

9-30-2016

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2016-09-30

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 2016-09-30" (2016). *All Committee Minutes*. 291.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/291

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 30, 2016 13:50 – 15:00

Prepared by Mark Jacobs

Present: Joel Whitaker, Carissa Krane, Ann Biswas, Andrea Seielstad, Caroline Merithew, Carolyn Phelps, Deo Eustace

Guest: Paul Vanderburg

Minutes of prior meeting were approved by consent.

Committee is still awaiting input from school of engineering on use of clinical titles. However, Deo provided a document detailing the policies for such positions at Purdue.

Discussed the need for criteria to distinguish between lecturers, other non tenure track, and clinical positions.

Discussed the duration of time required before promotion can be made to associate and full levels.

Concern was expressed about the integrity of the “Assistant”, “Associate”, and “Full” descriptors. Specifically that they have common meanings across campus.

The language of the draft policy document at the beginning of the meeting created difficulty in handling cases where an experienced / advanced candidate is hired. There was much discussion and little resolution about the duration of six years being associated with promotion. There was some thought that requiring two intermediate reviews prior to the final review ameliorated the problem, but then we were unresolved if this applied to the promotion from associate to full.

The term rank is to be removed from section 1A2b and language about privileges added.

There was discussion about the composition of the university committee that will oversee clinical promotion policies. Should there be 1, 2, or 3 clinical faculty on the 3 member committee?

There was vigorous and thoughtful conversation across these topics that helped illuminate further the challenge faced in crafting the policy on promoting clinical faculty. However, while nothing was explicitly resolved, the overall sense was that the project was advanced in a meaningful way. Andrea will modify the working draft of the policy which will form the basis of the discussion at our next scheduled meeting.