

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Thursday, December 3, 2020
9 AM, Zoom teleconference

Minutes

Members present: Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Kevin Edwards, Nancy Novotny, Frank Beck, Miranda Lin, Chad Buckley, Melissa Oresky, Rachel Shively, Borinara Park, Ron Guidry
Absent: none

- Call to Order
 - Buckley convened the meeting at 9:04 A.M.
- Review and approval of minutes of 10-29-20 URC meeting
 - Beck motions, Park seconds. 6 in favor of approval, 0 against, 2 abstentions (1 committee member joined the meeting after this vote)
- 5-year Revisions of ASPT Policies
 - Updates from sub-group discussions since previous meeting
 - Group 1 Shively, Edwards, Lin:
 - Section I.B. -
 - Discussed proposed addition of language that extends the scope to include individuals involved in amorous relationships (as well as the inclusion of some examples).
 - Catanzaro – highlighted two potential issues, (1) what kind of relationships constitute a "relationship"; (s) what kind of management responses are appropriate.
 - Suggestion was made to consider refer to existing policy about conflict of interest (e.g., 3.1.44 & others)
 - The group will continue working on this section during the spring term.
 - Section VIIB-
 - The group proposed language to add explicit mention that service is a part of the assignment letter and that changes are documented
 - Catanzaro suggests that "documented" be expanded to include documentation that is communicated in writing to the faculty member.
 - Catanzaro suggests revising the first sentence to say read “in an assignment letter” rather than “in writing”.
 - Guidry - in his dept each faculty member completes a sheet laying out what their weighting preferences for service, teaching, research.
 - Catanzaro asks is that weighting or timing preferences? (weighting)
 - Oresky - asked about departments that don't provide an assignment letter, noting that in some units, teaching is typically assigned long before service work.
 - Catanzaro - may need to think about dept/school service level, because chair/direction may not always know about college and/or university service
 - Shively proposed some revisions to some of the language
 - Discussion of proposed revisions to section I.D will be carried over until the next meeting.
 - Group 2, Buckley, Oresky, Novotny: The group has had several discussions regarding revisions, but have not yet drafted specific language

- Buckley – the group has examined issues involved with the steps for salary incrementation (addressing fairness & equity and compression issues), 10-year residency requirements, and clinical professorships.
 - Catanzaro - these kinds of questions that intersect with broader policy and/or context. On the issue of clinical professorships, there are some disciplines in which there are some areas that are unique to a small set of the faculty, but not nearly as related to the work done by the rest of the faculty. E.g., In POL we have a legal studies program, the folks best suited for some training are lawyers, who's scholarship is very different from typical academic scholarship
 - Group 3, Beck, Park, Guidry – reported that the subgroup had discussed a number of the issues that the group discussed (note several new members) - 2 outstanding issues:
 - Process (if needed) for appeals of non-reappointments pre-tenure
 - Appeals process of a form (standardized process) for appeals
 - Will table further discussion of these issues until the next meeting
- Buckley provided a brief review regarding the next steps
 - Proposed revisions go to faculty caucus for review and discussion. (URC members may be invited to discuss). Then they make revisions, then they vote
- Discuss DFSC question sent to URC (see email attached below)
 - The question is whether their DFSC can continue with their work in the spring with if they have vacancy unfilled.
 - University guidelines don't seem to prohibit them doing their work (Catanzaro confirms). Susan thought things are okay, Catanzaro and Buckley concur.
 - Buckley will contact the Dept/School
- Review and approval of the 2021-2022 ASPT Calendar
 - Mostly just proforma check for date/day changes
 - Given COVID were any other changes made? Catanzaro doesn't think so. (some dates may have been changed or discussed for current year related to COVID).
 - The conversations about shifting to a different cycle have a lot of work to do and would not apply until at the earliest the next cycle.
 - Shively move to approve Edwards seconds - all in favor 9, 0 against
- Other Business
 - Will need to see if we need to do a poll for Spring semester or does this time still work? Looks like it should work so will tentatively keep the same day.
 - May skip next meeting as whole and meet in subgroups instead.
- Adjournment
 - Oresky moved that the meeting be adjourned. Shively seconded. Motion passed with 9 voting in favor. Meeting adjourned at 10:25

For the DFSC question discussion – here is the original email that has prompted the discussion.

It was suggested that I reach out to you for your thoughts around a DFSC membership situation we are facing in XXX. A tenured member of the XXX DFSC will be retiring at the end of the calendar year, and

that retirement will leave a vacancy. Unfortunately, no tenured department member has stepped forward to fill the vacant seat on the spring XXX DFSC.

Our ASPT guidelines require all but one member of the DFSC to be tenured. Ours is a young faculty, and two tenured faculty already serve on the XXX DFSC, another two serve on the current YYY CFSC, and the one remaining tenured faculty declined the request to serve.

Of course, we don't want fewer people evaluating TT faculty's annual performance, but I feel like we are caught between the proverbial rock and hard place. As far as I know, the body can operate with an open seat and be in accordance with XXX and university ASPT guidelines, but please advise me of any policy that does not permit such an opening. Thanks in advance for your thoughts.