

University Review Committee  
Tuesday, October 4, 2011  
1:10 p.m., Hovey 302  
MINUTES

Those present: Cynthia Huff, Nancy Lind, Cyndee Brown, Chad Kahl, David Rubin, Domingo Joaquin, Sam Catanzaro.

The meeting was called to order at 1:15

- I. The September 13, 2011, minutes were shared and approved. Approval moved by C. Kahl, Seconded by C. Huff
- II. Disposition of CFSC annual reports after URC discussion: Just one issue brought to light about a name inadvertently left on the report. No other concerns about the reports. Moved to accept reports by David Rubin, seconded by Cynthia Huff. The reports were approved. A letter will go to each Dean saying that the reports have been reviewed and accepted.
- III. Review of DRAFT 2012-2013 ASPT Calendar: Several calendar items were questioned as follows:
  - Calendar for Reappointment: May 15, 2013, - a possible issue "third and subsequent year" Change indicated to the previous language - from 2014 to 2013.
  - Calendar for Promotion and Tenure: November 15 should read Prior to December 15, 2012.
  - Calendar narrative should be consistent with the beige book.
  - Calendar dates should be consistent with the beige book and notations made when dates occur when the University is closed.

Discussion ensued regarding clarification of termination dates. Sam will consult with legal and the Provost and report back to the URC.

A revised draft ASPT calendar will be developed and reviewed as a future agenda item.

- IV. S. Catanzaro provided an update on the Academic Senate Faculty Caucus' status of the URC's position to retain the current ASPT policy that has no appeal process for non-reappointment of probationary tenure-track faculty.

- The Faculty Caucus requests the URC to reconsider developing a process for non-reappointment of probationary faculty, working from the circulated documents:

**ASPT Sections XI and XIII.J (Appeals for non-reappointment of probationary faculty)**

Additional aspects: One suggestion - keep it as simple and straight forward as possible. Should not be onerous. What is the definition of "procedural"? Process of appeal for probationary faculty members must be different from that of a tenured faculty member. What is adequate consideration? Define, examine this process - don't blind side people is the intent. Academic Freedom and Ethics are the procedural grounds that may be considered in an appeal. Discussion of various scenarios ensued.

Recommendations: do not add specific examples. Is there a way to clarify the procedure? Have a conversation with the faculty caucus when this is revisited. Perhaps the examples of adequate consideration can be handled in discussion and or the faculty caucus could re-write any of the language of URC.

(Failure to follow University policy) Possible language to include. (May include but are not limited to) Sam may try to craft some language with University legal counsel

Discussion of spousal hiring procedures and protocols.

- V. Mennonite College of Nursing Appeal Process for CFSC recommendations, operating without a DFSC.

Recommendation for Mennonite which has only a CFSC; how and to whom do they appeal? Use procedures/processes as any CFSC appeal; Motion made by N. Lind that the following language address the issue:

**ASPT Policy Changes**

Context: Mennonite College of Nursing lacks sufficient faculty to operate both a DFSC and a CFSC and hence operate with only a CFSC in effect dropping out the bottom stage of the process. Thus, the question arises as to what type of appeals process is available for performance evaluations and promotion and tenure decisions.

Rationale: It is important to allow an appeal equivalent to the appeals allowed to faculty operating under the 'normal' ASPT process by giving faculty the opportunity for a single review of the CFSC decision. The FRC is an elected body of faculty most similar to the CFSC.

Members of the URC do not believe new language is needed to allow for a promotion/tenure appeal as the current guidelines already indicate that “any negative promotion and/or tenure recommendation by a DFSC/SFC or CFSC may be appealed.”

On a motion made by Nancy Lind, seconded by Cynthia Huff, to make the following changes to the ASPT Policies:

ASPT Policies Item XIII.E.2.

Performance evaluations conducted by a DFSC/SFSC may be appealed to the CFSC only. **Performance evaluations conducted by a CFSC, in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC, may be appealed to the FRC.** (See XIII.H.)

The motion carried.

Prior to submitting to the faculty caucus of the Academic Senate, Sam will review with the Provost and University Legal Counsel.

VI. Other Items

No meeting next week, October 11, but the URC will meet on the October 18. The meeting was adjourned at 2:10.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cyndee Brown, Secretary.

