

**UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**Thursday, February 25, 2021**  
**9 AM, Zoom teleconference**

**Minutes**

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

- Call to Order - start time: 9:02 AM
- Review and approval of minutes of 1-28-21 URC meeting
  - Guidry moved, Shively seconded, 6 Yes, 0 No, 1 abstain (1 member joined after the vote)
- Reports from ASPT Subgroup discussions
  - Group 1 Shively, Edwards, Lin
    - Pretty much done with exception of one item, the one about FSC creation for interdisciplinary programs. Have reached out to Amy Hurd for additional information and the group will address that issue in our next discussions.
  - Group 2, Buckley, Oresky, Novotny
    - Oresky - had a conversation with Senators Horst and Kalter for more context around the stepped salary system. Continuing to gather information. There may be some overlap with recommendations in one of the administrator retreat workgroup's white paper. The senators are not describing a whole new rank, but rather a way to have incremental progression within the rank of professor. The University of California system uses something similar to this (but they are R1, so may not be comparable). Might be helpful to set benchmarks that could be used to address salary compression issues. Especially among professor rank in which there is a potential ceiling. Recommendation is that the issue is so large, it should probably be discussed by entire URC rather than just the subcommittee.
      - Catanzaro - this is an issue worth exploration and discussion. That said, we need to go back to understanding what the issue that we are trying to solve. The point that you mention about cost is critical. One model might be to tie this to a post-professor rank review kind of process (tied to the post-tenure review cycle). One of the structural problems that this discussion is trying to solve is related to the fact that since the 2008 recession, the average raise is less than 2% (because we've been at 2% or 0 every year), but starting salaries have followed the median. That has largely driven some of the compression and inversion. So, a first step needs to be deciding exactly what it is that we have to model, and from that determine cost relative to the resources available to address the issues.
    - Oresky- I have wondered whether that system is the "right way" to address our issues. Are there other alternatives to the step salary system that could be used to ensure parity within ranks?
    - Novotny - what is the expected timeframe to receive the equity report?
      - Catanzaro - has been working with PRPA on this. We were working on how the data should be constructed/represented. COVID hit and those efforts were paused for a while. Discussions have resumed, and Catanzaro is examining the results to make sure that the data are accurately structured and working with PRPA and OEOA before sharing it with units. Catanzaro gave a brief review of the project for members new to the committee this year.
    - Buckley - The group has also focused on two other issues. Both of these issues will be discussed by the subgroup in our upcoming discussions.
      - The tenure residency issue, aren't really in favor of that.
      - The clinical professorship issue - have followed up with Senator Kalter about this issue and received some names of additional people to talk to about the issue.

- Group 3, Beck, Park, Guidry
    - Beck - The group discussed a few outstanding issues.
      - Should there be an appeals process for non-reappointment process based on substance? There is one based on process, but not substance. Arguments on both sides, but came down to a decision that the current processes are enough. It is critical that DFSC have the ability to make these decisions, and that there are enough safe guards in place. So our recommendation is to leave the process as is. The subgroup is looking forward to continuing this conversation with entire URC.
      - Looking at salary incrementation at full professor rank. Last year's subgroup already drafted a substantial recommendation submitted last year. It is in favor of a stepped process to address salary compression and inversion. We would like to bring this to the full URC for discussion.
      - Section 17 of the ASPT guidelines is all about appeals, it takes a lot of time and effort to get through it. The section is not as clear as it could be (some statements seem to potentially contradict others). One of our charges was to see if there is a way to streamline these processes. One recommendation is use Appendix 8 as a model format for section 17 h, i, j, k, l. That might help with the interpretability of section 17. Also thought we would try to rearranged a-g to make it flow a little better. We might need a deadline.
        - Catanzaro - agrees that is a tough read and it is a good idea to try to make it easier to get through with the use of visuals. In terms of a deadline, we are aiming to get our proposed revisions late Aug, early Sept. So, aiming for the end of this semester for direction/draft then Catanzaro works on drafting over the summer. Then early Fall URC review/revises these and then get it to Faculty Caucus.
    - Beck we have also reviewed language developed by the subgroup last year and agree with it.
  - Buckley - will put out a call to subgroups to report in our next meetings.
- Discussion of ASPT workgroup recommendations and issues raised at the Spring Administrator's Retreat (Day 1)
  - Catanzaro - with expectation that some of you may have read all of this, while others may not have had a chance to read any of it. Special thanks to all who volunteered to do it and Miranda for serving on the workgroup. For those of you who have read it, what questions and/or comments might you have about it?
  - Catanzaro presented a brief review of the planning process, what the group's charges were. Looked at the recommendations. Described the crosswalks that the group did. Appendix 2 mapped very well with the university's strategic plan (ECE), but not very well with the Framework for Inclusive Teaching Excellence (FITE). Catanzaro presented a brief overview of what FITE is.
  - Catanzaro give a brief overview of the four recommendations from the ASPT workgroup (referenced the ASPT workgroup whitepaper that was distributed to the committee)
  - Beck - are these recommendations going to flow through URC and then Faculty Caucus?
    - Catanzaro - yes
- Other Business
  - None
- Adjournment
  - Edwards motioned to adjourn. Shively seconded. 8 members voted in favor of the motion. Meeting adjourned at 9:54 AM.