the University retains its most 67 valuable scholars, sustains
excellence in its instructional program, and promotes its mission for 68 service. 69

70 Promotion and tenure decisions are among the most important events in a faculty member's 71
professional life. Accordingly, it is essential that all faculty members be treated fairly and granted due 72
process in the deliberations that determine promotion and tenure.

73

74 As a Catholic and Marianist institution, the university is committed to the diversity of its faculty and 75
their full and equitable inclusion in all facets of university life. Building a diverse, equitable, and 76
inclusive community across the university enriches and expands our institutional ability, intelligence, 77 and
creativity, and is fully aligned with our Marianist charism. Accordingly, the university recognizes 78 that
diversity, equity, and inclusion are inextricably linked with excellence. In order to realize this 79
commitment, promotion and tenure of faculty will value the practical and educational benefits of 80 faculty
activities which contribute to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

81

82 This University Promotion and Tenure policy establishes general guidelines that govern University 83
wide procedures for promotion and tenure review. These guidelines and procedures are designed to 84
ensure communication, fairness, and due process throughout the review process. This policy includes 85
opportunities to respond in the event of disagreements over promotion and tenure recommendations 86
and provides an appeals procedure.

87

88 In addition, this policy provides a process for initial and periodic review of promotion and tenure 89
documents for procedural consistency and clarity of substantive criteria both at the unit and department 90
level.

92 I. Establishment, Review, and Approval of Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures 93

94 A. Definitions

95

96 1. Tenure is a status of employment wherein a ranked faculty member's relationship with 97 the university can be terminated only by voluntary separation through resignation or 98 retirement, for adequate cause or under extraordinary circumstances such as financial

2

99 exigency or discontinuance of a program or a department of instruction, or medical
100 101 reasons.¹

102 2. Tenure is granted based on demonstrated potential for effective, sustained, long-term 103 contributions to the University and its mission. Tenure is granted to demonstrate the 104 reciprocal long-term commitment of the University to tenured faculty and provides 105 stability to the academic and research mission of the University. 106

107 3. As defined by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP): "Tenure 108 is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of 109 extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the 110 profession attractive to [individuals] of ability. Freedom and economic security, 111 hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its
112 113 students and to
obligations to its society."²

114 4. Promotion is the advancement in rank, e.g. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor 115 based on meritorious achievement in, teaching effectiveness and/or librarianship, 116 scholarship and/or artistic accomplishment, and service.

117 B. General University-wide Criteria and Eligibility for Promotion and Tenure Evaluations 118 119 1. Criteria for promotion and tenure focus on the academic credentials and the academic 120 performance of the applicant. The faculty member's performance will be evaluated as 121 appropriate to the profession in the areas of:
122

- 123 a. Teaching effectiveness and/or librarianship,
- 124 b. Scholarship and/or artistic accomplishment, and
- 125 c. Service.

126 2. Candidates for tenure and promotion must meet the following criteria: 127 a. For tenure and promotion to associate professor:

- 128 i. Demonstrate effectiveness in teaching/librarianship and efforts to 129 improve teaching/librarianship quality, and
- 130 ii. Provide evidence of scholarship/artistic accomplishment that 131 demonstrates promise in the field, and
- 132 iii. Provide evidence of a developing practice of service, in multiple internal 133 and external contexts, that advances the operation, mission, or reputation 134 of the University.

135

136 b. For promotion to professor:

- 137 i. Demonstrate sustained, high-quality teaching/librarianship and a 138 commitment to further enhance

teaching/librarianship quality, and 139 ii. Provide evidence of on-going scholarship/artistic accomplishments that 140 demonstrate excellence and are recognized and evaluated positively by 141 the scholarly/artistic community,

¹ Defined in the Faculty Handbook under general faculty policies and procedures as outlined in the section titled, “University Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure” and “2020-05 Bylaws for Faculty Hearing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure”.

² AAUP definition of tenure.

