

9-13-2017

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2017-09-13

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 2017-09-13" (2017). *All Committee Minutes*. 302.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/302

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.

Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes:

September 13, 2017

Present: Andrea Seielstad (Chair), Maher Qumsiyeh, Caroline Merithew, Rebecca Wells, Deo Eustace, Carolyn Phelps (Ex Officio), Paul Vanderburgh (Ex-Officio), , Mary Ellen Dillon

Absent: Kevin Kelly, Suki Kwon, Kathy Webb, Corinne Daprano, Laura Leming

1. Minutes of September 6, 2017 FAC meeting were approved.
2. We continued with the discussion of the scope of the lecturer promotion policy. There was a brief discussion comparing lecturers to tenure-track faculty. Primarily, it was noted that lecturers provide more teaching capacity and flexibility in staffing of curricular needs. In fact, the official workloads of most lecturers is exclusively for teaching. It was also noted that there can be pressure, either for those striving to get tenure-track positions or sometimes as a result of specific departmental needs, for lecturers to sometimes engage in service and research.
3. The group also discussed other issues important to lecturers. Some have been teaching as lecturers for a very long time and become virtually indistinguishable in terms of actual activity from tenure-track colleagues. Greater opportunities for professional development was one area of concern. Security of position was another. It was noted that the Provost's Office has recently been issuing 3-year appointment letters for positions they know will continue to be funded for that length of time. It was also noted that the approach most consistent with both the tenure-track and clinical positions was to leave the decision-making about the rights and benefits of any given status of lecturer, to the Unit and Departments. A change in that approach for lecturer would likely require a change in approach for clinical as well as tenure-track requirements. The group also had a preliminary discussion about whether it would be advisable to put a few guidelines in for departments and units to follow with respect to these kinds of matters, i.e., the issuance of 3-year appointment letters, for securely funded positions. Some noted the importance of trying to do this to improve lecturer morale.
4. One guideline that was especially emphasized by some members of the committee was that it should be very clear that lecturers were teaching faculty. If we hire you to teach as a lecture, we want you to do that. Money for professional development could be linked to that, it was argued. If you want to do research or other activities, it would be acknowledged that that is on your own.
5. With respect to the issue of promotion itself, it was noted that promotion would allow for better recognition of teaching skill. Policies from other schools were reviewed in which the majority seemed to utilize the titles of Lecturer, Senior Lecture, and Distinguished Lecturer. Another nomenclature was discussed as well.
6. One more meeting will be allocated to discussion of this matter to determine whether we could proceed with something similar to the clinical promotion policy.

Respectfully submitted: Deo Eustace