

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Thursday, September 23, 2021

11:30 a.m. – 1 p.m., Zoom

Members present: Roberta Trites (non-voting), Chad Buckley, Miranda Lin, Kevin Edwards, Erin Reitz, Joyce Walker, Frank Beck, Melissa Oresky

Absent: Bo Park, Ron Guidry – Ron will be taking a hiatus this fall, will rejoin in the spring.

Chad Buckley called the meeting to order at 11:33 a.m.

URC will continue working on reviewing proposed ASPT document revisions.

--Picked up where previously left off with revising language on External Peer Review:

Departments/schools should be given the latitude to make specific guidelines appropriate to their areas. It should be clearly communicated to the candidate going up for tenure as to whether or not they will have the opportunity to view the external reviews.

--Considered language from ASPT Working group 3 (2019-2020)

A suggestion to evaluate teaching, scholarly work, & service every three years as opposed to every year doesn't appear to be workable. It provides major challenges to annual salary increment process. There would have to be a much larger conversation to move forward with this suggestion. Working group was of the consensus that you can't realistically give raises annually if you aren't reviewed annually. Instead, it is possible to have a streamlined process for submission of materials, and many are working towards that.

-Appendix 2. Considered this revision:

Remove from the first paragraph of Appendix 2: "The activities referred to in this section are illustrative rather than prescriptive." Instead, place this sentence immediately following the first paragraph of Appendix 2: "The teaching, creative and scholarly, and service activities referred to in this Appendix are illustrative rather than prescriptive and are not exhaustive."

-Considered D/FSC Deadlines: DFSC workload is very compressed, and is there a way to improve that. Spread out calendar of review and responses, but match with dates for 5 year post tenure reviews. Evaluating pre-tenure faculty would benefit from more time, but they need to get feedback in a timely manner.

The URC will check to ensure that all ASPT deadlines (appeals, etc.) will be compatible with an extended deadline for pre-tenure evaluations.

Appeals, General

Frank will bring information to the next meeting. It has been discussed in the subgroup.

-Integrity in Research: Add sentence:

Appendix 2, p. 97 (add a new sentence at the end of the third paragraph under “Definition of Research”): “The scholarship of discovery and the scholarship of integration require adherence to University Policy 1.8 (Integrity of Research and Scholarly Activity).”

It just brings some clarification to the policy and updates it to coincide with Carnegie rather than AAUP.

-Considered expanded appeals process for non-reappointed faculty. Trites: There is a limited appeals process for someone who is not tenured and is non-reappointed. They can appeal the process that was used for the non-reappointment, but they can't appeal on the substance of the reasons for the non-reappointment. Therefore, this puts a lot of power with the Chair/Director, as well as the DFSC/CFSC. However, this is appropriate and aligns with shared governance; changes aren't needed.

For next meeting, time permitting: Response to Salary Enhancement Issues. There is more to come from the Equity Study that will provide more data. Harvard job satisfaction survey will be done in the spring and should help us. Is it best to hold off until we have job satisfaction results in combination with PRPA data? Agenda item for a future date after the report to faculty caucus.

6 pm on Wed. 10/13 is special meeting of faculty caucus to discuss our ASPT revisions. It would be great to have as many URC members there as possible.

The next meeting is scheduled for 10/7, 11–1 to provide more time for ASPT revision work; members should attend to the extend their schedules allow.

Adjournment

Chad adjourned the meeting at 1:03 pm.