

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