

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, October 20, 2015  
11 a.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Joe Goodman, Christopher Horvath, Doris Houston, Sheryl Jenkins, David Rubin, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting)

Members not present: Rick Boser, Diane Dean

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

I. Call to order

Chairperson Doris Houston called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

II. Approval of minutes from the October 6, 2015 meeting

David Rubin moved, Joe Goodman seconded approval of minutes from the October 6, 2015 meeting as distributed prior to the meeting. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

III. Faculty Caucus ASPT review update

Friendly amendment to Overview, Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty

[Note: At its October 7, 2015 meeting, the Faculty Caucus asked URC to revise “Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty” on page 5 of the ASPT document, since the dean of Mennonite College of Nursing does not currently serve as the chairperson of the Mennonite College of Nursing DFSC or CFSC.]

Houston asked if additional direction regarding changes to “Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty” has been received from Faculty Caucus since its October 7, 2015 meeting. Catanzaro reported that no new information has been received.

Sheryl Jenkins explained that the dean of Mennonite College of Nursing (“Mennonite”) typically serves as chairperson of the CFSC but does not normally serve on the DFSC. In light of that divergence from the passage on page five of the ASPT document, perhaps the passage is not needed anymore, she said. Christopher Horvath asked if faculty members are elected to the Mennonite DFSC. Jenkins said they are and added that the associate dean for research/graduate program coordinator chairs the committee. Catanzaro explained that the associate dean for research at Mennonite retains faculty status, while some other associate deans at the University do not. He explained that the current interim dean of Mennonite does not have faculty status and, therefore, does not serve on either the DFSC or CFSC.

Goodman asked if there is a way to deal with the underlying structural problem necessitating differences in DFSC and CFSC composition at Mennonite, i.e., not having multiple departments in the college. Catanzaro responded that doing so is beyond the scope of ASPT.

Angela Bonnell asked if two other passages in the ASPT document related to composition of the DFSC and CFSC also should be examined for changes: IV.A.3.a-d on page 12 and V.A on page 17. Catanzaro responded that, in his reading of those passages and a related passage on page 18, only the passage on page 5 needs to be revised. Catanzaro noted that the university ASPT document permits Milner Library faculty to decide the composition of its DFSC and CFSC, adding that Mennonite might consider a similar model.

Jenkins suggested that URC involve Mennonite in this matter. Houston asked if URC should ask Mennonite to initiate the revisions. Catanzaro noted that there would be time for Mennonite to discuss this matter and to report to URC, given the schedule the Faculty Caucus has adopted for reviewing the ASPT document. All present agreed to this approach. Catanzaro agreed to contact Mennonite, and Jenkins agreed to explain the context of the URC request when Mennonite faculty members discuss it.

#### Revisit Article I.E

Houston reported that the Faculty Caucus has asked URC to consider a change in its recommended new Article I.E., replacing the word “obtain” with “consider.” Catanzaro said some caucus members are concerned that the word “obtain” implies a charge to get information by conducting an investigation. Horvath asked if the intent of recommending the new article is to direct committees and officials within the ASP system to only consider reliable information in their deliberations. David Rubin confirmed that was the case. Horvath said if the word “obtain” is changed to “consider,” the passage would still further that intent.

Rubin moved to revise Article I.E. in the ASPT document revisions recommended to the Faculty Caucus by replacing the word “obtain” with the word “consider.” Goodman seconded the motion. The motion was approved on voice vote, all voting aye.

#### Revisit Article V.B.1

Houston reported that the Faculty Caucus has asked URC to reconsider its recommendation that departments/schools review their ASPT policies at least every three years. She added that caucus members contributing to the October 7, 2015 discussion expressed a preference for review every five years, if such a review is required at all. Caucus members expressed concern that departments/schools not be in a constant state of ASPT policy review. Caucus members also expressed concern that the requirement for ASPT policy review every three years might be an unnecessary administrative burden. Goodman reminded the committee that it too grappled with those concerns when considering the recommendation. Houston asked which URC subgroup recommended the change. Catanzaro responded that no subgroup suggested it, that requiring review of DFSC/SFSC policies was requested by the University Research Council.

