

2-17-2017

Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2017-02-17

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

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

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2017-02-17" (2017). *All Committee Minutes*. 239.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/239

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, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

APC Meeting minutes

February 17, 2017

respectfully submitted by Markus Rumpfkeil, chair APC

Present: Dixon, Wu, Rumpfkeil, Trollinger, Peters, Dunne, Pierce, Webb, Wells, Bickford, Farrelly

Guests: Carolyn Roecker Phelps, Associate Provost for Faculty and Administrative Affairs
Jonathan Hess, Associate Dean for Faculty Scholarship, Internationalization and Inclusive Excellence in the College for Arts and Science
Margaret Pinnell, Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff Development in the School of Engineering

Agenda Items:

1. Minutes from February 3rd approved
2. Fact Finding on Experiences with Post-Tenure Review Policy

Carolyn informed APC that she has reports from 4 units (SoE, College, Libraries and Business) about conducted post-tenure reviews. She also reported that one report stated that there were difficulties with candor and that another unit saw no discernible positive benefits of conducting these reviews. When the question was asked whether it would be possible to create a list of UD faculty that had gone through a post-tenure review Carolyn was sure this could be done. Similarly, when the question was asked whether some kind of review process is in place, is applied and is taken seriously in most units and departments Carolyn's answer was affirmative.

The college reported that there are likely variations in the quality of the formative feedback among the Departments and that the chairs play the most crucial role in making this review meaningful. SoE reported that they have a "backlog" for conducting these reviews due to the transition in leadership.

The opinion was voiced that the peer review aspect makes the post-tenure review process valuable and relevant but there is a danger for a lack of candor because of it. The concern was raised that the feedback loop is not closed in most departments, i.e. a faculty member is informed about the findings of the review but does not have to come up with a plan on how to remedy shortcomings. A quick discussion ensued about Section 2 item 3 (DOC2006-11) that a sabbatical review is sufficient and can be used in lieu of a comprehensive peer review with most people feeling it is not.