

University Review Committee
Tuesday, October 4, 2011
1:10 p.m., Hovey 302
MINUTES

Those present: Cynthia Huff, Nancy Lind, Cyndee Brown, Chad Kahl, David Rubin, Domingo Joaquin, Sam Catanzaro.

The meeting was called to order at 1:15

- I. The September 13, 2011, minutes were shared and approved. Approval moved by C. Kahl, Seconded by C. Huff
- II. Disposition of CFSC annual reports after URC discussion: Just one issue brought to light about a name inadvertently left on the report. No other concerns about the reports. Moved to accept reports by David Rubin, seconded by Cynthia Huff. The reports were approved. A letter will go to each Dean saying that the reports have been reviewed and accepted.
- III. Review of DRAFT 2012-2013 ASPT Calendar: Several calendar items were questioned as follows:
 - Calendar for Reappointment: May 15, 2013, - a possible issue "third and subsequent year" Change indicated to the previous language - from 2014 to 2013.
 - Calendar for Promotion and Tenure: November 15 should read Prior to December 15, 2012.
 - Calendar narrative should be consistent with the beige book.
 - Calendar dates should be consistent with the beige book and notations made when dates occur when the University is closed.

Discussion ensued regarding clarification of termination dates. Sam will consult with legal and the Provost and report back to the URC.

A revised draft ASPT calendar will be developed and reviewed as a future agenda item.

- IV. S. Catanzaro provided an update on the Academic Senate Faculty Caucus' status of the URC's position to retain the current ASPT policy that has no appeal process for non-reappointment of probationary tenure-track faculty.

- The Faculty Caucus requests the URC to reconsider developing a process for non-reappointment of probationary faculty, working from the circulated documents:

ASPT Sections XI and XIII.J (Appeals for non-reappointment of probationary faculty)

Additional aspects: One suggestion - keep it as simple and straight forward as possible. Should not be onerous. What is the definition of "procedural"? Process of appeal for probationary faculty members must be different from that of a tenured faculty member. What is adequate consideration? Define, examine this process - don't blind side people is the intent. Academic Freedom and Ethics are the procedural grounds that may be considered in an appeal. Discussion of various scenarios ensued.

Recommendations: do not add specific examples. Is there a way to clarify the procedure? Have a conversation with the faculty caucus when this is revisited. Perhaps the examples of adequate consideration can be handled in discussion and or the faculty caucus could re-write any of the language of URC.

(Failure to follow University policy) Possible language to include. (May include but are not limited to) Sam may try to craft some language with University legal counsel

Discussion of spousal hiring procedures and protocols.

- V. Mennonite College of Nursing Appeal Process for CFSC recommendations, operating without a DFSC.

Recommendation for Mennonite which has only a CFSC; how and to whom do they appeal? Use procedures/processes as any CFSC appeal; Motion made by N. Lind that the following language address the issue:

ASPT Policy Changes

Context: Mennonite College of Nursing lacks sufficient faculty to operate both a DFSC and a CFSC and hence operate with only a CFSC in effect dropping out the bottom stage of the process. Thus, the question arises as to what type of appeals process is available for performance evaluations and promotion and tenure decisions.

Rationale: It is important to allow an appeal equivalent to the appeals allowed to faculty operating under the 'normal' ASPT process by giving faculty the opportunity for a single review of the CFSC decision. The FRC is an elected body of faculty most similar to the CFSC.

Members of the URC do not believe new language is needed to allow for a promotion/tenure appeal as the current guidelines already indicate that “any negative promotion and/or tenure recommendation by a DFSC/SFC or CFSC may be appealed.”

On a motion made by Nancy Lind, seconded by Cynthia Huff, to make the following changes to the ASPT Policies:

ASPT Policies Item XIII.E.2.

Performance evaluations conducted by a DFSC/SFSC may be appealed to the CFSC only. **Performance evaluations conducted by a CFSC, in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC, may be appealed to the FRC.** (See XIII.H.)

The motion carried.

Prior to submitting to the faculty caucus of the Academic Senate, Sam will review with the Provost and University Legal Counsel.

VI. Other Items

No meeting next week, October 11, but the URC will meet on the October 18. The meeting was adjourned at 2:10.

Respectfully submitted,
Cyndee Brown, Secretary.

Future Meetings: Tuesdays, starting at 1:10 p.m.

October 18, Hovey 401-D

October 25, Hovey 302

November 1, Hovey 401-D

November 8, Hovey 302

November 15, Hovey 401-D

November 29, Hovey 302

December 6, Hovey 401-D

AGENDA: October 18, Hovey 401-D, 1:10 p.m.

- I. Approval of October 4 minutes
- II. Distribute Revised Draft 2012-13 ASPT Calendar
- III. Update on appeal for nonreappointment probationary faculty
- IV. Update on ASPT Item XIII.E.2 appeal of annual evaluation to FRC when conducted by CFSC in absence of DFSC/SFSC.
- V. Discussion/Approval of Milner College Standards