Horvath asked why URC recommended review of ASPT policies by departments/schools every three years rather than every five years, noting that review every five years does not seem unreasonable. Rubin explained that the University Research Council (of which he was a member) is concerned that some units are not changing their ASPT policies as their disciplines change. Requiring review every five years rather than three would run counter to what the council wants, he said. Bonnell noted that units will need to review their policies every five years anyway, to check for alignment with changes made to the ASPT document through the mandated five-year document review. Goodman said he prefers not changing the committee recommendation from three years to five years. He noted that URC has already held lengthy

discussions about the issue and decided it wanted the review to occur between the five-year reviews necessitated by changes to the ASPT document.

Houston suggested that URC clarify its intent that departments/schools review their ASPT policies at least every three years but not necessarily revise them if faculty decides that changes are not needed. Horvath asked if CFSCs would be required to, in turn, review department/school ASPT policies on this three-year cycle whether or not a department/school revised its policies. Catanzaro responded that CFSCs would need to do so in accordance with Article IV.B.2 of the ASPT document (page 13).

Catanzaro offered to draft revised language to clarify the intent and nature of the three-year review and to then circulate the draft to committee members prior to the next meeting. Committee members could then decide whether to resolve the matter by email or to discuss the draft at the next meeting. Committee members agreed. Rubin noted that in revising the language Catanzaro may need to consider the need for consistency between Article V.B.1 and Article IV.B.1.

Houston reminded URC members that the next Faculty Caucus ASPT discussion is scheduled for Wednesday, October 21, 2015. Sections of the ASPT document scheduled for caucus review at that meeting are sections reviewed by URC subgroup 3 (Bonnell and Jenkins). Houston said it would be helpful for subgroup members to attend the caucus meeting but they are not required to do so. In response to a question by Bonnell, Houston reported that the Senate and Caucus have been adhering to their rules regarding ending times for their discussions.

#### IV. Continued discussion of equity review

Houston cited two issues before the committee related to equity review: what to include in the ASPT document regarding equity review and how to respond to the request from the Provost for additional information regarding equity review and the potential role of a campus-wide equity review task force.

Goodman asked whether the Academic Senate has a committee already charged with conducting equity reviews. Houston responded that the Academic Senate does not have such a committee at this time. Catanzaro noted that equity review may be discussed by the Academic Senate and its committees without a formal charge to do so. Bonnell recalled discussion of data related to the academic impact fund when she served on the Academic Senate. Some of the data may have informed discussions regarding equity, she said.

Catanzaro reported that Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter is aware of ongoing URC discussions regarding equity review and has consulted campus colleagues regarding the issue. Houston reported that Kalter has indicated to her that the Academic Senate might take up the issue in the coming year.

Houston asked what the Provost is expecting URC to report to her regarding this issue. Catanzaro responded that the Provost would like to know how information provided to the committee by Shane McCreery affects the URC request for formation of a campus-wide equity review task force, if it does at all.

Horvath asked if it is the consensus of the committee that current kinds of equity review conducted by the University are inadequate, that there are questions related to equity not being

answered, and that there are data related to equity not being captured. Committee members concurred.

Houston asked Catanzaro if, based on the committee consensus, it would be appropriate for URC to restate its initial request for a campus-wide equity review committee in a second memorandum to the Provost. Catanzaro responded that it would be appropriate but that it would also be helpful to the Provost if the committee identifies what is not being done and what needs to be done regarding equity review. Houston asked committee members to review the memorandum sent to the Provost last academic year and materials disseminated to committee members by Subgroup 3 to identify additional questions to be asked and points that should be clarified. Houston asked committee members to email suggestions to her prior to the next committee meeting (scheduled for November 3, 2015). Houston will send committee members a reminder of her request, with pertinent materials attached, via email.

V. Other business

There was none.

VI. Adjournment

Jenkins moved, Bonnell seconded that the meeting adjourn. Houston adjourned the meeting at 12:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder