

Approved

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

NOVEMBER 18, 2021

11:30 – 1:00

ZOOM

Members Present

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

Absent: Ron Guidry, Bo Park.

Called to order at 11:30 a.m.

Trites, Buckley and Edwards met with Senate, which finished its preliminary review of all Article revisions. They are going to delay consideration of Appendix 2.

Senate feedback on a new requirement for external review letters for tenure/promotion (Article VIII) was discussed. Trites: The letter issue has been discussed for several years, prior to the current Provost. Milner Library should have a different plan due to their exceptional roles. Fine Arts needs a plan that better fits their forms of productivity. The sense from CAS CFSC is that these letters make it easier to assess DFSC decisions, particularly by providing knowledgeable assessment of publication quality.

It was considered that the severe lack of resources provided to, for example, Fine Arts makes the institution of external review very problematic, requiring a phase-in period and significant institutional change. In general, addition of external review should only apply to new hires so they can prepare for it.

Typical current practice is for the candidate (only) to choose who is eligible to review them, so there should not be any surprises in the source of the letters. Other than this, it was agreed the concept should not be much different than other routine peer review of our work; only scholarship is reviewed. URC discussed language to ensure any review letters are written in the context of the candidate's workload and resources provided (e.g., start-up), and departmental information and standards, which should be given to the reviewer. Evaluators also should not make tenure recommendations; they are only providing evidence for the FSC's to do so.

Discussed the features of the evaluators: how many, their qualifications, and if they know the candidate; most of this can be left to the departments to set a standard as needed. The departments should also detail confidentiality guidelines for letters.

Overall, the consensus is that while any given piece of information may be imperfect, the more information the better, and letters can provide information and perspective not found elsewhere in a tenure/promotion package. The prospect of having faculty members' work externally reviewed should, ideally, be a strong incentive for ISU to provide adequate scholarly resources to faculty.

Set a start date of 2028 to provide time for faculty to prepare.

The new text will be sent back to Senate.

Meeting adjourned at 1 p.m.