

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Thursday, October 29, 2020
9:00 AM, Zoom teleconference

Minutes

Members present: Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Kevin Edwards, Nancy Novotny, Frank Beck, Miranda Lin, Chad Buckley, Ron Guidry

Absent: Melissa Oresky, Rachel Shively, Borinara Park

- Call to Order
 - Buckley convened the meeting at 9:04 A.M.
- Review and approval of minutes of 10-15-20 URC meeting
 - Guidry motions to approve, Beck seconds. 6 in favor of approval, 0 against, no abstentions
- Update of Faculty Caucus discussions of COVID impacts
 - The Faculty Caucus did not meet on 10/21/20. Catanzaro thought that they would discuss something, but they chose not to meet. It looks as if there may not be a meeting on 11/4
 - It may be that the thinking is that this is an issue that the Caucus would want to be covered as part of the 5-year ASPT revisions.
- 5-year Revisions of ASPT Policies
 - The group discussed possible ways to continue the work from last year. It was proposed that the group consider the use of the sub-groups for discussions that were used last year. This process was briefly described for the new committee members. A variety of issues and suggestions had been forwarded to the URC for consideration for revisions to the 5-year ASPT policies (coming largely from Catanzaro and from the Academic Senate). The group agreed that using a similar approach would work.
 - Catanzaro suggested that this is also an opportunity to integrate new issues that have emerged from the current COVID context. Two suggestions were mentioned:
 - Some interest in the possibility of a standardized reporting university-wide format, there seem to be a lot of variability across units/individuals in what is done. This has resulted from the decentralized nature of much of what we do historically at the University. We would still want to have flexibility for disciplines and individual distinctiveness
 - The Provost Office ASPT planning subcommittee has started meeting. Our charges include developing a white paper for ...check audio for this missing piece... For this subcommittee the white paper will constitute a set of suggestions that are then passed onto the shared governance bodies within the university to develop and implement. E.g., faculty work has evolved over recent decades but some university policies may not have been updated to keep pace with these evolutionary changes.
 - Beck - asked how should the subgroups be formed given the change in URC membership? He noted that Group 3 still had items to discuss and draft proposed revision.

- Catanzaro - that's up to this committee as to how to proceed given what has already been accomplished. We don't need/want to redo the work that has already been done.
- Buckley- looking at the original, all of the subgroups focused on priority items, but have additional items to work on. We will need to integrate our new members into these subgroups to replace the members who are no longer on the committee
- Catanzaro - suggested that the committee needs to first determine whether these the content for the subgroups should remain as they were last year? The general consensus was to keep that content the same. The group decided to allow new members to look over the original description of the charges for each subgroup and have a week to decide their preferences for filling in for the faculty who are no longer on the committee. Buckley will review the progress that was made last year and send out a summary of what remains to be discussed for the subgroups.
- Edwards - asked whether the URC may want to hold off discussing some items if those items are also being discussed by the ASPT subcommittee that Catanzaro is leading in advance of the planned administrators spring retreat.
 - Catanzaro - agreed that we could do that, but there may also be an advantage of doing those discussions in parallel. The subcommittee is not drafting proposed policy, but rather highlighting things for this committee to do. So it may just circle back as a charge for this committee.
 - Edwards - some of our agenda items will require input from others outside of this committee, so the subcommittee may be able to provide some of this input (e.g., special FSC's for Program faculty)
- Evaluation Calendar – Calendar Year vs. Academic Year (hold until Faculty Caucus has discussed this item?)
 - This item will be taken up by FC on Nov 4, will discuss at URC at a meeting following the FC discussion (do we want to discuss it in advance of that meeting as well?)
 - Catanzaro – recommends that URC chair Buckley reach out to Senate Chairperson Kalter to let her know that the URC is aware that there is interest in this discussion, but the group is uncertain about how much it should be considering in advance of the Academic Senate discussion. This discussion needs to include consideration about the downstream impacts on implementing a change in the calendar.
 - Guidry– it seems as if the first step should be a costs analysis because it may come back as a non-starter.
 - Buckley indicated that he will communicate with the Senate Chairperson and relay the response to the URC.
- Buckley asked whether anyone was aware of any other items for the URC's long-term agenda?
 - Catanzaro I think the 5-year revisions are the big one. At the moment nothing comes to mind.
- Any other business?
 - Buckley – if more COVID related things come up we will deal with it as it comes.
 - Edwards – asked whether there another COVID ASPT memo coming out?

- Catanzaro – indicated that he does not think that there are plans to send out a university-wide memo. He indicated that he has communicated with the deans, chairs and directors and that they will be communication to their respective faculty. He has started to develop an online workshop for ASPT committee for how to do their evaluations without the student feedback (which has typically been consider a standard input into the evaluations of faculty teaching).
 - Catanzaro – any other COVID related questions? Or other questions for me. None were indicated
- Adjournment
 - Beck moved that the meeting be adjourned. Edwards seconded. Motion passed with 6 voting in favor. Meeting adjourned at 9:43