

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Tuesday, March 24, 2020
9 a.m., Zoom teleconference

Minutes

Members present: Chad Buckley, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Kevin Edwards, Nancy Novotny, Rachel Shively, Diane Dean, Melissa Oresky, Frank Beck, Yoon Jin Ma, Joe Goodman

1. Call to Order
 - a. Chairperson Shively called the meeting to order (via Zoom teleconferencing) at 9:02.
2. Approval of minutes from February 12th, 2020 meeting
 - a. The previously distributed minutes were considered. Goodman moved to approve minutes. Beck seconded the motion. The motion passed with nine ayes.
3. Updates: deadline for ASPT revisions and equity review
 - a. Talked to Senate Chair Kalter, will take to Senate first or second meeting in Fall
 - b. PRPA said that they are currently closed and will get back to Shively
 - i. Sam has had meetings with PRPA and the Provost concerning PRPAs analysis. Will run a regression analysis, from that will identify the outliers based on residual scores (categorize by bands/strata), that information will then go to the CFSCs for their use in qualitative judgments. Shively, did they give a timeline for when PRPA will be ready to get the equity review stuff to us, Catanzaro they are waiting on him.
 - c. Sam is also working on Appendix 2 still, but currently on hold.
4. ASPT Interpretations and Guidance in Light of Coronavirus
 - a. Catanzaro: some background - these questions emerged from discussions with chairs and directors. Trying to keep things as normal as possible, while retaining flexibility/reasonability.
 - b. Working bottom up here: Catanzaro doesn't think that the academic calendar needs to be changed. For conference presentations, things that were accepted to the conference should count even if the conference itself was cancelled. May need be in a situation in which faculty will need/want to provide more context to indicate the impact. Student reactions, this is a "tricky one." We have already been having discussions about how useful these collections have been. Response rates tend to be low, responses tend to be more bimodal (extreme views are more likely to respond). With those caveats, any feedback that we get needs to be interpreted within the current context, but we have the opportunity to learn from this experience. How do we use this in ASPT process? Our proposed solution is a compromise. We collect them, and faculty select whether they wish to submit them. An important part of this the opportunity for the faculty member to provide a reflection of the feedback.
 - c. Goodman question: some universities are going to pass/fail and/or credit/no credit. Catanzaro, these issues are being discussed. They are complicated issues, we are working on the impact of these choices. Different units may be impacted in different ways. Impact could also affect student feedback that goes into the ASPT process. (also could impact things like financial aid). Shively suggests that we encourage faculty to describe what they learned through this process as part of their ASPT submission. Edwards mentions that there is a box in Digital measures where that information can be entered. Goodman - what about the impact going forward, loss of brick and mortar, move to all online? Would like to encourage language from the Provost office to address these sorts of concerns. The purpose of the feedback isn't to evaluate the potential of a move in this direction. Oresky asks whether there is going to be an extension of the deadline? Catanzaro says that people are working on that.
 - d. Dean mentions that many other institutions have extended tenure clocks and not count this semester's student evals towards performance review. Catanzaro says that our current procedures

already allow faculty to stop the clock under exceptional circumstances. The current context certainly counts as an "exceptional circumstance." Rather than extend the clock for everybody, would rather have each faculty member have the choice. If they feel that they are ready to go up for tenure now, then they may choose that option. Would explicit language that the "stop the clock" will not be viewed negatively? Catanzaro mentioned that this would be a point of emphasis in ASPT/CFSC/DFSC workshops. Edwards asks, would the stop the clock request be denied under any circumstances? Sam, the only circumstance is if they can't make the case that it was outside of their control. So here all it will take is to point to the COVID context. Perhaps we can provide a template, and other ways to minimize these sorts of concerns. Goodman asks whether we need to extend the deadlines for contract renewal deadlines (1 year, 3 year). Sam in this specific case, Catanzaro isn't aware of any cases of faculty in this situation. He doesn't think that our current context is going to impact this. Next year, we expect that the current context will be taken into account for T&P decisions.