3

142 iii. Provide evidence of on-going, established service, in multiple internal and 143 external contexts, that advances the operation, mission, or reputation of 144 the University and that accompanies a record of leadership in service. 145

146 Recognizing that faculty may engage in a wide range of activities, which further the 147 mission of the university, units, departments, or institutes have the responsibility to 148 determine the weight given to each category of evaluation. Specific criteria that value 149 a variety of pathways for promotion to professor must be clearly defined in Unit, 150 department and institute criteria (see section I.C.1-7 below). 151 152 3. Tenure-track faculty with no prior service credit will be considered for tenure no later 153 than their sixth year of active, full-time service. Time devoted to leaves of absence, 154 sabbaticals, or other interruptions in the annual performance of teaching, research, 155 and service may affect the total period of evaluation and the timing of departmental 156 reviews. The effects of such interruptions on the period of evaluation and timing of 157 reviews must be agreed to in writing by the faculty member, chairperson, dean, and 158 Provost at the time that the interruption takes place or within six months of the 159 initiation of the interruption. 160

161 4. Tenure will not be granted to a faculty member whose rank is below the level of 162 associate professor. Except in the School of Law, candidates cannot request to 163 be promoted to associate professor without consideration of tenure (in the 164 School of Law, candidates cannot request to be promoted to professor without 165 consideration of tenure). Faculty members who have already been granted tenure 166 at the assistant professor level, or have been granted promotion to associate 167 professor without tenure, prior to implementation of this policy will retain their 168 tenure and rank. 169

170 5. A candidate can only be considered for tenure once. Candidates may request to 171 be considered for early promotion and tenure. Candidates who wish to have an 172 early decision must request an accelerated tenure clock by (no later than) the 173 start of their fourth year of service and, once granted, the decision for early 174 consideration is irrevocable. The details of the accelerated tenure clock must be 175 put in writing and agreed to by the candidate, the department chair, the dean and 176 the Provost. 177

178 6. A candidate who successfully completes the promotion and/or tenure process 179 will be granted promotion and/or tenure with his or her next contract. 180

181 C. Unit, Departmental, and Institute Authority and Responsibilities

182

183 1. Each unit, academic department and/or institute will adopt clear criteria and 184 procedures for promotion and tenure. The criteria for promotion and tenure must 185 address:

186

187 a. Teaching effectiveness and/or librarianship,

188 b. Scholarship and/or artistic accomplishment, and

189 c. Service.

190

4

191 2. The university recognizes that faculty may engage in a wide range of activities -- 192 outside of

“traditional” disciplinary efforts -- that further the mission of the 193 university. Meritorious contributions to teaching and/or librarianship, scholarship 194 and/or artistic accomplishment, and/or service that include community engagement, 195 incorporate multidisciplinary, foster innovation, venture creation, and/or other 196 defined academic or professional activities consistent with the positional role and 197 responsibilities of the faculty, and that further the mission and reputation of the 198 University are encouraged and should be given due recognition during the faculty 199 tenure and promotion process and evaluated and credited in the same way as other 200 faculty achievements. Each unit, academic department and/or institute must adopt 201 clear criteria for evaluating these contributions where relevant. 202

203 3. An applicant for promotion and tenure must be considered on the strength of the 204 complete application as well as the achievements and contributions that have been 205 made in each of the three evaluation dimensions. Each unit, academic department, 206 and institute will clearly describe their expectations for promotion and tenure. A 207 successful applicant must meet those expectations as defined by each unit and 208 department.

209

210 4. Given that diversity, equity, and inclusion are fundamental to academic and 211 institutional excellence, the University expects an applicant for promotion and tenure to demonstrate a commitment to inclusive excellence³

212 in at least two of the 213 dimensions of evaluation (in teaching and/or librarianship, scholarship and/or artistic 214 accomplishment, and service). Each academic unit, department, and/or institute will 215 adopt criteria for evaluating contributions and achievements in promoting inclusive 216 excellence. 217

218 5. Each unit, academic department and institute will clearly describe their criteria for 219 promotion and tenure separately for:

220 a. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor,

221 b. Promotion to Professor.

