

University of Dayton

eCommons

All Committee Minutes

Academic Senate Committees

2-1-2021

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2021-02-01

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee

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

Minutes FAC Meeting
12 April 2021, 2:30-3:30 pm via Zoom

1. Attendance: Lissa Cupp, Samuel Dorf, Deo Eustace, Mark Jacobs, Ryu-Kyung Kim (FT-NTT guest), Katherine Kohnen, Carissa Krane, Sayeh Meisami, Grant Neeley, Carolyn Phelps (ex officio), Andrea Seielstad, Kathy Webb, Mary Ziskin
2. Minutes from the 29 March 2021 FAC meeting were approved.
3. Update on Unit/Division level consultation
 - A. Results
 - B. Consultation sessions:
 - a. CAS/CCPD: Carissa and Grant: April 7
 - b. CAS Divisions
 - i. Arts (Sam) -- sessions on April 7 (12:20-1:10pm) and April 15 (1-1:45pm)
 - ii. Hum (Sayeh), -- sessions April 12 (3:30-4:30pm) and April 16 (9-10am)
 - iii. Soc Sci (Grant) Tuesday 13 APR 3 - 5 pm, Thursday 15 APR 8-10 am
 - iv. NS (Carissa)---Sessions on Monday April 12, 8 am and Friday April 16 8 am
 - c. SEHS--Dean/Chairs (April 8); P&T committee (April 9); Congress April 9 (Mary, Carissa)
 - d. SOE-- (Deo, Eddy) (done 4/8/21 & 4/9/21 - were open to all tenure track/tenured faculty in the school)
 - e. SBA--Friday 4/10 at 10:30 and 1:00 - open to all SBA faculty
 - f. Libraries--(March 12 and April 1 - all University Libraries faculty)
 - g. Law-- (Andrea)
4. Discussion of feedback from consultation and open forums, and anonymous feedback forms:
 - DEI concerns: Concerns over criteria for evaluation--unclear as to the fact that the Unit/Department/Institutes have authority.responsibility for evaluation criteria:
 - More specificity from University
 - Unit/Dept specificity
 - Frustration that these changes were not in place when individuals went up for promotion or P&T. Grievances with past criteria/policy.
 - SBA: 2 open forums, anonymous comments from SBA, faculty meeting---strongly negative against DE&I; negative against promotion and tenure tether (recognizing that SBA does not usually untether P&T). 15% SBA participated; DE&I doesn't belong in the policy; If it is a procedure document why are there values statements in the policy? DE&I is a topic in which society has evolved on, and continues to evolve, during the course of a person's tenure period, whereas other standards of evaluation have remained consistent (journals); if it should pass SBA, DE&I must be excised
 - Q: Is the opposition in SBA to DE&I due to lack of exposure/professional development. Eg. no comments on DE&I in SOE feedback. Why is it so different?

- When SOE started forums when they first started P&T revisions DE&I was a big issue, turn out was big; now it is more established and accepted; open forums/educational opportunities
- SEHS: evidentiary applications of DE&I used as examples (accreditation, broader impacts); themes could be addressed in FAQs; provide additional examples; “equality vs. equity” framing; only limited opportunities to serve on DE&I committee;
 - Arts: Training was contentious; who would oversee, and how would it be overseen,
 - CAS: DE&I language isn’t strong enough (Commitment vs. proficiency); requirement in all 3 or even a 4th dimension vs. issues with $\frac{2}{3}$ -- General support for DE&I but not $\frac{2}{3}$ --leave it up to departments/units
 - Q: Is there a misunderstanding of how the process works? Re-stated that there is no University level evaluation committee; this is a university wide foundational policy
 - Libraries: DE&I Only required in 1 not $\frac{2}{3}$. Questions about who would be covered by the change in policy. Need to make it clear that if in progress towards P&T that you would be governed by what existed when you came in; legacy clause needed; ways of voting in pieces/blocks; not full support for tethering promotion and tenure. If DE&I isn’t included in P&T, but it is everyone’s work, the only place it goes is in merit.
 - Concerns about venture creation; but not other aspects in that list which seems to deviate from policy language;
 - Guidance on legacy clause; existing vs. new criteria; provide clarity
 - Issues of consistency between hiring and P&T
 - Introduction reliance on DE&I and no mention of scholarship, teaching, service as part of the mission and identity
 - Video to talk about DE&I and mission.
5. Discussion of presentation at SENATE MEETING:
- A. Highlight feedback we have received; open up broader discussion
 - B. Specific issues to highlight: DE&I, tethering P&T, mission and identity framing of P&T, legacy issue, criteria not in UPTP
 - C. Straw Poll using Zoom Poll function on 1. DE&I 2. training; 3. mission statement 4. Coupling P&T
 - D. Invite senators to weigh in (?); make the decision if we should vote for this on the 30th or if there is more work needed (?)
6. Action items:
- Carissa will put together a powerpoint and draft poll questions and circulate among FAC members for feedback
 - Request that FAC members help to field questions during senate meeting

Respectfully Submitted,
Carissa Krane