

2-24-2006

## 2006-02-24 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas\\_mins](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee, "2006-02-24 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate" (2006). *ECAS Minutes*. Paper 104.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas\\_mins/104](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins/104)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in ECAS Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact [frice1@udayton.edu](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu).

[Approved March 3, 2006]

Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

February 24, 2006

St. Joseph Hall 325; 1:30 PM

Present: J. Biddle, D. Biers (presiding), D. Courte, D. Gudaitis, J. O’Gorman, R. Penno, R. Wells.

Excused: S. Hileman, P. Johnson, M. Morton, F. Pestello, A. Seielstad

Guests: H. Gerla (member Post-Tenure Review Committee), P. Meyers (chair Post-Tenure Review Committee), D. Polzella (for M. Morton)

Opening Prayer: Robert Penno began the meeting by reading from a speech given by Tony Dungy, Head Coach of the Indianapolis Colts, on a date just prior to Super Bowl XL.

Roll Call: Seven of the twelve members of the Committee were present.

Approval of Minutes: Approval was deferred until the next meeting.

Announcements: Announcements were deferred until the next meeting.

Old Business: Old business was deferred until the next meeting in order to give time to invited guests.

New Business:

Committee Reports: Reports were deferred until the next meeting to provide time for invited guests.

Report of Post Tenure Review Committee: Dean Pat Meyers was invited to discuss the report of the Provost’s Committee on Post Tenure Review. This report was presented to the Provost’s Council on December 20, 2005. The intention is that later this semester it will be discussed during a meeting of the Academic Senate.

Pat Meyers began the discussion with a brief review of the membership, work, and recommendations of the Provost’s Committee. Given that the Faculty Handbook already contains a policy on post-tenure review, the Provost’s charge to the committee was to investigate and study best practices for such a review and to offer guidelines for its full implementation.

It was noted, and agreed, that the membership of this Provost’s Committee was representative of the faculty at large.

The expectation, as articulated in the report, is that by August 2007 each academic unit (department or school) will design an implementation policy for post-tenure review that reflects the culture of that unit. This is **not** intended to be a re-tenure/re-promotion policy.

Dave Biers raised the issue of the purpose of the review, developmental or evaluative. Harry Gerla emphasized that the intention was mainly developmental. The guidelines were based on the assumption that academics are members of a self-regulating profession and take responsibility for the review of their peers.

The issue addressed by the guidelines regarding underperformance, however, led to extensive discussion. Jack O’Gorman and Bob Penno raised issues regarding the link between post-tenure review and annual faculty reviews that are related directly to salary and merit. The intention of the guidelines is to give flexibility to each unit to design an appropriate process that acknowledges expectations for faculty members. It is important to note that this process does not require a decision of any kind be made regarding the faculty under review. The peer review provides legitimacy to the process. In the case of underperformance, the post-tenure review provides a basis for administrative action designed to give a faculty member the opportunity to develop.

Don Polzella asked about the expectation that peers will provide objective reviews. Could this lead to an uncomfortable situation? Pat Meyers responded by highlighting that resources would be made available through the LTC to support departments in this process.

Dave Biers posed three questions. First, is it being suggested that a committee be formed to review the processes of all units? The answer is no. Second, should the university-wide P&T process be considered by the Academic Senate before the post-tenure review process? Members of ECAS agreed that the two should be considered concurrently, along with the workload policy and the evaluation of teaching. Third, what is the purpose of the Sense of the Senate discussion? This question initiated a discussion of the authority of the Academic Senate and whether or not the Senate had legislative authority in this matter. Harry Gerla referenced the constitution of the Academic Senate in this regard. Because there are specific standards (guidelines) Senate legislative action is in order.

Jim Biddle then provided the background for this initiative. It originated with the Board of Trustees Academic Policies Committee several years ago along with the university-wide promotion and tenure initiative. Jim then raised the issue about the coordination of these two initiatives with two additional initiatives, the evaluation of teaching and faculty workload. The members of ECAS agreed the Academic Senate should consider all four of these issues concurrently. Don Polzella noted that all four initiatives address efforts to develop and retain the best possible educators.

Suggestions were then offered regarding the timetable for further consideration of post-tenure review policy. If all four initiatives are considered concurrently, then the timing of selected components of the process may change. It was agreed that the August 2007 implementation was reasonable and that the schedule would be further refined after subsequent discussion.

It was suggested that the committee chair of each of the four initiatives (P&T, post-tenure review, teaching evaluation, and workload) meet together with ECAS during the next

meeting. Because these initiatives may result in significant changes in the culture of UD, Bob Penno and Jim Biddle both suggested the Academic Senate encourage discussion of these issues in all academic units.

The Committee thanked Pat Meyers for the presentation and discussion.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 3:02 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rebecca Wells  
(Substituting for Patricia A. Johnson, Secretary)