

10-30-2020

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2020-10-30

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 2020-10-30" (2020). *All Committee Minutes*. 354.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/354

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.

Minutes FAC Meeting
30 October 2020, 2:30-3:20 pm via Zoom

Present: Present: Lissa Cupp, Samuel Dorf, Mark Jacobs, Ryu-Kyung Kim, Katherine Kohlen, Carissa Krane, Sayeh Meisami, Grant Neeley, Carolyn Phelps, Eddy Rojas, Kathy Webb, Mary Ziskin

Guests: Janet Bednarek, Joe Valenzano

1. Introductions of guests and welcome to Kyung Kim who is joining the discussion as the ECAS appointed NTT faculty representative.
2. Minutes from 20 October 2020 meeting were approved.
3. Brief recap of ECAS Charge and FAC progress to date.
4. PRoPT co-chairs Summary:
4 peer institutions were examined: University of Wisconsin, Duquesne, SLU, and Xavier
Recommendations were made based on UD mission/culture. Peer institutions were simply a check, but not a benchmark. PRoPT used the UPTPTF report, Special reports to the Provost (SET; Service), Merit task force report, mission and identity report, Hiring and Advancement for Diversity and Inclusion working group materials in making the recommendations.
5. FAC asked for specific clarification on the following:
Coupling promotion and tenure: Rationale: Separate criteria do not exist for promotion and tenure. Therefore, if granted one, should be granted the other since the criteria are the same. Discussed history of UD when these were uncoupled (preliminary tenure, promotion and then tenure). Also discussed workload associated with separate applications/criteria review. Noted that individuals coming to the university can be hired at Associate rank without tenure, but that is a special circumstance.

Outcome: Straw poll on Oct 12 indicated 5 for, 6 against; after this discussion, majority support for coupling promotion and tenure.

"one and done" for tenure---can only go up once. Rationale: consistent with current policy; would place undue burden on P&T committees to have applicants submit portfolios just to test the waters.

Outcome: majority support for one and done tenure decision

Early tenure (if coupled with promotion): Rationale: Makes sense to offer early tenure if coupled with promotion for candidates who are prepared; would need to make sure that candidate was ready, and be done in consultation, with a timeline for making the decision in negotiation with the provost's office; there needs to be a deadline past

which the application cannot be withdrawn and would move forward through the process. Could address the needs expressed by some unit Deans that this is needed for retention of faculty. Proposed condition that early tenure be no more than 1 year early; however, no general agreement on this, as some want to leave it up to units.

Outcome: majority agreement for 1 year option for early tenure if coupled with promotion.

"high/adequate achievement" for full promotion to full professor:

Rationale: Primary source for this was the Service report, which indicated that there is disproportionate service expectation on some groups on campus that prevent them from achieving the scholarship requirements for promotion to full professor. No peer institution data provided. Desire to generate multiple paths to achieve promotion to full, to recognize the composite of ways faculty contribute to the mission of the university. Recognition that some "get stuck" as associate professor due to the scholarship expectation.

Discussion: Several statements offered: 1. Scholarship should continue to be the main criterion for promotion to full; set by external/academy expectations. 2. The 2 high achieving areas should include scholarship as one of the areas of high achievement. 3. Units can decide what areas are high/adequate and what that means. 4. Concern about propagating the undervaluation of service and discordance between unit expectations if it is left up to the units/departments to decide.

Outcome: Needs more discussion.

6. Working draft of revised University Promotion and Tenure Policy document:
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZQPb-RDmJVkcjEQkG8OFKJYoC87F7ycB/edit>

7. Next FAC Meeting: Monday, 2 November, 2020, 2:00-3:15 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Carissa Krane