222 c. Tenure for those who were hired at the rank of Associate Professor or 223 Professor 224 These criteria must at a minimum meet the university’s and the unit’s policies. 225 226 6. Each unit, academic department and institute will adopt clear processes and 227 procedures to ensure the fair and equitable evaluation of promotion and tenure. 228

229 7. All of those involved in candidate review are expected to engage in anti-bias training 230 and professional development in diversity, equity and inclusion prior to participating 231 in the work of the unit, department, and/or institute review committee. The Provost 232 Office in consultation with the Office of Diversity and Inclusion and Academic 233 Senate will oversee and determine frequency and content of training. 234

235 D. University Academic Senate Authority and Responsibilities

236

237 1. The Academic Senate will establish the University Committee and provide oversight 238 of the elections of faculty members to the University Committee. 239

³University of Dayton Diversity and Inclusion Assessment Task Force Report, September 27, 2019.

240 2. The Academic Senate will determine all University-wide procedural policies on 241 Promotion and Tenure and explicate such policies in the Faculty Handbook. If the 242 University Committee notes inconsistencies between documents not covered by 243 University-wide procedural policies on promotion and tenure, those procedural 244 inconsistencies will be submitted to the Academic Senate for resolution.

245

246 E. The University Committee

247

248 1. The University Committee will

249

250 a. review and approve the promotion and tenure policies of all units for consistency 251 with University

policies and procedures

252

253 b. annually review the promotion and tenure process for adherence to appropriate 254 procedures and present a report to the Chairperson of the Academic Affairs 255 Committee of the Board of Trustees and the President of the Academic Senate. 256 The President of the Academic Senate will annually present this report to the 257 Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

258

259 2. The University Committee will consist of fifteen tenured faculty members: seven from 260 the College of Arts and Sciences (two from the Humanities, one from the Visual and 261 Performing Arts, two from the Natural Sciences, two from the Social Sciences); two 262 respectively from the School of Business Administration, the School of Education and 263 Health Sciences, and the School of Engineering; and one each from the School of Law 264 and the University Libraries.

265

266 a. The University Committee members will be elected by tenure and tenure-track 267 members of their respective constituencies.

268

269 b. Members of the University Committee will serve three-year terms (maximum of 270 two consecutive terms, with staggered terms within and across units); all 271 members will be tenured with rank of associate professor or professor and cannot 272 hold an administrative appointment (including departmental chairpersons, 273 assistant and associate deans, deans, and other full or part-time administrators 274 with line authority). The University Committee will elect a chairperson from 275 those duly elected. The chairperson shall serve for one year, and may serve 276 consecutive terms. Terms will begin effective June 1 of the year elected. 277

278 c. Any individual who cannot complete his or her term of office will be replaced 279 from the list of candidates in the year in which the member was elected. 280 Candidates not elected to the University Committee will be listed by area in the 281 order of votes received, beginning with the highest, and will, in that order, be 282 asked to fill vacated positions.

283

284 d. The Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, in consultation with ECAS, Academic 285 Deans, and the VP for Diversity Equity and Inclusion, may appoint two ad-hoc 286 tenured faculty members to this committee to ensure that the committee has 287 diverse representation. This diversity includes, but is not limited to gender 288 diversity, racial and ethnic diversity, and professional path diversity. 289

6

290 e. All members of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee are expected to 291 engage in anti-bias training and professional development in diversity, equity and 292 inclusion prior to participating in the work of the committee. The Provost Office

293 in consultation with the Office of Diversity and Inclusion and Academic Senate 294 will oversee and determine frequency and content of training. 295

296 3. The University Committee will approve those unit documents that define clear 297 substantive criteria and procedures consistent with University policies, including 298 mechanisms for communicating throughout the entire promotion and tenure process. 299

300 4. After the initial approval has been received by a unit, the University Committee will 301 review that unit's policies every three years. Whenever substantive changes are proposed, 302 the unit promotion and tenure documents must be approved by the University Committee 303 for consistency with University policies and procedures.

