

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 2, 2020
10:30 AM, Zoom teleconference

Minutes

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

- Call to Order
 - Catanzaro convened the meeting at 10:33 A.M.
- Welcome and overview of URC
 - Brief introductions, description of Catanzaro and Cutting's roles
 - Welcome the returning and new members of the committee
 - Brief overview of URC charges
 - regular business is to review ASPT documents from colleges and university.
 - Regular business, including scheduling of future meetings (note. Sam is having internet connectivity issues)
 - historically this committee tries to meet every two weeks. Sometimes we have to alternate between two different weekly day/times when the majority of the committee can work and all can meet considering both meeting times.
 - COVID-related
 - This semester we are also dealing with COVID related issues (and setting aside, for now, our discussion of the 5-year review of ASPT).
- Election of officers
 - Chair - nominations: Beck nominates Edwards as chair, but he declines nomination (would be willing to continue as secretary, too busy with the conversion to online). Shively nominates Oresky, but she declines. Oresky nominates Shively, but she declines. Beck nominates Buckley, Shively seconds. Vote by roll call - abstain - 1, yes - 7, no - 0
 - Vice Chair - nominations: Beck nominates Shively, Oresky seconds. Vote by roll call - abstain - 0, yes - 8, no - 0
 - Secretary - nominations: Shively nominates Edwards, Beck seconds. Vote by roll call - abstain - 0, yes - 8, no - 0
- Acceptance of 2019-20 FRC report, confirmation of 2019-20 URC report, and approval of minutes
 - FRC annual report - moved by Shively seconded by Edwards, no discussion. Vote to accept 8 yes
 - URC annual report - moved by seconded by, discussion. Minor edit, suggestion of some language change to the ASPT equity review section. Park asks what was the motivation for this item? Catanzaro reviewing this on a 5-year cycle is part of the URC charge. The challenge is working out how to capture, organize, and present the data for the review. Vote to accept with the amendments recommended. Shively moves to accept, Oresky seconds, yes - 8, no - 0, abstain - 0.
 - Minutes - Shively moves to approve (with minor edits), Beck seconds, yes - 8, no - 0, abstain - 0.
- COVID considerations for promotion and tenure—Review of input and discussion
 - Catanzaro presents his summary of feedback/comments that have been collected from the Faculty Caucus. Briefly reviews events that surrounded the memo that was discussed and endorsed by the URC last Spring. Is expecting a similar process as last time, except that Faculty Caucus is providing more input to the initial draft that the URC will review.

- Catanzaro presented some general framing comments: Most urgently we are thinking about tenure, and to a lesser degree promotion. Last semester we affirmed that we have stop the clock as an option already as part of policy. Since then, there has been a lot of discussion about potential unintended consequences of the stop the clock option. Faculty have been redirecting of their resources to deal with COVID, within all areas, teaching, scholarship and even service, and work/family balance issues have been disrupted. There are also economic issues, as the first promotion increment is delayed by stop-the-clock. There are also economic issues, work/family balance issues that have been disrupted. These issues are forcing us to revisit what the expectations for tenure are. In particular looking for a more holistic approach, rather than just counting products. Need to revisit how we recognize quality. The Provost has already begun meeting with Deans and their offices to discuss these issues and encourage that these conversations be started within their CFSCs and S/DFSCs. Recall that these are department/school level driven policies (the University policy allows for very broad scope of what may be considered, see Appendix 2 long list of potential things to consider. Note that list is not intended to be an exhaustive list). In particular for new faculty, even though tenure may be a long way off, the current context will shape their efforts as a faculty member for the years to come. Asking faculty members to include a statement and reflection that discusses how the COVID context has impacted their roles may be something that we suggest/encourage.
 - What are you hearing/thinking about these issues?
 - Edwards – if depts have quantitative expectations written into their documents, are we allowed to override those? Catanzaro – could revisit those in the light of the current contexts.
 - Catanzaro – if departmental ASPT changes can be made this semester, they could apply beginning Jan. 1. So that wouldn't affect folks going up this November, but would impact those next year. Note that these efforts are not an attempt to make tenure easier, rather it is a recognition that things are different now, and for some time into the future.
 - Beck – would like to back up everything that Catanzaro just said. This is up to the departments.
 - Oresky – Scholarship will change in different ways for each faculty member. Some people may benefit in some ways, if already an expert online instructor, new research opportunities, etc. There were calls to implement an optional COVID statement to augment annual review reports and tenure & promotion materials. Is there a way to create a survey to collect information about how this is impacting faculty, so that we can have that data to help drive our policy development. And then be able to provide that data to Schools and Depts for them to consider.
 - Catanzaro – good ideas, in some sense that's what the faculty caucus is trying to do.
 - Oresky – I think that a standard set of questions for all faculty could be done.
 - Shively – I think that need to also include questions that ask about now and in the future.
 - Shively - Because Kalter asked about and we got feedback from faculty about various issues beyond just tenure, including changing from calendar year to academic year and annual performance assessments. So at this point are we just focusing on the tenure piece? Catanzaro – yes, that's our focus today. Also how we use student input into our T&P evaluations. There are additional topics that this group will need to talk about.
- Edwards – thinking about how this has played out over time. In the spring our focus was to steer people to stop the clock if they were adversely affected. Given the more general and extended COVID impacts, are we now recommending that people steer away from stopping the clock? Guidance we provide needs to give those going up for tenure enough confidence in the process to make the best decision... if they do not stop the clock, will FSC's take COVID impacts into account?
- Catanzaro – the memo will include not only guidance for policy for future years, but also for this year. Additionally we will be doing ASPT workshops (as we normally do) that will focus

on dealing with the COVID context. Probably a combination of pre-recorded presentations to allow for flipped-model. Groups will be made to try to bring together disciplines that have similar policies. Good policies should have reasonable flexibility along with “strong guardrails”. It isn’t that stop the clock is a terrible thing, but it isn’t a solution that fits everybody. So we need to make sure that there is the needed flexibility, other alternatives, and enough information for faculty to make their choices.

- We will send out a doodle poll and see if we can find a day/time to meet next week. In the meantime Catanzaro will continue to draft something and will circulate it to the committee. This can be a starting point.
 - Edwards, can we share some of this discussion of directions (but not preliminary any drafts of the memo)? Catanzaro – the provost office has already shared, today there is a meeting with chairs and directors. Guidance is coming is fine to share.
 - Catanzaro – will draft the memo based on Senate and URC input. Important to note the faculty ultimately 'owns' this process, and his draft should not be considered to constrain faculty input into the memo.
- Adjournment
 - Shively moved that the meeting be adjourned. Oresky seconded. Meeting adjourned at 12:02 P.M.