

Approved

## UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

OCTOBER 21, 2021

11:30 – 1:00

ZOOM

### Members Present

Chad Buckley, Miranda Lin, Kevin Edwards, Frank Beck, Joyce Walker, Bo Park, Melissa Oresky, O. Erin Reitz, Roberta Trites (non-voting member)

Chad called the meeting to order at 11:32 a.m.

Minutes from the October 7<sup>th</sup> meeting were reviewed. With no revisions made the minutes were approved. Frank Beck abstained from the vote as he was not able to attend the last meeting.

Senate report: The faculty caucus meeting last week went well. [Revisions](#) that were submitted to Academic Senate were presented. Revisions up to the middle of Article IX have been discussed and feedback was returned to URC. There are some changes requested for most of the revisions. The faculty caucus also met last night following the Senate meeting for some additional time and will continue to do so.

Review of the previously discuss revisions to Appendix 2 began.

Appendix 2, Scholarly and Creative Service: The preamble includes a new phrase highlighting the value of research aimed at diversity and equity. Scholarship of teaching and learning and scholarship of application are also new additions. Discussed how to include new digital media output as productivity items; these need not be peer-reviewed but should be substantive/influential/impactful to be considered. Discussed documentation of "work-in-progress" items.

Appendix 2, Service: preamble was clarified. Reviewing of scholarly works was moved from service to scholarship, since this is a scholarly contribution, requiring discipline-specific intellectual work (beyond administrative skills). Decided to exclude any paid work on an external contract from service consideration, since this is already compensated and not on the work hours covered by ASPT.

Items that should be considered at next URC meeting are autonomy of CFSC to disagree with D/SFSC's, and Grandfathering (barring new ASPT revisions from affecting tenure of existing faculty).

Proposed Mid-probationary Review also needs further consideration:

- Does it become part of ASPT review
- Does it remain as internal department-only document
- Should it be stated that it cannot be used against you

Meeting adjourned at 12:58 p.m.