304

305 5. In the event the University Committee does not approve unit documents or proposed 306 changes to them, and if the dean of that unit disagrees with the decision of the University 307 Committee, the matter will be resolved by the President in consultation with the Provost. 308

309 6. The Provost's office will be responsible for providing administrative support for the 310 work of this

committee and assuring that all documents are distributed in a timely and 311 appropriate manner. 312

313 II. Common Processes for Promotion and Tenure Evaluations

314

315 A. Common process for pre-tenure review

316

317 1. The approved University, unit, departmental, and institute criteria and procedures will 318 be shared with the candidate at the time of hire by the Office of the Provost. These will 319 be the basis of the pre tenure, final tenure, and promotion reviews. 320

321 2. Each unit dean will establish a timetable regarding the submission and review of pre 322 tenure materials.

323

324 3. During the pre-tenure period, every candidate will receive a minimum of two reviews 325 of his or her teaching and/or librarianship, scholarship and/or artistic accomplishment, 326 and service by his or her department and the appropriate dean, with the final review 327 conducted the year prior to the final departmental tenure recommendation. The School of 328 Law and University Libraries will have only a unit review.

329

330 4. Credit toward tenure granted for prior service

331

332 a. A candidate who is given two or fewer years credit toward tenure will receive 333 two comprehensive reviews (as described in II.A.5 below). 334

335 b. A candidate receiving three or more years credit toward tenure will receive a 336 minimum of one review of his or her teaching effectiveness and/or librarianship, 337 scholarship and/or artistic accomplishment, and service by his or her department 338 and the appropriate dean, with the final review conducted the year prior to the 339 final departmental tenure recommendation. The number of and timing of the

7

340 review(s) will be explicated in the candidate's first letter of hire. The School of 341 Law and University Libraries will have only a unit review. 342

343 c. Any changes in the tenure clock after this first letter of hire may require a change 344 in the review cycle. Such changes must be agreed to in writing by the faculty 345 member, chairperson, dean, and Provost.

346

347 5. Pre-tenure review process

348

349 a. A candidate will submit his or her review materials and supporting 350 documentation for review to the responsible persons (i.e., departmental 351 chairperson, departmental promotion and tenure committee) at the departmental 352 level. (The School of Law and University Libraries will have only a unit review. 353 Materials will be submitted directly to the unit dean.) 354

355 b. After giving adequate consideration to the materials, each department/unit will 356 provide written feedback to the candidate in a timely fashion as designated by the 357 departmental (unit in the case of the School of Law or University Libraries) 358 promotion and tenure document. In addition to a statement regarding progress 359 toward tenure, feedback will include comments of a developmental nature, in line 360 with the criteria for tenure, indicating areas of concern and suggestions for 361 improvement. 362

363 c. The candidate's review materials, supporting documentation, and the written 364 feedback will be forwarded to the appropriate unit dean. The dean will then 365 review the materials and provide written feedback to the candidate in a timely 366 fashion.

367

368 B. Common application and final review process for tenure and/or promotion 369 370 1. Each unit

dean will establish a timetable regarding the submission and review of 371 promotion and tenure

materials.

372

373 2. The review materials for promotion and tenure will be cumulative. Materials generated 374 as a result of review at the departmental level (unit in the case of the School of Law or 375 Libraries), including letters from chairperson, departmental promotion and tenure 376 committee, and response, will become part of the application package and will be 377 forwarded to the unit for review. Likewise, materials generated in the unit review, 378 including letters from dean, unit promotion and tenure committee, and responses, will be 379 forwarded to the Provost for review.

