University of Dayton

eCommons

Fall 8-23-2021

Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate 2021-08-23

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee

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

1. Attendance: Maureen Anderson, Carlos Bernal, Jon Fulkerson, Camryn Justice, Carissa Krane (chair), Sayeh Meisami, Grant Neeley, Carolyn Phelps (ex-officio), Margie Pinnell Andrew Sarangan, Kathy Webb, Andrea Wells (FT-NTT non-voting), Mary Ziskin (participated via Zoom)
2. Introductions, orientation to the FAC, function as a committee of the Academic Senate. Contributions from all members are equally welcome, valued, and encouraged.
3. All materials will be available through a Google Shared Drive: AS-FAC Folder 2021-2022. Weekly meetings are scheduled for 2:30-4 in RL 215. We will plan to meet in person.
4. Communication is generally through email and Google calendar links. Please RSVP to the Google calendar invitations.
5. Please feel free to communicate directly with Carissa Krane, chair of the FAC with any suggestions, comments, questions, concerns, etc.
6. ECAS has asked that the FAC assist with preparing faculty across the university for the tenured/tenure track faculty vote to ratify DOC 2021-05 Revisions to the University Promotion and Tenure Policy.   The FAC engaged in a discussion surrounding the strategics, logistics and tactics surrounding the vote.

   A.   50% of the Tenure/TT faculty must vote, and majority of those voting must approve for it to pass; S. Dorf has proposed voting would begin after the second senate meeting in October and would be open for 2 weeks. Participation would be monitored by the elections committee and prompts to vote sent out in response to participation rates.
   B. Need lay out a timeline and process for information campaign
       a. What is/are the process(es) that will be used to develop content
       b. What is/are the process(es) that will be used to disseminate content
       c. What is/are the process(es) that will be used to engage the Tenure/TT faculty in this process
   C. Concerns were expressed about the relatively short timeline for preparing the faculty for the vote given that the majority of faculty were not engaged in this last year.
   D. Eric Spina, Paul Benson and Sam Dorf plan to address the vote to ratify the UPTP during the fall faculty meeting on Sept 17: A concern was expressed that having leaders talk about the UPTP doesn't feel ground up. There was also a concern about inconsistent messaging if 3 people are presenting. A suggestion was made that maybe only Sam as President of the Senate should discuss this at the fall faculty meeting.
   E. Members were reminded that those outside of the senate have not been following the 4 year long discussion. Therefore, re-education is needed every time there is action on the UPTP.
   F. Reminder of the 4 year consultative process and the timeline of faculty participation throughout the process is critical.

G. It is important to highlight the fact this was faculty initiated---that the majority of the changes were designed to highlight the breadth of faculty work to better reflect the composite of the activities in which faculty are involved as part of the P&T process. These areas were identified by faculty as "not counting" in P&T, even though they were hired to specifically contribute in these areas.

H. Need to recognize for some, there is fear of devaluing the "traditional"P&T criteria by recognizing additional faculty work---need to reassure

I. Designed to give individual depts maximum flexibility in considering faculty work, research, etc; put in place to provide access, inclusivity, valuation without devaluing other work

J. A suggestion was made to provide metrics of participation: A list of names of those directly involved in the process/consultation, and a summary of the numbers of those who participated in open forums, anonymous feedback, etc.

K. A suggestion was made that an infographic produced by communications specialist for use in purpose of informing the nature of the changes would be helpful for those not embedded in the conversation.

L. Sam Dorf had identified a few individuals willing to share their personal stories on these issues through videos or participation in senate meetings. Concerns were expressed about using the personal stories/videos (?) because of pushback; that's not what I do; or none of these witnesses were promoted under this policy. As an alternative, it was suggested that we use anonymous stories received through the anonymous feedback mechanisms or use the stories from the identified faculty without personally identifying them---e.g. Stories of faculty who experienced P&T reviews that did not "count" what they were hired to do; This could have been because departments didn't know how to count therefore it didn't get counted; or couldn't figure out where the activity fit under the current evaluation dimensions.

M. Modes of communication should include, Porches, Isidore, multiple times posting; Campus reports

N. Direct messaging to chairs to deliver to faculty---chairs are not expected to lead a discussion, but rather read a paragraph describing the upcoming vote and where to find information, encouraging faculty to vote/participate

O. Could we have a one-stop shopping website including the documents, the presentations, the FAQ, a one page graphic showing the process? The chairs could share one link.

P. Supervised online forum for people to ask questions; engagement incentivizes participation; make sure they use their UD email.

Q. Focus on "This is the policy" rather than what changed.

R. Head count 518 Tenured/TT (April 2021)

S. It was recommended that we provide clarity on the process of implementation---who will be affected and when.

T. Many don't know the purpose of the UPTP, in relation to Unit/Dept P&T bylaws. Need to develop FAQs about what is the UPTP, and how the University P&T committee fits with Unit vs. dept; don't understand the process of the layering; adding a component to the framework.

U. Not every dept has a DEPT policy. SBA, SOE, Library and Law only have Unit policies
V. Important to clarify how UNIT policies are developed and approved. CAS (development process and faculty approval mechanism is unclear--fear that it will be lead and determined solely by the CAS Dean's office); Likely SEHS Congress would vote? SOE voted on their P&T policy. ??? Do we need to inform faculty about unit processes for making changes to Unit level P&T---is it a fair a laid out procedure or is it going to just be the dean's office driving the changes

7. Carissa Krane will bring these ideas to ECAS on August 27, and ask for further guidance on how ECAS would like FAC to proceed.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
   Carissa Krane, Chair FAC