**Future Meetings: Tuesdays, starting at 1:10 p.m.**

October 18, Hovey 401-D  
October 25, Hovey 302  
November 1, Hovey 401-D  
November 8, Hovey 302  
November 15, Hovey 401-D  
November 29, Hovey 302  
December 6, Hovey 401-D

**AGENDA: October 18, Hovey 401-D, 1:10 p.m.**

- I. Approval of October 4 minutes
- II. Distribute Revised Draft 2012-13 ASPT Calendar
- III. Update on appeal for nonreappointment probationary faculty
- IV. Update on ASPT Item XIII.E.2 appeal of annual evaluation to FRC when conducted by CFSC in absence of DFSC/SFSC.
- V. Discussion/Approval of Milner College Standards

University Review Committee  
Tuesday, October 18, 2011  
1:10 p.m., Hovey 401D

Those present: Nancy Lind, Chad Kahl, David Rubin, Domingo Joaquin, Sam Catanzaro, Ron Meir, Cheri Toledo, Cyndee Brown

The URC meeting was called to order at 1:11 p.m.

- I. Approval of October 4, 2011, minutes: Moved to accept minutes by C. Brown, second by C. Toledo. The motion carried.
- II. The revised DRAFT 2012-ASPT calendar was distributed.

Sam reported that he reviewed the dates for non reappointment with Provost Everts. Following a discussion regarding the dates the committee agreed that the language for the calendar should reflect the ASPT Policies since it was approved by the faculty caucus.

Nancy Lind moved (seconded, Cyndee Brown) to revise the following ASPT calendar dates as follows:

Calendar for Reappointment

- February 1, 2013: Provost issues notification of non-reappointment by February 1, 2013, to faculty member in the second academic year of service, notifying candidate that the last employment date is May 15, 2013, or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
- March 1, 2013 Provost's notification of non-reappointment must be given by March 1, 2013, to candidate in the first year of service, notifying candidate that last employment date is May 15, 2013, or if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.
- May 15, 2013 Provost notifies third and subsequent year faculty members who will not be reappointed, 12 months before the termination of the appointment, that the candidate's last employment date is May 15, 2014. If the appointment is at least 12 months and terminates during an academic year, notification must take place at least 12 months in advance of the end of the appointment period.

After additional discussion Chad Kahl moved (Seconded, Rubin) to delete the parenthesis in the narrative and retain the approved ASPT language.

The motion carried.

Linda will revise the ASPT calendars and prepare them for a January 2012 campus distribution.

- III. Sam distributed a DRAFT XIII.J. Appeal of Recommendations for Non-reappointment. Also, Domingo distributed an MIT policy as an example of a similar policy. Committee members reviewed and discussed various language changes.

David Rubin moved (seconded, Domingo) to table this agenda item for further discussion on language issues.

- IV. Sam provided an update on ASPT Item XIII.E.2., The Appeal Process for an annual evaluation in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC. This agenda item was brought to the Committee by the College of Nursing. Sam will continue to develop the policy language with the College of Nursing for submission to the faculty caucus by Nancy.
- V. Discussion/approval of Milner College Standards. Committee members reviewed and discussed the Standards. Nancy Lind made a motion (C. Brown, seconded) to accept Milner's College Standards. The motion carried (Kahl abstention). Nancy and Linda will work to send an acceptance memo to Milner CFSC.

There was no new business.

The October 25 and November 1 meetings are cancelled. The next meeting will be November 8. The meeting adjourned at 2:02 p.m.

Recorded, Cyndee Brown

**Future Meetings:**

Tuesday, November 8, 1:10 p.m., Hovey 302  
Tuesday, November 15, 1:10 p.m., Hovey 401-D  
Tuesday, November 29, 1:10 p.m., Hovey 302  
Tuesday, December 6, 1:10 p.m., Hovey 401-D

**Agenda for November 8**

- I. Approval of October 18 minutes
- II. DRAFT Article XIII.J Appeal of Recommendation for Non-reappointment
- III. Update on appeal process of performance evaluation in absence of DFSC/SFSC, Article XIII.E.2.
- IV. College of Fine Arts ASPT Standards
- V. College of Applied Science and Technology ASPT Standards
- VI. College of Nursing ASPT Standards
- VII. Other Items

University Review Committee  
Tuesday, November 8, 2011  
1:10 p.m., Hovey 302  
MINUTES

Those present: Cynthia Huff, Nancy Lind, Cyndee Brown, Chad Kahl, David Rubin, Domingo Joaquin, Sam Catanzaro, Ron Meier, Cheri Toledo

The meeting was called to order at 1:13 p.m.

- I. The October 18, 2011, minutes were reviewed. Chad Kahl moved (Brown, seconded) to accept the minutes. The motion carried.