380

381 3. Materials of a substantive nature which update the submitted application (e.g., 382 acceptance or publication of a manuscript) can be added to the application by the 383 candidate at any point in the tenure review process until the Provost's recommendation is 384 made. It is expected that appropriate consultation will take place if materials are added 385 that will affect the recommendation.

386

387 4. Each academic department or institute (unit in the case of the School of Law or 388 University Libraries) will develop a "Procedural Form" that itemizes the promotion and 389 tenure steps that are to be followed in the department and unit. As steps are completed, 390 each of the responsible persons (e.g., departmental chairperson, departmental promotion

8

391 and tenure committee, chairperson of the unit promotion and tenure committee, and dean) 392 in the unit will provide his or her signature, acknowledging that steps were completed in 393 accordance with the departmental and unit procedural policies and indicating the date in 394 which steps were completed. Each candidate will be provided an opportunity to sign, 395 acknowledging receipt of written documentation and the date it was received. A 396 candidate's signature will not indicate agreement with the feedback or recommendations 397 at any given point.

398

399 5. Departmental Application and Review Process (does not apply to School of Law or 400 University Libraries)

401

402 a. A candidate will submit his or her application and supporting documentation or 403 promotion and/or tenure to the departmental chairperson by the date specified by 404 the departmental promotion and tenure documents.

405

406 b. After giving adequate consideration to each application, each department, in 407 accordance with its unit promotion and tenure procedures, will make a promotion 408 and tenure recommendation in writing to the appropriate unit promotion and 409 tenure committee regarding each candidate. A letter from both the departmental 410 chairperson and departmental promotion and tenure committee will go forward to 411 the unit promotion and tenure committee. These letters will specify the reasons 412 for the departmental recommendations and will be copied to the respective 413 candidate.

414

415 c. If the candidate chooses, he or she can respond in writing. This response will be 416 forwarded with all related materials to the unit promotion and tenure committee. 417

418 6. Unit Application and Final Review Process (applies to all units) 419

420 a. The specific administrative process for submitting material, including to whom, 421 must be specified in each unit's promotion and tenure policies. 422

423 b. After giving adequate consideration to each application, each unit promotion and 424 tenure committee will make promotion and tenure recommendations regarding 425 each candidate in writing to the appropriate dean by the date specified in the unit 426 promotion and tenure documents.

427

428 c. After giving adequate consideration to the application, the unit dean will inform 429 each candidate, in

writing, of the recommendation and the reasons for it no later 430 than the first business day following December 14. In units that conduct 431 departmental reviews, this letter will be copied to the departmental chairperson. 432 After ensuring the candidate has received notification, the departmental 433 chairperson will share the recommendation with the departmental promotion and 434 tenure committee. The dean will also inform the unit promotion and tenure 435 committee of the recommendation.

436

437 d. Candidates or concerned individuals (e.g. departmental chairpersons, or 438 promotion and tenure committee members) who wish to submit a written 439 response to the dean have until the first business day following December 21 to 440 do so.

441

9

442 e. The dean will then consider any additional evidence and responses and send a 443 recommendation in writing to the Provost, along with the completed “Procedural 444 Form,” cumulative file, and the response(s) of any candidate or concerned 445 individuals no later than the first business day after January 1. In units that 446 conduct departmental reviews, this letter will be copied to the departmental 447 chairperson, no later than the first business day following January 1. After 448 ensuring the candidate has received notification, the departmental chairperson 449 will share the recommendation with the departmental promotion and tenure 450 committee. The dean will also inform the unit promotion and tenure committee 451 of the recommendation. 452

453 7. Provost Recommendation Process

454 a. Candidates or any other concerned individuals (e.g. departmental chairpersons, or 455 promotion and tenure committee members) have until the first business day 456 following January 15 to file a written response to the dean’s recommendation 457 with the Provost.

458

459 b. The Provost will review all materials and make recommendations to the 460 President no later than the first business day following January 30. Each 461 candidate will be informed in writing of the Provost’s recommendation. 462 Candidates or any other concerned individuals (e.g. departmental chairpersons, or 463 promotion and tenure committee members) who wish to submit a written 464 response to the Provost will have until the first business day following February 465 15 to do so.

