

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE**Thursday, April 8, 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, Frank Beck

Absent: Nancy Novotny

Guests: Tina Williams, Katy Strzepek, Rocio Rivadeneyra

- Call to Order- start time: 9:02
- Review and approval of minutes of 3-11-21 URC meeting
 - Not yet submitted to entire committee
- Subgroup 3 progress report
 - Beck reported on potential revisions to section XVII.B.2. The section is hard to follow and have discussed ways to clean-up and clarify the language. The appeals process for non-reappointment section focuses on the process, rather than the substance. The appendix includes a timeline for appeal of non-reappointment. Senate Chair Kalter has asked the URC to establish an appeals process based on substance be added to the guidelines. The group has decided to leave the process as it stands, but the recommends that the entire URC discuss this. The attached document has proposed revisions to the language with the goal of increasing the clarity of the document. Section XVII.C there is a definition of the appeal, added language clarifies that notification of the appeal does not constitute the appeal, there is still a required written submission. XVII.1 added language to clarifying language. Clarified language to refer to specific dates. XVII.3 paragraph suggests an informal meeting prior to the formal meeting. This seemed redundant and suggest striking this paragraph.
 - Beck - reviewed document with proposal to add tables to the document to improve clarity.
 - This discussion was tabled to allow time for agenda items related to the guests.
- 9:15 Guest - Dr. Katy Strzepek (Director, Center for Civic Engagement)
 - Dr. Strzepek was invited in response to letter forwarded to URC by Senate Chair Kalter regarding the potential for integration of Civic Engagement into the ASPT process
 - This potential arises from our Carnegie classification (starting work for our reclassification in 2023) and out of some recommendations that emerged from the recent Provost's retreat
 - Dr. Strzepek reviewed some of the recommendations from the white pages from the retreat
 - Provide a definition of community engagement, and how it differs from other types of scholarship, teaching, and service - add to an appendix (or footnotes).
 - Based on what other institutions have done and best practices
 - Includes community partners as part of the peer review/evaluation processes
 - Made recommendations as to how this language can be folded into Appendix 2 of the ASPT. This language includes:
 - Instruction or community learning and projects
 - Includes supervision of students in community engaged research or advocacy
 - Co-creating curricula with community partnerships
 - include languages with respect to review and evaluation.
 - Includes language about professional development and how it impacts community engagement activities
 - Broaden what gets included as scholarship to include community/public scholarship
 - Service component to include disciplinary knowledge to inform community change and/or public policy
 - Open the floor for questions and discussion

- Beck - this is important for us to do this. Our group will consider these recommendations and make decisions about which will be included in the ASPT revisions. I am glad that this issue is being considered for all three aspects (teaching, scholarship, and service).
- Beck - is there a definition of peer-review by the community and how does that differ from the traditional peer-review process used in academic scholarship
 - Catanzaro - yes, we are going to have to have this discussion. There is not a uniform definition of peer review.
- Oresky - in WSCFA - civic engagement is already firmly a part of what we do. Will the definition of civic engagement and peer review need to be broadened to accommodate differences across colleges/disciplines?
 - Strzepek and Catanzaro - there is already some of this in the language, but perhaps we can work to clarify it. Finding the right balance between general and specific is often the challenge.
 - Catanzaro - recommends that we examine the [Boyer classification of scholarship](#) - four types that are not always equally recognized. Scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of teaching and learning, scholarship of application. Our Appendix 2, explicitly recognizes the first two, but the others are not included. The first draft will include all four of these forms of scholarship.
 - Strzepek - that omission is what has driven the recommendations for the revisions that the group has suggested adding to the policy
 - This revision provides an opportunity to counter the implicit silo-ing of faculty activity (that in some cases was institutionalized in policy over 20 years ago)
 - Strzepek - asked about timeline.
 - Catanzaro - the goal is to a draft of revisions to the faculty caucus early in Fall 2021, with hopes to have approval in Spring 2022
- 9:45 Guests - Dr. Tina Williams (Acting Director, Honors Program); Dr. Rocio Rivadeneyra
 - Discussion topic - how are faculty recruited for participation in honors and how are faculty's honors activities recognized in the ASPT process.
 - Recruiting is done through a couple of open pathways
 - January mass email (to faculty and AP listserv) asking for faculty who are interested in participating in our honors exploration classes (not for credit) and advanced honors seminar classes (for 1 credit). An opportunity to take a deeper dive into an area that they may not be able to cover in a normal courses.
 - Honors Mindset courses have typically been taught by non-tenure track faculty
 - Those interested submit a proposal for what they want to do and participants are selected by the honors staff based on those proposals
 - Regarding ASPT recognition, sometimes faculty have asked for a letter describing their participation in the program that they can submit in their annual review materials.
 - Rocio - this might be a good idea to make this a common practice for all participating faculty
 - Catanzaro - part of the reason that this issue was referred to the committee was a question that was forwarded to us asking about how this participation may impact a faculty member's assigned teaching load. What sort of benefits may arise (e.g., additional pay, student recruiting for your lab)?
 - Rivadeneyra - these are treated as overloads. Since they are either 0 or 1 credit courses, they really can't serve as substitutions for other assigned assignments.
 - Williams - we sometimes have to work with faculty to redesign/redevelop their courses to conform to the 0 or 1 credit format (sometimes what they initially plan look much more like 3 credit courses in terms of expectations).
 - Beck - if a course has an "H" associated with it, this doesn't mean that everybody enrolled in is are honors students.
 - Williams - yes, if the honors section of a course doesn't fill with enough honors students, it may be opened to other students who meet a minimum GPA.