- II. Draft Article XIII.J. Appeal of Recommendation for Non-Reappointment

Domingo distributed a draft article that provides more specificity and procedural clarity in the language of the article.

The committee discussed the draft document which was originally drafted by the URC in 2010-2011. The article is founded in the language of due process. It was noted that detailed language may lead to more appeals and issues in the appeal process. If the language is more general in the ASPT process, the SFSC/DFSC has the opportunity to be more specific in department/school guidelines. The institutional perspective is that the more general the document, the easier it will be to administer.

A friendly amendment to the document: Item XIII.J.4. Delete significant.

Sam will have the draft article reviewed by University General Counsel.

- III. Sam reported that the Mennonite College of Nursing is voting today on the DRAFT Article XIII.E.2. regarding the appeal of a performance evaluation in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC.

Once approved by the college of Nursing, the Article will then be submitted to the Senate Faculty Caucus.

- IV. Review of College Standards.

It was noted that the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Business have not submitted their revised Standards.

**College of Fine Arts Standards.** The Standards will be returned to the College for correction to the approval process by the full faculty.

**College of Applied Science and Technology.** Chad Kahl moved (Meier, seconded) to accept the CAST Standards. The motion carried.

**Mennonite College of Nursing.** Cheri Toledo moved (Rubin, seconded) to accept the College of Nursing Standards. The motion carried.

**College of Education.** Domingo Joaquin moved (Kahl, seconded) to accept the College of Education Standards. The motion carried.

**Milner Library.** The Milner Library Standards were approved by the URC October 18, 2011. However, it was then noted that a recusal statement was not included. Nancy Lind moved (Toledo, seconded) to return the Standards with a request for a revision to include a recusal policy. The motion carried.

V. The November 8 meeting is cancelled. The next meeting will be November 29.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cyndee Brown, Secretary.

Future Meetings:

Tuesday, November 29, Hovey 302, 1:10 p.m.

Tuesday, December 6, Hovey 401-D, 1:10 p.m.

**Agenda: November 29.**

1. November 8, 2011, minutes.
2. Update on Article XIII.J. Appeal of Recommendation for Non-Reappointment.
3. Update on Article XIII.E.2 Appeal performance evaluation in the absence of a DFSC.
4. **College Standards:**
  - Arts and Sciences, not yet submitted.
  - College of Business, submitted November 15, no changes.
  - College of Fine Arts, submitted with suggested (URC) revisions.
  - Milner, approved but returned to with URC suggested revisions regarding recusal. Not yet received by URC.

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, December 6, 1:10 p.m. Hovey 401-D.

University Review Committee  
Tuesday, November 29, 2011  
1:10 p.m., Hovey 302  
MINUTES

Those present: Cynthia Huff, Nancy Lind, Chad Kahl, David Rubin, Domingo Joaquin, Sam Catanzaro, Ron Meier, Cheri Toledo

I. The November 8, 2011, minutes were reviewed. Ron Meier moved (Huff, seconded) to accept the minutes. The motion carried.

II. College Standards Review

**Arts and Sciences:** Revised standards for the College of Arts and Sciences have not been submitted. The College is working on them and is aware they need to submit the Standards prior to the end of the semester.

**College of Business:** Cheri Toledo moved (Huff, seconded) to accept the College of Business Standards as submitted. The motion carried.

**College of Fine Arts:** Cynthia Huff moved (Rubin seconded) to accept the College of Fine Arts Standards as submitted. The motion carried.

**Milner Library Standards:** Nancy Lind moved (Joaquin seconded) to accept the Milner Library revision to their approved Standards. The revision addressed the issue of CFSC members participating in ASPT deliberations, including appeals, and provided clarification to Item I.B. of the Milner Standards.

III. Sam reported that the Senate Faculty Caucus will meet on Wednesday December 7, 2011, and will address ASPT Policies XIII.J., Appeal of Recommendation for Non-reappointment.

Sam also noted that the Mennonite College of Nursing endorsed Article XIII.E.2., the appeal of a performance evaluation in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC. The Senate Faculty Caucus will address this ASPT Policy on Wednesday, December 7, 2011.

IV. Nancy reminded committee members of the urgency to approve the College of Arts and Sciences Standards prior to the end of the semester. Thus, an additional meeting will be scheduled for Tuesday, December 13, if needed.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Recorded, Linda Wellenreiter

**Future Meetings:**

Tuesday, December 6, Hovey 401-D, 1:10 p.m.