- e. Suggestions for revisions to the memo:
 - i. Clear statement that any surveys of student reactions to teaching are solely for helping faculty better understand the success of their online teaching, and will not be used later in any evaluative process.
 - ii. Invited presentations that have been cancelled can also be counted because the invitation—presumably based on a certain level of impact and reputation—has already been issues (similar to the peer review for presentations)
 - iii. Clear statement that stopping the clock does not incur any penalty or additional productivity requirements. The standard criteria for tenure and promotion apply.
 - f. Shively asks are we asking for a vote, or just feedback. Sam likes the idea of a vote if the committee is willing to do so. It is good shared governance. Sam asks whether an electronic vote would be okay. Cutting will call for a vote on Thursday at noon and ask for vote by end of workday on Friday.
 - g. Following the meeting Edwards suggested the following statement (following suggestion during meeting by Dean) with regards to the impact on the length of probationary period and evaluation for tenure and promotion:
 - i. *"It should be emphasized that stopping the tenure clock does not invoke any penalty, and does not incur any extra productivity requirements beyond those used for standard tenure decisions."*
5. ASPT subcommittees will report back about discussions since the last meeting - ran out of time, will move to next meeting.
- a. Subgroup 1 (Shively, Edwards, Ma):
 - b. Subgroup 2 (Buckley, Novotny, Oresky):
 - c. Subgroup 3 (Beck, Dean, Goodman):

6. Adjournment

- a. Edwards moved that the meeting adjourn. Oresky seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 10 a.m.

7. Notes from discussion on 2/225, 2020

Members present: Chad Buckley, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Kevin Edwards, Nancy Novotny, Rachel Shively

Members not present: Diane Dean, Melissa Oresky, Frank Beck, Yoon Jin Ma, Joe Goodman,

We did not have a majority of committee members, so did not reach a quorum. We postponed a vote on the minutes of the Feb. 12, 2020 meeting.

The members present decided that we could discuss a few things, but wouldn't take any votes.

ASPT subgroup reports

Subgroup 1- (see handout - scan this in) (Edwards, Shively, Ma)

Addressing Kalter comments about service. The contracts are different than the annual level.
Issue with faculty of color working overload with students of color.

Worked on section VIIA. See the proposed changes in red.

Drafted a new Section VIIB. Sam comments: I like this, suggest a couple of edits. Second sentence 4th line: change "position" to "assignment." some discussion of the use of "administrative." Practically speaking assignment letters are delivered when teaching assignments are known, and often the committee assignments come out later. So, they may be difficult to include in the assignment letters. Maybe add the term "anticipated". Changes do occur during the year, so that word helps capture that. Possibility of adding something along the lines of "additional service assignments that may arise will be documented" (could be a revised assignment letter, could be an email). Edwards asked where in the document the timeframe of when the letter is sent out? If it isn't mentioned in the document, then that provides some flexibility/discretion. May want to look that up/see what practice across department. Novotny asked a question about the final sentence. Where/when course releases are "asked for." Could be in the by-laws. Suggestions about how to clarify this? The sentence as written says "service" maybe that's too restrictive. Perhaps "service or other assignments." Sam suggestion remove "service" and replace with "non-classroom." Edwards asked about the word "clarify" - does that mean "in the letter" or "in by-laws" or something else (or in dept/school ASPT document). Sam says, the key is that it is transparent and documented. Suggests, "in their faculty evaluation guidelines/DFSC documents" Department/School policy and procedures" is probably the best option. Edwards had a suggestion for a re-write of the last bit "Certain exceptional service activities or non-classroom work with students may qualify for full or partial course release. The Dept shall provide, in their governing document or ASPT document, a clarification of what types of activities qualify for such course releases, and a mechanism for faculty to apply for those releases."

VIID. Intended to address the "invisible mentoring." Sam likes the "informal or unassigned" language. Sam considers mentoring as teaching. Also likes it because it typically has more of an impact. So, suggests adding "teaching or service" Or "all assigned activities" Sam discussed that some roles are crossing multiple categories (e.g., RSO faculty advisor - service and teaching/mentoring).

Appendix - program reviews should not be considered teaching, so they added that to service

Sam notes that he is almost ready with a completed new draft of Appendix 2. He will make sure to incorporate the above note into these revisions. He will hope to circulate this later this week

Subgroup 2 - (Buckley, Novotny, Oresky) - the group was unable to meet prior to today's meeting

Subgroup 3 - (Beck, Dean, Goodman) - none of the members of this subgroup were present at the meeting

Almost a month until the next meeting (because of Spring Break) - subgroups will meet to discuss more changes.

Also subgroup 1 was asked to look into Program committees (e.g., to cover WGS, Latino/a, etc.). Shively will reach out to somebody about this.