

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Tuesday, April 24, 2012
3:00 p.m., Hovey 401d
MINUTES

Members present: Cyndee Brown (Secretary), Sam Catanzaro (ex officio), Cynthia Huff, Domingo Joaquin, Ron Meier, David Rubin, Cheri Toledo

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (Recorder)

Recused: Nancy Lind (Chair), Chad Kahl (Vice-Chair)

Chairperson Nancy Lind and Vice Chairperson Chad Kahl recused themselves due to potential conflicts of interest related to the policy interpretation action item. In their absence Secretary Cyndee Brown chaired the meeting.

I. Approve minutes of April 10, 2012 meeting

Cyndee Brown noted a correction needed to the minutes. The last sentence in the “Other business” section indicated that annual CFSC reports would be reviewed by URC in the fall. CFSC reports will instead be reviewed at the May 8 URC meeting. Nancy Lind reported the error prior to the meeting via email. Cynthia Huff moved, Ron Meier seconded approval of minutes of the April 10, 2012 meeting with this correction. The motion carried.

II. Action Item (continuation from April 10, 2012):

Request for policy interpretation (ASPT V.B.1 and V.B.2, pp. 18-19 Beige Book)

Sam Catanzaro reported having made inquiries to determine whether precedent exists through actions of other ASPT units on campus that might provide guidance to the URC regarding ASPT V.B.1 and V.B.2. Catanzaro reported that a pertinent case may have been identified in the College of Applied Science and Technology. Catanzaro said he expects to receive more information about the case by Thursday.

Discussion then continued from the previous URC meeting regarding committee response to policy questions raised by the associate professor and whether the committee should communicate with campus ASPT units regarding broader issues related to the matter.

Brown expressed support for communicating to ASPT units the importance of transparency. Domingo Joaquin agreed, suggesting that as departments revise their guidelines, faculty should discuss the salary increment determination process, how it has worked and how department faculty would like it to work.

Toledo noted that confusion regarding DFSC policies can arise when department chairpersons change. Brown wondered if the committee should remind faculty members that salary increment policies need to be voted on by faculty. Huff cautioned that there is a difference between policies and methods used to implement those policies.

Catanzaro observed that, in its discussions thus far, the committee has touched on two key ASPT themes: transparency and decentralization. He suggested that these might guide the committee in its response.

Rubin stated that he favors consistency across campus in this matter. He said that there should be transparency in the process and that salary increment policies should be voted on by faculty members before they are implemented.

Discussion ensued regarding faculty involvement in DFSC policy making and differences in approaches to ASPT administration across departments. Brown wondered if the message to campus faculty should be to get more involved when department policies and procedures are made. Meier asked what could be done to fight the broader issue of faculty members not being familiar with their ASPT documents. Huff asked whether there still are meetings of chairpersons to discuss ASPT implementation on the college and department levels. Catanzaro said that such meetings have been held and that another workshop is planned for October. Catanzaro said that a template for evaluation letters has been disseminated to ASPT units, and that the template includes a passage regarding the evaluation appeal process.

Meier suggested that another approach might be to modify ASPT V.B.1 to require DFSCs to distribute methods and tools to the faculty in addition to policies and procedures. Catanzaro said that it is in the purview of URC to initiate such a change but cautioned against doing for a single case because of the time involved working through Faculty Caucus and the precedent it might set. DFSC guidelines for all departments would also need to be revised. Catanzaro suggested the following language for providing direction to ASPT units regarding existing policy.

In considering the issue of how salary increments should be determined, URC considered two overarching principles: transparency/participatory governance and the decentralized nature of the ASPT system. URC advises that, when developing department/school guidelines, faculty members should keep in mind that broad statements empowering DFSCs/SFSCs to implement procedures without specifying those procedures are allowable but may have unintended consequences as DFSC/SFSC membership changes. Departments/schools may choose to be more or less explicit in specifying methods used to translate performance evaluations into salary increments.

Brown suggested approaching the matter in two steps: first, respond to the specific request for an interpretation from the faculty member and, second, address the broader issue of whether and how URC should communicate guidance to campus ASPT units regarding salary increments. Committee members agreed.

Ron Meier moved, David Rubin seconded that URC send a letter informing the associate professor that, based on URC review of existing department, college, and university ASPT policies, the committee finds actions of the DFSC and CFSC involved in the matter consistent with those policies. Copies of the letter would be sent to the dean and department chairperson.

Catanzaro suggested adding to the letter thanks from the committee for raising the issues and a note that the committee is considering actions on the campus level for the greater good. Committee members agreed.

The motion as amended carried.

Brown asked if the two colleagues who have recused themselves from this discussion thus far could be invited to participate in discussion of broader committee responses to the issue, since the committee has now acted on the specific request. Committee members agreed.

III. Update: Summary of DFSC reports on overall faculty ratings for 2011

Catanzaro reported that he has received annual DFSC reports (PERS 913). Through this form DFSCs report the numbers of faculty members rated overall satisfactory and overall unsatisfactory in the recent performance evaluation cycle. Catanzaro reported that campus wide five or six faculty members received overall unsatisfactory ratings during this performance review cycle.

IV. Other business

There was none.

Brown noted that, at its next meeting, the committee will continue discussion of communication to ASPT units regarding ASPT V.B.1 and V.B.2. The committee will also review annual CFSC reports. Meier said that he would be absent on May 8.

Brown adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

NEXT MEETING: 3:30 p.m., Tuesday, May 8, 2012, Hovey 401d