466

467 8. Final Administrative Authority

468

469 a. Final administrative authority rests with the President. Each candidate will be 470 informed in writing of the President’s decision. This decision will also be copied 471 to the Provost, the appropriate dean, and the appropriate departmental 472 chairperson.

473

474 9. Mediation and Appeals If the candidate chooses to appeal the President’s decision, he 475 or she may begin the mediation process in accord with the Faculty Handbook, Section 476 IV.E. If mediation does not resolve the complaint, the candidate may make use of the 477 appeal processes set out in the Faculty Handbook (Sections IV.C.1, IV.E, and XIII.E.). 478 The Board of Trustees will serve as the court of last resort in the appeals process. 479

480 10. Report to the Board of Trustees

481

482 a. The President will provide the Board of Trustees with a report of promotion and 483 tenure actions at the spring meeting. The summary report will minimally include 484 statistics regarding the gender and minority status of candidates. 485

486 b. The University Committee will receive a copy of the President’s summary report 487 on promotion and tenure no later than two weeks prior to the spring Board 488 meeting.

489

490 c. The University Committee will review the promotion and tenure process for 491 adherence to appropriate procedures and will examine the President’s summary 492 report before compiling a report of its

493 Committee of the Board of Trustees at the Board's spring meeting. This report 494 will also be provided to the President of the Academic Senate who will present it 495 to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. 496

497 **III. Implementation of the University application and review process for promotion and tenure. 498 THIS SECTION WILL BE REVISED TO INCLUDE NEW TRANSITION PLAN, PENDING TIMING 499 OF ACTIONS AS DETERMINED BY ECAS**

500

501 A. Following passage of this policy by the faculty members, the Provost will send a letter to each 502 tenure-track faculty member who has received three or more probationary contracts prior to May 15, 2008^b 503 . The letter will inform these tenure-track faculty members that they have the choice to 504 be evaluated relative to the procedure and criteria for promotion and tenure which were in place 505 at the time of their most recently affected probationary contract or relative to the resolutions 506 presented here. Each affected tenure-track faculty member will submit his or her choice to the 507 Provosts' office within six months of the passage of these resolutions. Tenure-track faculty 508 members who have received two or fewer probationary contracts prior to May 15, 2008 will be 509 evaluated relative to the resolutions presented here. 510

511 B. Faculty members who have been granted the rank of associate professor as of May 15, 2008 will follow procedures for promotion to full professor as explicated above.^b

512

513

514 C. The elimination of the provisional tenure year will be implemented with the first set of 515 contracts distributed following the approval of these resolutions.

516

517 D. Work of the University Committee 1 Elections for University Committee members will be conducted in Fall 2007.^b

518 2 Each unit will submit its procedural policies for promotion and tenure 519 to the Provost's office. Those materials should be submitted as early as January 1 and no later than April 1, 2008.^b

520 3 The University Committee will review all promotion and tenure procedural

521 522 523

524 by May 15, E. Initial
2008.^b rotation of
members^c

525 1. Members to initially serve a three year term: Law, Libraries, Arts, Humanities(1), 526 Natural Sciences(1) 2. Members to initially serve a two year term: Social Sciences(1), 527 Business(1), Education and Health Sciences(1), Engineering(1), Humanities(2) 3. 528 Members to initially serve a 1 year term: Natural Sciences(2), Social Sciences(2), 529 Business(2), Education and Health Sciences(2), Engineering(2) 530

531

^a

532 School of Law includes the School of Law faculty and Law Library faculty.

533

^b

534 Dates assume passage of the above resolutions by Fall 2007.

535

^c

536 Candidates with the highest number of votes in areas where two representatives are elected are 537 designated by the number 1 in the rotations listed above. Candidates with the next highest number of 538 votes in those areas are designated by the number 2.