Tuesday, December 13, Hovey 302, 1:10 p.m. (new meeting scheduled)



**Agenda: December 6.**

1. November 29, 2011, minutes.
2. Update on Article XIII.J. Appeal of Recommendation for Non-Reappointment.
3. Update on Article XIII.E.2 Appeal performance evaluation in the absence of a DFSC.
4. **College Standards:**
  - Update on Arts and Sciences Standards

FUTURE MEETING IF NECESSARY: Tuesday, December 13, 1:10 p.m. Hovey 302.

University Review Committee  
Tuesday, December 13, 2011  
1:10 p.m., Hovey 302  
MINUTES

Those present: Nancy Lind, Chad Kahl, David Rubin, Domingo Joaquin, Sam Catanzaro, Ron Meier

I. The November 29, 2011, minutes were reviewed. Ron Meier moved (Rubin seconded) to accept the minutes. The motion carried.

II. Sam and Chad reported on the Senate Faculty Caucus discussion of two ASPT agenda items.

1. **ASPT Item XIII.E.2** Performance evaluations may be appealed to the CFSC only. **Performance evaluations conducted by a CFSC, in the absence of a DFSC, may be appealed to the FRC.** (See XIII.H.)

The Faculty Caucus moved this information item to an action item and voted to accept the change. Sam will inform the Deans and also the Mennonite College of Nursing faculty.

2. **ASPT Item XIII.J. Appeal of Recommendation for Non-reappointment.**

David Rubin moved (Domingo seconded): to accept the recommendation of the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate to replace the phrase “procedural errors” with “due process errors” in the suggested revision to ASPT XIII.4.” The motion carried.

The following ASPT item (URC approved) will be returned to the Faculty Caucus for consideration:

- ASPT Item XIII.J.4.** If, using the preponderance of the evidence (more likely than not) test as the standard of review, the CFSC determines **procedural due process errors** that substantially affected the non-reappointment decision, the CFSC shall refer the recommendation back to the DFSC/SFSC to reassess the merits, remedying any inadequacies of the prior process.

III. College Standards Review

The URC received the College of Arts and Sciences Standards. Chad Kahl moved (Lind seconded) to accept the A&S College Standards. The motion carried, 3 – 0 with 2 abstentions.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Recorded, Linda Wellenreiter

Future Meetings: A schedule for spring 2012 URC meetings will be set and distributed to committee members.

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, February 21, 2012  
3:00 p.m., Stevenson 140 (College of Arts and Sciences office)  
MINUTES

Members present: Cyndee Brown (Secretary), Sam Catanzaro (ex officio), Cynthia Huff, Domingo Joaquin, Chad Kahl (Vice Chairperson), Nancy Lind (Chairperson), Ron Meier

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (Recorder)

Nancy Lind welcomed Bruce Stoffel, Coordinator of Academic Programs and Policy in the Office of the Provost and new URC recorder.

I. Approve minutes of December 13, 2011, meeting

Minutes of the December 13, 2011, meeting were reviewed. Ron Meier moved and Cynthia Huff seconded to accept the minutes. The motion carried.

II. Update on membership

Sam Catanzaro reported that Mennonite College of Nursing faculty elected a colleague to serve on URC. However, because the elected faculty member already serves on the Mennonite CFSC, pursuant to ASPT policies the faculty member cannot also serve on URC. URC will proceed without a member from Mennonite, as Mennonite faculty is not large enough at this time to support membership on URC. It may be some time before URC representation is possible. Catanzaro noted that the vacant Mennonite term expires in 2012.

III. Update: ASPT Item XIII.J.4 (approved by Faculty Caucus)

The option to appeal non-reappointment in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC was approved by Faculty Caucus on January 25, 2012. Thus, a route of appeal is now available to Mennonite probationary faculty members recommended for non-reappointment. Faculty Caucus made editorial changes to the version of the article recommended to Faculty Caucus by URC. The changes are consistent with the spirit of ASPT policies and consistent with previous URC action on the matter.

[remainder of page intentionally left blank]

Article XIII.J as approved by Faculty Caucus on January 25, 2012:

XIII.J. Initiation of a Non-Reappointment Recommendation Appeal:

