

9-23-2016

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2016-09-23

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee

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

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee, "Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2016-09-23" (2016). *All Committee Minutes*. 288.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/288

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlengen1@udayton.edu.

Approved FAC Minutes
Sept. 23, 2016, 1:15-3 pm, Roesch Library 205

Attendees: Kevin Kelly, Carolyn Phelps, Joel Whitaker, Mark Jacobs, Andrea Seielstad, Corinne Deprano, Carissa Krane, Susan Elliott, Ann Biswas

Guests: Sue Wulff, Paul Vandenburg

1. The Sept. 9, 2016, minutes were approved with minor changes.
2. Andrea distributed the “Law School Accreditation Standards, American Bar Association” document as background for the committee’s discussion of promotion parameters for clinical faculty or faculty of practice.
3. Discussion with Sue Wulff, founding director and chair of UD’s PA Program, regarding Clinical Faculty issues related to promotion. We discussed the promotion policy document, criteria, timeline, and committee structure.

The PA accreditation standard states, "Principal faculty and the program director should have academic appointments and privileges comparable to other faculty with similar academic responsibilities in the institution." Sue noted that the PA program was given Provisional Accreditation and that she must report progress on this issue every six months. She would like things to be resolved no later than by the end of the 2018 calendar year, which is when the PA program will come up for Continuing Accreditation. Regarding the part of the standard that reads, “comparable to other faculty with similar academic responsibilities in the institution”: A question was raised about whether we should be comparing the Clinical PA positions to Lecturer positions rather than to tenure-line positions.

Clinical Faculty Promotion Policy Document

No decisions were made, but the committee discussed several points related to the Clinical Faculty promotion document, including

1. In what ways should the Clinical Faculty policy be similar to the existing Promotion and Tenure policy?
2. Should there be two separate policies or one document that covers tenure-line faculty and Clinical Faculty?

Promotion Criteria

Discussed at length were the criteria required for promotion review. Carolyn noted that these items are not listed in the contract. In particular, the committee discussed whether scholarship should be a part of the review process. The Western University of Health Services 2006 *College of Allied Health Professions Faculty Handbook* includes wording related to scholarly activities as a criterion required for promotion, which we might use as a guideline.

Sue explained that Clinical Faculty are on renewable one-year contracts (none has received a 3-year expectation of renewal letter). UD's Clinical PA Faculty teach at the university and have a clinical job outside the university where they work one day a week, although this is not a requirement of the position. This work helps them stay current on their practice. They are paid by the organization where they work (e.g., family practice, ER, pediatrics unit). Clinical PA Faculty also do student advising; thus, both teaching and service are currently requirements for these positions.

Sue noted that comparable PA programs have assistant, associate, and professor levels for their clinical faculty

The committee considered three possible criteria for Clinical Faculty promotion:

- a. Teaching
- b. Professional Development
- c. Service

A discussion ensued regarding item b:

- Is professional development a part of service?
- Would this apply to all clinical position?
- Would this take into account licensure requirements?
- Each department or unit would be deciding what specific professional development is required.

A suggestion was made to remove item b. Sue noted that if we remove item b, the promotion would lose something; Clinical PA faculty are currently required to do a and c. A suggestion was made to revised the wording of b as follows:

- b. Clinical or professional practice and/or development and/or research, scholarship

Timing of Clinical Faculty Promotion

The committee discussed at length the timing of when Clinical faculty should be promoted and/or reviewed. No decisions were made, but the following items were considered:

1. Tenure is based on a 6-year timetable with two reviews prior to the final one. Should Clinical Faculty policy follow the same timeline?
2. Could we require a review at 2 and 4 years? At 3 and 5 years?
3. The first 2-year review could be the review/promotion to assistant professor, the second review could be promotion to associate, and the third to full.
4. Should Clinical Faculty consult with their chair and determine when the instructor is ready for promotion?
5. Could we allow departments/units to determine their own timeline or should there be a consistent university-wide timeline for NTT?
6. Should we specify a minimum time at UD before an individual could go up for review? Should we specify a minimum of 6 years to keep this comparable to the

tenure timeline? The law school follows a different timeline (Andrea will follow-up with details)

7. Should promotion be required or optional? Should it be encouraged? What advantages are there to encouraging Clinical Faculty to be promoted?
8. What will happen if someone goes up for promotion and is denied?
9. Could prior years of service be counted toward promotion?

The committee considered the following suggested wording:

“Clinical faculty will be eligible for promotion no earlier than 6 years with two evaluations leading up to promotion to the Associate Professor.”

There was general consensus that this would make the Clinical faculty policy align with the tenure track policy.

The Clinical Faculty Committee

The committee reviewed the existing Promotion and Tenure guidelines (part D) regarding the University Committee composition, which states that the committee includes 15 tenured faculty. The University Committee’s responsibilities are to review and approve policies and process issues only.

The committee discussed at length the following issues regarding the composition of a committee to review policies and processes for Clinical Faculty promotion:

1. Should there be Clinical Faculty representation on the University Committee? Currently no untenured tenure-line faculty are on the committee. What would the repercussions be of adding Clinical Faculty representation? Would we be adding more members to the University Committee?
2. If Clinical Faculty are added to the University Committee, should they only have a vote on matters related to Clinical Faculty?
3. Should a new committee be established for Clinical Faculty promotion rather than using the University Committee for this work? A suggestion was made to keep this new committee small (e.g., 3 members: 1 Clinical, 2 tenured).

4. Concluding comments

- The committee would like to hear from Eddie Rojas regarding promotion issues with faculty of practice positions.
- Our next meeting is Friday, Sept. 30, from 1:15-3, in 602 Library.

The meeting adjourned at 3 pm.

Respectfully Submitted By,

Ann Biswas