

9-6-2017

## Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2017-09-06

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee, "Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2017-09-06" (2017). *All Committee Minutes*. 303.  
[https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins/303](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/303)

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](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu), [mschlengen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlengen1@udayton.edu).

Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes:

September 6, 2017

Present: Andrea Seielstad (Chair), Maher Qumsiyeh, Caroline Merithew, Laura Leming, Rebecca Wells, Kevin Kelly, Carolyn Phelps (Ex Officio), Corinne Daprano, Mary Ellen Dillon

Absent: Deo Eustace, Suki Kwon, Kathy Webb

1. Minutes of August 30, 2017 FAC meeting were approved.
2. Chair Seielstad reviewed FAC issues pending from AY 16-17. Chair Seielstad reviewed the charge from ECAS regarding the drafting of a lecturer promotion policy (LPP) as well as the policy drafted last year for clinical faculty/faculty of practice.
  - a. Review of the following definitions and key points ensued: (See Approved Document.)
    - i. Clinical Faculty/Faculty of Practice Promotion Policy (CFPP) was focus of FAC deliberation for much of AY 16-17. The the CFPP was formally approved by the Senate.
    - ii. Chair Seielstad asked Committee members to consider whether and to what extent the approved CFPP was useful in developing a LPP.
    - iii. The following questions emerged from discussion:
      1. Does CFPP have resonance – serve as a suitable model - for LPP development? Discussion ensued.
      2. Should policy resemble existing promotion policies in terms of ranks/tiers and promotion evaluation time frames?
      3. What are the universals across UD – and what is School/College specific?
      4. Will the LPP address post-promotion position security? Or should the determination of position security remain at the unit level?
        - a. Mary Ellen Dillon advocated for multi-year appointments to accompany promotion. What is similar and different about lecturers? AS
      5. How will lack of uniformity in expectations for lecturers (e.g., service, voting rights) across campus affect emergent LPP? More information is needed regarding existing lecturer position practices and expectations.
      6. Rebecca Wells stated that the CFPP provides a good model for use in developing LPP.
3. There was a discussion of next steps, including information needs.
  - a. Laura Leming stated that we need to discuss what promotion means in the Lecturer title/line/position. What are the possible titles? What are the advantages? What are the criteria by which promotion judgements are made?
  - b. Chair Seielstad stated that FAC, in addition to determining how to proceed with respect to LPP, also needs to determine those from whom feedback should be sought.
  - c. Corinne Daprano volunteered to share LPP models from other Universities.

Respectfully submitted: Kevin R. Kelly