1. A recommendation for non-reappointment of a probationary faculty member may be appealed to the CFSC to consider whether the DFSC/SFSC provided a adequate due process to the non-reappointment decision. In instances when a non-reappointment recommendation is made by a CFSC because of the absence of a DFSC/SFSC, the probationary faculty member may appeal to the FRC.
2. In determining whether a adequate due process was provided, the CFSC shall restrict its inquiry to procedural issues related to the manner in which the review was conducted. The CFSC shall not substitute its judgment for that of the DFSC/SFSC on the merits of whether the candidate should be reappointed.
3. If, using the preponderance of the evidence (more likely than not) test as the standard of review, the CFSC determines due process errors that substantially affected the non-reappointment decision, the CFSC shall refer the recommendation back to the DFSC/SFSC to reassess the merits, remedying any inadequacies of the prior process.
4. If a faculty member believes that the basis for non-reappointment was an academic freedom or ethics violation, the faculty member may request a review by the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee. In order to allow a final decision prior to the end of the faculty member's appointment, the faculty member must file a complaint as required by Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee within five (5) business days (days when University offices are open to the public) of the date that the faculty member received the official notification of non-reappointment from the Provost. The Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee must submit its report by May 1 of the academic year in which the appointment terminates.
5. If a faculty member believes that the basis for non-reappointment was a violation of the University's Policy on Harassment and Discrimination, he/she may seek relief through the Office of Equal Opportunity, Ethics and Access.

Catanzaro noted that this version is based on a draft Faculty Caucus minutes provided by the Academic Senate Administrative Clerk. Wording in approved Faculty Caucus minutes may differ slightly, but the meaning should remain unchanged.

IV. Action Item: ASPT XI.A (consider revision suggested by Faculty Caucus)

At its January 25, 2012, meeting, Faculty Caucus reviewed changes recommended by URC, modified them, and returned the matter to URC for further review. The Faculty Caucus modification is intended to guarantee that a probationary faculty member recommended for non-reappointment receive a written statement of reasons for non-reappointment if requested. Catanzaro noted that sections A.1.a and A.1.b of the article are based on American Association of University Professors guidelines. Lind moved and Meier seconded acceptance of the article as revised by Faculty Caucus on January 25, 2012, and return of the article to Faculty Caucus for its review and approval. The motion carried. Faculty Caucus is expected to consider the matter at its March 7, 2012, meeting.

Article XI.A as accepted by URC and referred back to Faculty Caucus:

**XI. Termination of Appointment of Probationary and Tenured Faculty**

**A. Probationary Faculty**

1. Recommendations for nonreappointment prior to a tenure decision shall be made by the DFSC/SFSC in consultation with the Dean and the Provost. The Chairperson/Director of the DFSC/SFSC shall communicate the recommendation of nonreappointment in writing to the faculty member, the Dean, and the Provost. Nonreappointment can also be the result of a negative tenure recommendation. Official notices of nonreappointment, whether issued prior to a tenure decision or as a result of a negative tenure decision, are issued from the Office of the Provost.
  - a. Upon notice of non-reappointment other than a negative tenure recommendation, a probationary faculty member may request an oral statement of reasons for non-reappointment from the Chair/Director.
  - b. Following the oral statement of reasons for non-reappointment under a., a probationary faculty member may request a written statement of reasons for non-reappointment from the Chair/Director. The Chair/Director shall advise the probationary faculty member of the pros and cons of obtaining such a statement in writing. If the probationary faculty member still wishes a written statement, the Chair/Director shall provide the requested written statement.
  - c. Appeals of non-reappointment other than those following a negative tenure decision shall be governed by Article XIII.J.
  - d. Appeals of non-reappointment following a negative tenure recommendation shall follow the provision of Article XIII.F.
2. Notice of termination shall be given not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination; not later than February 1 of the second academic year of service; or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination; at least twelve months before termination of an appointment after two or more years of service.

**V. Other business**

The February 28, 2012, URC meeting is canceled due to lack of agenda items.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 27, 2012, at 3 p.m. in Hovey 401D. Agenda items may include CFSC annual reports and any proposed revisions to College Standards received from CFSCs.

Lind adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cyndee Brown, Secretary  
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

NEXT MEETING: 3 p.m., Tuesday, March 27, 2012, Hovey 401D

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, April 10, 2012  
3:00 p.m., Hovey 401d  
MINUTES

Members present: Cyndee Brown (Secretary), Sam Catanzaro (ex officio), Cynthia Huff, Domingo Joaquin, Ron Meier, David Rubin, Cheri Toledo

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (Recorder)

Recused: Nancy Lind (Chair), Chad Kahl (Vice-Chair)

Chairperson Nancy Lind and Vice Chairperson Chad Kahl recused themselves due to potential conflicts of interest related to the policy interpretation action item. In their absence Secretary Cyndee Brown chaired the meeting.

I. Approve minutes of February 21, 2012 meeting

Cynthia Huff moved, Cheri Toledo seconded approval of minutes from the February 21, 2012 meeting. The motion carried with one abstention (David Rubin).