**STUDENT ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE (SAPC)
REPORT TO ECAS on STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

Lee Dixon and Sharon Gratto, Co-Chairs

This report is written in response to the following charge from the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to the SAPC:

ECAS requests that SAPC review the recommendations from the SAPC final report “The Digital Student Evaluation of Teaching” submitted 3/1/20 (SAPC Chair, Dr. Laura Leming, and Co-Chair, Prof. Suki Kwon). SAPC should consider in its work (1) feedback in the Senate meeting [4/17/20] as well as the UPTPTF Final Report and other relevant reports and resources (e.g., studies by Dr. Jana Bennett, Dr. Erin O’Mara, LTC), (2) utilization in faculty review, instrument, as well as implementation (such as response rate), (3) ECAS is particularly concerned with SET in light of the action steps toward becoming an anti racist university, and other broader conversations around diversity, inequality, and inclusion. ECAS requests that SAPC review, make recommendations, and draft proposed revisions to relevant policies.

After extensive discussion, the current SAPC has made the following **assumptions** regarding SET:

- The need for an evaluation tool to gather student feedback regarding faculty teaching is important and necessary
- The current Student Evaluation of Teaching tool.....
 - was thoroughly researched, well-developed using an internal and national consultative process, and carefully written between 2010 and 2014 by a committee of faculty and students and was designed to be used in a formative way.
 - represents a significant improvement over prior versions.
 - has not always been used in a formative way.
 - like most tools used for teacher evaluation, its responses have inherent biases related to gender, race, ethnicity, first language if other than English, and nationality.
 - should be seen as only one part of the larger process of teaching evaluation.
 - continues to yield low response rates.
- In relation to SET, faculty....
 - teaching should be evaluated using multiple measures.
 - should be protected against harassing written SET comments.
 - should be assessed with considerations given to inherent biases in SET evaluation results.
- In relation to SET, students.....
 - are stakeholders in the faculty evaluation process.
 - do not have the right to submit inappropriate comments or comments that violate

related UD policies (e.g., Student Standards of Behavior and Code of Conduct go.udayton.edu/codeofconduct, Nondiscrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy <https://udayton.edu/policies/finance/nondiscrimination-policypage.php>)

2

- would benefit from training about how SET scores are utilized and how to write constructive comments that can help improve teaching and learning.

Following are the SAPC's **recommendations** regarding SET usage:

1. SET should reflect the University's commitment to eliminate inherent bias and the perpetuation of inequity in the evaluation process
2. Students need training and preparation about the purpose of SET along with faculty guidance before they complete course SET forms
3. New faculty need direction during orientation in administering SET and information about available resources for reading and interpreting resulting SET scores and comments
4. Evaluators need training to read, interpret, and utilize SET scores and comments with an understanding of the inherent biases that exist in the responses
5. Given inherent biases in most, if not all, respondents, SET scores and comments should be used primarily as a formative instrument that supports growth in teaching and learning
6. Given that SET is to be used as a formative instrument, Units and Departments should be held accountable not to use SET in a summative manner in decisions regarding compensation and promotion and tenure
7. Faculty should demonstrate how SET scores and comments were used to improve teaching and learning
8. Merit and promotion and tenure decisions should be made only after reviewing faculty members' demonstration of how SET results were used to improve teaching and learning
9. SET should be administered during class to increase response rates, allow time for faculty to present the purpose of the tool and describe how students should complete it
10. Faculty should be encouraged to use additional tools they select including Isidore check ins, Midterm Diagnostic tools, and other tools for self-evaluation
11. Faculty need opportunities to review their SET scores and comments with Chairs and/or other administrators without concern for negative impact on supervisor reviews
12. Comments that violate related UD policies (e.g., Student Standards of Behavior and Code of Conduct go.udayton.edu/codeofconduct, Nondiscrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy <https://udayton.edu/policies/finance/nondiscrimination-policypage.php>) should be flagged by faculty, shared immediately with Chairs and/or other administrators, and not be considered when evaluation forms are reviewed
13. SET scores and comments are to be evaluated holistically
14. SET is to be used among multiple forms of feedback to guide growth and improvement in teaching

In Senate Document I-06-08, titled "Evaluating Faculty Teaching for the Purposes of Tenure," the following statements are made in Section III:

- A. The evaluation of faculty teaching for the purpose of tenure must be based on multiple measures drawn from multiple sources.
- B. All tenure track faculty must have their teaching evaluated according to a schedule

determined by department or unit guidelines or bylaws.

