

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE**Thursday, March 11, 2021****9 AM, Zoom teleconference****Minutes**

Members present: Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Kevin Edwards, Miranda Lin, Chad Buckley, Melissa Oresky, Rachel Shively, Borinara Park, Ron Guidry, Nancy Novotny, Frank Beck

Absent:

- Call to Order- start time: 9:03
- Review and approval of minutes of 2-25-21 URC meeting
 - Novotny moved, Beck seconded, 8 Yes, 0 No, 0 abstain
- Reports from ASPT Subgroup discussions
 - Group 1 Shively, Edwards, Lin
 - Shively - Not much new since the last meeting. We have reached out to Amy Hurd regarding the potential of developing Faculty Status Committees for Interdisciplinary programs/units (e.g., WGSS), she is not generally in favor of the idea. Catanzaro suggested that we speak to faculty in these areas. The question was raised as to whether this an item that the committee should continue to pursue?
 - Catanzaro - the concern is that the faculty who contribute to these programs may end up taking on more service. Out-of-class work that emerges from the minor may not be recognized by their home departments. This may also apply to scholarship (e.g., faculty's home unit may not be familiar with the publishing outlet, impact of the scholarship, etc.). Those interdisciplinary programs don't have the same administrative structure to support the same faculty review (e.g., a D/SFSC). Perhaps there is some sort of middle ground that maybe allow for external letters from experts in the area to be considered by their home S/DFSC.
 - Shively - sounds like a good suggestion, do you have an idea about where to add something like this to the ASPT guidelines?
 - Catanzaro - maybe in Section IXD: Tenure Policies Procedural Considerations Related to Tenure.
 - Catanzaro - May also want to consider what other universities do.
 - Oresky - notes that the suggestion might help with the scholarship part, but asks whether it addresses the service concerns? She suggests that we need to have an explicit mention about a mechanism for recognizing service.
 - Catanzaro - that might be best addressed by the director of the minor, perhaps with a letter to the home unit D/SFSC.
 - Group 2, Buckley, Oresky, Novotny
 - Nothing new from the subgroup. The group plans to meet within the next 2 weeks. Additionally, the plan is to bring the step salary issue to the full committee for discussion.
 - Group 3, Beck, Park, Guidry
 - Not quite ready to report. Have scheduled a meeting for next week
 - Catanzaro - Asks whether any of the subgroups looking into the idea of the clinical track/professor of practice conversation?
 - Buckley - yes, this is something that Group 2 is looking into.
 - Catanzaro - has spoken with some of the Deans that are particularly interested/impacted by this recommendation. He has also started to develop an interim possibility to address the issue in the

short term. He offers to meet with the sub-group when they meet to share those thoughts. He has some concerns about creating an entirely new path to tenure at this time (coming out of a pandemic).

- Oresky - noted that there are some job descriptions in HR ads for clinical professors.
 - Catanzaro - those are for NTT positions. He described how the language of "clinical" may work well for some disciplines, but is potentially problematic in others. He may prefer the term "professor of practice."
- Novotny - noted that when this work was raised in Nursing a couple of years ago, much of the discussion focused on the differences between the scholarship of DNPs vs. PhDs (e.g., difference between published papers vs. presentations). She noted that some DNPs may have left because they didn't think that they could earn tenure under our current university policies
- Oresky - suggested that it would be helpful to have a list of the different units where this will come into play, because there are probably big differences across different units.
 - Buckley - presented a list of potential exemplars.
 - Catanzaro - presented another list. The two lists were not identical. He suggests that it would be useful to obtain a list of units who have approached Dr. Kalter about this proposal rather than just thinking through in theory who might need/want this new category.
- Information Items (to be discussed at next meeting)
 - Discussion of issues raised in note forwarded from Senate Chair Kalter regarding faculty participation in teaching students within the Honors program
 - Buckley asks for any initial discussion?
 - Catanzaro - hopefully we can get the current and former directors of the honors program to find out some specifics about how this process works. The assumption is that if a faculty member is interested in teaching in honors (seminar or explorations) are making the decision to this and are letting their dept/school chairs/directors know (typically an overload). Nobody is being forced to do this. Perhaps there are differences across different units.
 - Buckley will draft invitations to the to current interim and former directors of the Honors programs to attend our next meeting.
 - Lin - noted that, beyond the seminar and exploration opportunities, the honors projects are the things that can involve a lot of faculty resources and may not be getting compensated/recognized within the faculty review process.
 - Oresky - asked whether there are data collected that measures how much participation/time is coming from different colleges/units? Is there a way to created a reward/recognition mechanism at that level?
 - Catanzaro - expressed a question about how representative these concerns are, what's the scope. Is this only one dept/school or is it coming from a larger constituency? Thinking through how this typically happens and about how to make it more transparent is a good discussion
 - Discussion of the recommendations related to civic engagement integration into the ASPT policies
 - The committee was presented with communications from Senator Kalter and Dr. Strzepek, Director of the Center for Community Engagement.
 - Catanzaro noted that there is some overlap with the discussions from the Spring Administrator's Retreat regarding potential changes to Appendix 2 of the ASPT document. He also noted that there is overlap with the Framework for Inclusive Excellence (FITE).
 - The group will invite Dr. Katy Strzepek to attend the meeting (with stagger the invites with our other invited individuals). Buckley will draft this invitation
 - Any initial discussion?
 - Shively - asked whether the intention to try to work this into the current revisions of Appendix 2?
 - Buckley and Catanzaro both replied yes.
- Other Business

- Adjournment
 - Shively moved that the meeting be adjourned. Guidry seconded. Motion passed with 9 voting in favor.
Meeting adjourned at 9:57