II. Update: ASPT XI.A (approved by Faculty Caucus)

Sam Catanzaro reported that Faculty Caucus approved a revised Article XI.A of the ASPT document at its March 7, 2012 meeting. An amendment was proposed during the Faculty Caucus discussion to further revise XI.A by inserting the word “specific” before the word “reasons.” The proposed amendment was voted down. Faculty Caucus then approved the language as recommended by URC at its February 21, 2012 meeting. Catanzaro said the revised section will take effect on January 1, 2013. The article as approved:

[the remainder of this page has been intentionally left blank]

## XI. Termination of Appointment of Probationary and Tenured Faculty

### A. Probationary Faculty

1. Recommendations for nonreappointment prior to a tenure decision shall be made by the DFSC/SFSC in consultation with the Dean and the Provost. The Chairperson/Director of the DFSC/SFSC shall communicate the recommendation of nonreappointment in writing to the faculty member, the Dean, and the Provost. Nonreappointment can also be the result of a negative tenure recommendation. Official notices of nonreappointment, whether issued prior to a tenure decision or as a result of a negative tenure decision, are issued from the Office of the Provost.
  - a. Upon notice of non-reappointment other than a negative tenure recommendation, a probationary faculty member may request an oral statement of reasons for non-reappointment from the Chair/Director.
  - b. Following the oral statement of reasons for non-reappointment under a., a probationary faculty member may request a written statement of reasons for non-reappointment from the Chair/Director. The Chair/Director shall advise the probationary faculty member of the pros and cons of obtaining such a statement in writing. If the probationary faculty member still wishes a written statement, the Chair/Director shall provide the requested written statement.
  - c. Appeals of non-reappointment other than those following a negative tenure decision shall be governed by Article XIII.J.
  - d. Appeals of non-reappointment following a negative tenure recommendation shall follow the provision of Article XIII.F.
2. Notice of termination shall be given not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination; not later than February 1 of the second academic year of service; or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination; at least twelve months before termination of an appointment after two or more years of service.

### III. Action Item: Request for policy interpretation (ASPT V.B.1 and V.B.2, pp. 18-19 Beige Book)

Catanzaro provided background information regarding a request from an associate professor in the College of Arts and Sciences for interpretation of ASPT V.B.1 and V.B.2, both regarding DFSC/SFSC development of policies and procedures for, among other matters, performance-evaluation and allocation of salary increments. The associate professor has asked the following questions regarding this matter. Is URC interpretation of ASPT guidelines V.B.1 and V.B.2 consistent with DFSC interpretation? Should DFSC/CFSC interpretation of ASPT guidelines V.B.1 and V.B.2 be consistently applied across Colleges and Departments? Catanzaro noted that the faculty member had consulted him directly about the matter. Catanzaro shared with the committee written information submitted by the faculty member.

Catanzaro explained that URC is not an appellate body and has no standing to review decisions made by DFSCs/SFSCs or CFSCs regarding specific faculty members. URC is an advisory body charged with interpreting ASPT policies and procedures in a broader sense.

Discussion ensued regarding faculty involvement in establishing performance-evaluation and salary increment policies and procedures in units across campus; whether a rubric used by a DFSC/SFSC to calculate salary increments constitutes a policy or procedure or is a tool for implementing policy or procedure; and the balance between promoting transparency in DFSC/SFSC decision-making and providing units flexibility in administering the ASPT system.

Committee members asked Catanzaro to research whether precedent in this matter exists through actions of other ASPT units on campus.

Committee members agreed to continue consideration of the associate professor's request at the next URC meeting, after more thoroughly reviewing information related to the request and considering the report from Catanzaro on his research into precedents.

IV. Action Item: Establish calendar for review of College Standards

Toledo moved, Huff seconded approval of the proposed schedule for review of College Standards. [Note: Nancy Lind voted in the affirmative via email.] Motion carried.

The Provost's Office will notify colleges of the schedule. The schedule as approved:

College	Year of Review	Due to URC
College of Education	2013-2014	May 1, 2014
College of Applied Science and Technology	2014-2015	May 1, 2015
College of Arts and Sciences	2015-2016	May 1, 2016
College of Business	2015-2016	May 1, 2016
Mennonite College of Nursing	2015-2016	May 1, 2016
College of Fine Arts	2016-2017	May 1, 2017
Milner Library	2016-2017	May 1, 2017

The next review/revision of the ASPT document is scheduled for completion and approval by the Faculty Caucus of Academic Senate in Spring 2016. The revised ASPT document will then take effect on January 1, 2017.

