

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 30, 2020
10:00 AM, Zoom teleconference

Minutes

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

Absent: Frank Beck, Ron Guidry

- Call to Order
 - Buckley convened the meeting at 10:03 A.M.
- Review and approval of minutes of 9-16-20 meeting
 - The group discussed whether the meeting minutes should include the audio transcription of the recorded minutes. It was proposed that they should be used to inform the generation of the minutes, but not be part of the formal minutes.
 - Shively moved that the meeting minutes be approved without the audio transcript. Edwards seconded. Motion passed with 7 voting in favor
- COVID impacts on promotion and tenure—Review of Catanzaro memo draft status
 - Catanzaro reported that he conducted further research and consideration of feedback provided by members of the faculty caucus. He has finished a revised version of the memo and has sent a courtesy copy to those members of the faculty caucus. This communication also included a cover letter that discussed issues considered but not adopted along with rationale.
 - The main highlights of revisions included:
 - Cleaning up and clarified the paragraph that started out along the lines of " COVID hasn't prevented faculty from working, it's made them work more, but in different ways "
 - Added a To-Do checklist to help D/SFSC's about what was being suggested
 - The Cover email included discussion of the difficulties involved with implementing retroactive raises and why we didn't go in that direction
 - Catanzaro is now working on the timing of sending out the mass email, hoping to get it out this week
 - Oresky – commented that it is critical that the URC recognize that COVID has impacted faculty in a variety of ways. This should be the driving force of the memo. Catanzaro reported that shortly before the meeting began one of the senators replied and felt that the revisions to the memo were appreciated.
 - Catanzaro will send the memo and the cover letter to those on this committee shortly
 - Buckley – suggests that a future topic for the URC will discuss the COVID impact on evaluation of teaching performance.
 - Catanzaro - Senate did pass a provision allowing Depts/School to revise their ASPT policies this year and apply them retroactively for the year. This is typically not a good idea (not fair), but in the current unprecedented context it is warranted. Next week Senate will be discussing the use of student feedback in this year's ASPT deliberations.
- Non-policy compliant D/SFSC elections
 - An issue came up that was an election for DFSC over the summer when faculty may not have been on the loop. Wanted the election postponed until Fall when back in session.
 - Catanzaro – noted that department did suspend the election until Fall.
 - Buckley – asked what is the URC's role in this?
 - Catanzaro – the URC approves the calendar for each academic year. Historically the place where there is the most slippage is with elections. In the policy they are supposed to happen in April. Faculty are busy and sometimes these elections fall through the cracks. He further described

some situations in which things happen during a summer resulting in a member of the D/SFSC needing to leave the committee. In those cases it is typical that a new election is held in the Fall. He recommends that one course of action is that this committee send out a memo reminding units of the timeline and what to do for special cases.

- Shively – asked whether the actions that prompted this issue were a repeated issue within the school/department? Are there plans to get back onto the policy timeline?
 - Catanzaro - The Dean in this case is aware of the situation and Sam hopes that they will align to the timeline outlined in policy.
 - Oresky - if there is a policy in place with timeline, does it also include language that the elections must be run during Fall/Spring terms?
 - Catanzaro -that's a good suggestion, but it is not in the policy. This group could include some language along these lines in the next version.
 - Novotny - when do we do the next version?
 - Catanzaro - once we get past the COVID related issues, we will return to the 5-year revisions of ASPT.
 - Oresky – believes that responding to this issue helps to develop trust of the faculty, knowing that the URC responded to the issue.
 - Shively – reminded the committee that the URC is not an enforcement body, but instead reviews and writes policy.
 - Edwards asks if the issue had it not been resolved, what would have happened? Is there something that can be put into the policy along the lines of "your election results will be invalidated by the Dean"
 - Park asked whether the Dean aware of the situation.
 - Catanzaro indicated that the faculty member contacted the Dean about the issue.
 - Park asked about clarification about what channels/procedures are appropriate for reporting an issue like this one?
 - Catanzaro - great question, there isn't a prescribed path. Ideally first would be contact with the director/chair. A faculty member could raise it at faculty meeting or they could take it to the dean. There is a general provision that any member of the faculty/staff may bring any issue to the Senate/Senate chair for discussion.
 - Catanzaro offered to draft a memo for the committee, unless the committee would like to draft it themselves. He would either email it to the committee or post it to the Teams site for review and discussion. And then it would be distributed by the URC.
 - Novotny asked who does it get distributed to?
 - Catanzaro - a general reminder to all colleges and schools. Chad - good plan, gets everybody on the same page.
 - Buckley - Are members in favor of a memo with a general reminder message? It is good that the Dept/School resolved the issue.
-
- CAS ASPT Revisions for URC Consideration
 - Buckley summarized the changes to the document
 - Some editorial changes.
 - Deleted language with Distinguished or University
 - Edwards moved to accept, Oresky second.
 - Following no additional Discussion – vote to accept the memo as revised passed unanimously
-
- Meeting Schedule - Wednesdays at 10 don't work with our newest committee member Ron Guidry. Oresky also indicated that the day/time isn't ideal. The group decided that we will conduct a poll to try to identify some alternative day/times.
 - Buckley - Any other business?
 - Adjournment

Approved, 10-15-20

- Shively moved that the meeting be adjourned. Edwards seconded. Motion passed with 7 voting in favor. Meeting adjourned at 10:56