3

- C. The results of all evaluations must be shared with the faculty member and the faculty member must be accorded the opportunity to respond in writing to any evaluation of his or her teaching.
- D. When making final recommendations regarding tenure, the evaluation of faculty teaching must be based on at a minimum:
 - 1. **Student course evaluations** for every class the faculty member has taught at the University of Dayton
 - 2. At least two **peer reviews of the faculty member's classroom teaching** conducted during at least two different semesters
 - 3. At least two **peer reviews of the faculty member's course material** conducted during at least two different semesters
 - 4. At least one **chair or administrator evaluation of the faculty member's teaching.**
 - 5. At least one **self-evaluation** produced by the faculty member.
 - 6. Faculty-provided **evidence of student achievement of learning objectives**

The SAPC recommends that letters A, B, and C be retained as stated, that letter D be revised, and letter E be added as suggested below:

- A. The evaluation of faculty teaching for the purpose of tenure must be based on multiple measures drawn from multiple sources.
- B. All tenure track faculty must have their teaching evaluated according to a schedule determined by department or unit guidelines or bylaws.
- C. The results of all evaluations must be shared with the faculty member and the faculty member must be accorded the opportunity to respond in writing to any evaluation of his or her teaching.
- D. When making final recommendations regarding tenure, the evaluation of faculty teaching must be based on at a minimum:
 - 1. **Evidence of how SET scores and comments were used to improve teaching and learning in every class the faculty member has taught at the University of Dayton. (also see Item III E below)**
 - 2. At least two peer reviews of the faculty member's classroom teaching conducted during at least two different semesters
 - 3. At least two peer reviews of the faculty member's course material conducted during at least two different semesters
 - 4. At least one chair or administrator evaluation of the faculty member's teaching.
 - 5. At least one self-evaluation produced by the faculty member.
 - 6. Faculty-provided evidence of student achievement of learning objectives
- E. **Evaluation of teaching for tenure recommendations must include consideration of student evaluations for every class with more than three students except for student teaching supervision**

These recommendations reflect earlier ones made by the Faculty Merit Evaluation Task Force in February 2018, the UPTPTF (University Promotion and Tenure Policy Task Force) in January 2019, and the PRoPT (Policy Review of Promotion and Tenure) Committee in January 2020, stating that multiple measures must be used to evaluate faculty teaching in the assessment process. Specific citations are provided below:

- 1) University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee, "DOC 2004-08 Use of Student https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_docs/37 Evaluations in Judging Teaching Effectiveness" (2005). Senate Documents. 37.
- 2) University of Dayton. Provost Committee, "DOC 2006-08 Evaluating Faculty Teaching for the Purposes of Tenure" (2008). Senate Documents. 24. https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_docs/24
- 3) DOC 2012-03 Recommendations for Revision to the Process for Student Evaluation of Teaching https://ecommons.udayton.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1201&context=senate_docs
- 4) DOC 2014-02 Proposal for a New Student Evaluation of Teaching Instrument and Delivery Method https://ecommons.udayton.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1213&context=senate_docs
- 5) Impact of Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) on Women Faculty and Instructors on UD's Campus (2017).
- 6) Final Report to the Academic Senate of the University Promotion and Tenure Policy Task Force, January 11, 2019 https://drive.google.com/file/d/1_8QQEzXn9xya01HgA8yPvg02H45neap/view