- Rivadeneyra - these are different than the honors classes that we were discussing earlier. Honors sections result from conversations with unit directors. Those courses are then part of a faculty member's load. These are typically courses that we have a good chance to be able to fill with honors students (e.g., general education courses)
- Oresky - specifically there is no explicit language within the ASPT policy which address honors participation. Is this being asked for here?
 - Catanzaro - this discussion was prompted by a question that was forwarded from Senate Chairperson Kalter to the committee from a unit head that expressed concern about how faculty participation in honors impacts faculty loads/ASPT. The group wanted to engage in the discussion with the Honor's staff to determine whether this is a general issue or whether this was an isolated concern (and may be an issue of miscommunication rather than a systematic problem or issue that needs to be resolved through the ASPT revision process).
 - Williams - there was an issue this past year with one faculty member within one unit that resulted from a communication issue (the unit head wasn't informed until later than usual in the process).
 - Rivadeneyra - past practice was consistent with this. Honors is contracting with the faculty member and it was left up to them to make a decision about whether they wanted to have a discussion with their unit head. Our assumption is that the faculty member is still meeting their assigned duties.
 - Williams - I am glad that we are having this conversation. This past year we had more submitted proposals than ever before and were able to provide a wide range of opportunities for the students.
- Park - I too am glad that this discussion happened. I wonder about the process and how and why this issue, one that arose from a single person's concern, came all the way to the URC.
 - Shively - This was forwarded by the Chairperson of the Academic Senate. The person in that position is sent many concerns and part of the position is to pass potentially relevant concerns forward to the respective senate committees
 - Catanzaro - Any member of the university community can bring a concern to the academic senate. Distributing all concerns to the relevant committees is a part of the shared governance philosophy of the university. What may appear as an isolated issues may be broader and it is the committees' responsibility to discuss and determine the scope of the issue.
 - Edwards - I think that this a good example of this. I don't think that this would have happened 10 years ago, and it is important for us to be aware of these issues.
 - Buckley - As the chair of the URC, I do, in consultation with Catanzaro and Cutting, discuss and vet these concerns to determine whether they need full committee discussion.
 - Oresky - Continuing the Honors discussion, I think that this issue is relevant to ASPT because it is worth thinking about how/where does honors participation fit into the process. Is it service, research, or teaching? So even if this was a one off situation, it does indicate the potential to grow in scope.
 - Buckley - asks the committee whether the letter that was forwarded to the committee is an isolated issue, or are there things that this committee what to do
 - Edwards - I think that Honors should consider contacting the unit heads earlier in the process so that the director can engage in discussion with the faculty member (to discuss the work of balancing load, impact on tenure process, etc.)
 - Lin - I think that it is the faculty member's decision and responsibility. It shouldn't be the responsibility of the unit head or the honors program
 - Edwards - but there could be an impact later
 - Catanzaro suggests that there are similarities with faculty engaging in independent study work with students. Those are decisions made by the faculty, not assigned by a unit head. Often the "reward" is the satisfaction that results from the activity. Although the faculty member can also list the students as part of their annual activities and might get some reward through ASPT.
- Edwards - should we be considering the civic/community engagement suggested language now, or should we wait until the draft from Catanzaro

- Catanzaro - I will try to get the draft to the committee soon.
- Updates on working group activity
 - Table until next meeting
- Other Business

- Adjournment
 - Edwards Motion, Shively second, 8 in favor, end time 10:32