V. Other business

Catanzaro reported that all departments/schools report annually to the Provost's Office on the numbers of faculty members in their units receiving overall satisfactory and overall unsatisfactory performance ratings. A summary report is then compiled and forwarded to the President who, in turn, shares it with Faculty Caucus. Catanzaro has received these reports from departments/schools for 2011-2012 and will share the summary report with URC at its next meeting.

Bruce Stoffel reported that Nancy Lind has sent requests to colleges for their current College Standards (as approved by URC) and their annual reports of CFSC activities as described in ASPT Article IV.D.3. Annual reports are due May 1 and will be reviewed by URC at its May 8 meeting.

Brown adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

NEXT MEETING: 3 p.m., Tuesday, April 24, 2012, Hovey 401d



UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, April 24, 2012  
3:00 p.m., Hovey 401d  
MINUTES

Members present: Cyndee Brown (Secretary), Sam Catanzaro (ex officio), Cynthia Huff, Domingo Joaquin, Ron Meier, David Rubin, Cheri Toledo

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (Recorder)

Recused: Nancy Lind (Chair), Chad Kahl (Vice-Chair)

Chairperson Nancy Lind and Vice Chairperson Chad Kahl recused themselves due to potential conflicts of interest related to the policy interpretation action item. In their absence Secretary Cyndee Brown chaired the meeting.

I. Approve minutes of April 10, 2012 meeting

Cyndee Brown noted a correction needed to the minutes. The last sentence in the “Other business” section indicated that annual CFSC reports would be reviewed by URC in the fall. CFSC reports will instead be reviewed at the May 8 URC meeting. Nancy Lind reported the error prior to the meeting via email. Cynthia Huff moved, Ron Meier seconded approval of minutes of the April 10, 2012 meeting with this correction. The motion carried.

II. Action Item (continuation from April 10, 2012):

Request for policy interpretation (ASPT V.B.1 and V.B.2, pp. 18-19 Beige Book)

Sam Catanzaro reported having made inquiries to determine whether precedent exists through actions of other ASPT units on campus that might provide guidance to the URC regarding ASPT V.B.1 and V.B.2. Catanzaro reported that a pertinent case may have been identified in the College of Applied Science and Technology. Catanzaro said he expects to receive more information about the case by Thursday.

Discussion then continued from the previous URC meeting regarding committee response to policy questions raised by the associate professor and whether the committee should communicate with campus ASPT units regarding broader issues related to the matter.

Brown expressed support for communicating to ASPT units the importance of transparency. Domingo Joaquin agreed, suggesting that as departments revise their guidelines, faculty should discuss the salary increment determination process, how it has worked and how department faculty would like it to work.

Toledo noted that confusion regarding DFSC policies can arise when department chairpersons change. Brown wondered if the committee should remind faculty members that salary increment policies need to be voted on by faculty. Huff cautioned that there is a difference between policies and methods used to implement those policies.

Catanzaro observed that, in its discussions thus far, the committee has touched on two key ASPT themes: transparency and decentralization. He suggested that these might guide the committee in its response.

Rubin stated that he favors consistency across campus in this matter. He said that there should be transparency in the process and that salary increment policies should be voted on by faculty members before they are implemented.

Discussion ensued regarding faculty involvement in DFSC policy making and differences in approaches to ASPT administration across departments. Brown wondered if the message to campus faculty should be to get more involved when department policies and procedures are made. Meier asked what could be done to fight the broader issue of faculty members not being familiar with their ASPT documents. Huff asked whether there still are meetings of chairpersons to discuss ASPT implementation on the college and department levels. Catanzaro said that such meetings have been held and that another workshop is planned for October. Catanzaro said that a template for evaluation letters has been disseminated to ASPT units, and that the template includes a passage regarding the evaluation appeal process.

Meier suggested that another approach might be to modify ASPT V.B.1 to require DFSCs to distribute methods and tools to the faculty in addition to policies and procedures. Catanzaro said that it is in the purview of URC to initiate such a change but cautioned against doing for a single case because of the time involved working through Faculty Caucus and the precedent it might set. DFSC guidelines for all departments would also need to be revised. Catanzaro suggested the following language for providing direction to ASPT units regarding existing policy.

In considering the issue of how salary increments should be determined, URC considered two overarching principles: transparency/participatory governance and the decentralized nature of the ASPT system. URC advises that, when developing department/school guidelines, faculty members should keep in mind that broad statements empowering DFSCs/SFSCs to implement procedures without specifying those procedures are allowable but may have unintended consequences as DFSC/SFSC membership changes. Departments/schools may choose to be more or less explicit in specifying methods used to translate performance evaluations into salary increments.

Brown suggested approaching the matter in two steps: first, respond to the specific request for an interpretation from the faculty member and, second, address the broader issue of whether and how URC should communicate guidance to campus ASPT units regarding salary increments. Committee members agreed.

Ron Meier moved, David Rubin seconded that URC send a letter informing the associate professor that, based on URC review of existing department, college, and university ASPT policies, the committee finds actions of the DFSC and CFSC involved in the matter consistent with those policies. Copies of the letter would be sent to the dean and department chairperson.

Catanzaro suggested adding to the letter thanks from the committee for raising the issues and a note that the committee is considering actions on the campus level for the greater good. Committee members agreed.

The motion as amended carried.

Brown asked if the two colleagues who have recused themselves from this discussion thus far could be invited to participate in discussion of broader committee responses to the issue, since the committee has now acted on the specific request. Committee members agreed.

III. Update: Summary of DFSC reports on overall faculty ratings for 2011

Catanzaro reported that he has received annual DFSC reports (PERS 913). Through this form DFSCs report the numbers of faculty members rated overall satisfactory and overall unsatisfactory in the recent performance evaluation cycle. Catanzaro reported that campus wide five or six faculty members received overall unsatisfactory ratings during this performance review cycle.

IV. Other business

There was none.

Brown noted that, at its next meeting, the committee will continue discussion of communication to ASPT units regarding ASPT V.B.1 and V.B.2. The committee will also review annual CFSC reports. Meier said that he would be absent on May 8.

Brown adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

NEXT MEETING: 3:30 p.m., Tuesday, May 8, 2012, Hovey 401d

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, May 8, 2012  
3:30 p.m., Hovey 401d  
MINUTES/NOTES

Members present: Nancy Lind (Chairperson), Cyndee Brown (Secretary), Sam Catanzaro (ex officio), Domingo Joaquin, David Rubin

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (Recorder)

Members not attending: Cynthia Huff, Chad Kahl (Vice Chair), Ron Meier, Cheri Toledo

Chairperson Nancy Lind noted the lack of a quorum. Accordingly, the meeting could not be officially called to order nor could business be officially transacted.

Lind suggested that members in attendance discuss action items on the agenda and indicate how they would vote if there were a quorum. The recorder would then poll members not present via email after the meeting. Members in attendance agreed to Lind's suggestion.

I. Approve minutes of April 24, 2012 meeting

The four voting members in attendance (Lind, Cyndee Brown, Domingo Joaquin, and David Rubin) indicated their acceptance of the minutes as drafted.

Cheri Toledo indicated via email on May 9, 2012, her acceptance of the minutes as drafted.  
Cynthia Huff indicated via email on May 9, 2012, her acceptance of the minutes as drafted.  
Chad Kahl indicated via email on May 10, 2012, his abstention regarding the minutes.

There being a majority affirmative indication in person or via email, the minutes were accepted as drafted.

II. Action Item (continuation from April 24, 2012):  
Possible campus communication regarding ASPT V.B.1 and V.B.2 (pp. 18-19 Beige Book)

Lind suggested deferring this item until a meeting in fall 2012, when more members would be present to contribute to the discussion. Members in attendance agreed.

III. Action Item: CFSC annual reports

Sam Catanzaro distributed CFSC annual reports submitted by all seven colleges in accordance with ASPT IV.D.3 (see reports at the end of these minutes). The four voting members in attendance (Lind, Brown, Joaquin, and Rubin) indicated their acceptance of the reports as complete and satisfactory.

On May 9, 2012, the reports were sent via email to members not present.  
Cheri Toledo indicated via email on May 9, 2012, her acceptance of the reports as submitted.  
Cynthia Huff indicated via email on May 9, 2012, her acceptance of the reports as submitted.  
Chad Kahl indicated via email on May 10, 2012, his acceptance of the reports as submitted.

There being a majority affirmative indication in person or via email, the reports were accepted as complete and satisfactory.

Chairperson Lind indicated that a memorandum would be sent to each CFSC c/o the college dean informing the CFSC of URC acceptance of the annual report.

IV. Other business

There was none.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cyndee Brown, Secretary  
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

THIS IS THE LAST MEETING OF THE 2011-2012 ACADEMIC YEAR.

*2011-2012 CFSC Annual Reports follow*

**The following attachments have been redacted from the version of this document posted on the University Review Committee Minutes website.**

*2011-2012 CFSC Annual Reports*