

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 17, 2015
11 a.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Rick Boser, Diane Dean, Joe Goodman, Christopher Horvath, Sheryl Jenkins, David Rubin, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting)

Members not present: Doris Houston

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

I. Call to order

In Chairperson Doris Houston's absence, Vice-Chairperson Diane Dean presided. Dean called the meeting to order at 11:07 a.m.

II. Approval of minutes from the November 3, 2015 meeting

Christopher Horvath moved, Angela Bonnell seconded approval of minutes from the November 3, 2015 meeting as distributed prior to the meeting. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

III. Discussion of ASPT suggestions and requests from Faculty Caucus

A. Editorial items

Dean reviewed editorial changes suggested by Faculty Caucus members documented in *Status of ASPT Document Changes as of November 13, 2015* (see attached).

[Notes: Item numbers referenced in III.A and III.B of these minutes refer to the item numbers referenced in the attached status report. ASPT document section numbers referred to in these minutes are numbers in the current ASPT document rather than the ASPT document proposed by URC.]

Item 15

Horvath asked how it is possible for there to be a March 1 deadline associated with formal meetings with a CFSC but a March 8 deadline associated with formal meetings with a DFSC/SFSC. Catanzaro explained that the March 1 deadline is related to promotion and tenure recommendations and the March 8 deadline is related to cumulative post-tenure reviews and/or remediation plans. Regarding the suggestion by the Faculty Caucus ("Caucus") that the order of XIII.B.3.c and XIII.B.3.d be reversed, Catanzaro said that both the order recommended by URC and the order suggested by the Caucus members are acceptable to him. He noted that because XIII.B.3 is intended to set forth a schedule for formal meetings, the Caucus suggestion makes sense.

Item 19

Bonnell noted that in other parts of the ASPT document references to CFSC/DFSC/SFSC appear as "DFSC/SFSC or CFSC" rather than "CFSC or

DFSC/SFSC.” Dean cited an example in XII.D.5. Catanzaro said that the syntax discovered by Bonnell seems to be the more common style throughout the document. Horvath suggested performing a global edit and changing all references to “DFSC/SFSC or CSFC” for consistency. Catanzaro asked if the document would be easier to read if references to “DFSC/SFSC or CFSC” were replaced with “full committee.” Consensus of committee members was to retain the reference as “DFSC/SFSC or CFSC.”

Horvath pointed out references in XIII.E to “Dean/Chair/Director.” He suggested separating “Dean” from Chair/Director” in such references. Goodman asked if the syntax used in XIII.E.4 (“Dean or Chair/Director”) is what Horvath suggests. Dean said that it is.

Item 22

Horvath asked why Caucus members want to reverse the order of XIII.E.2 and XIII.E.3. Horvath opined that the more useful action for a faculty member to take prior to appealing a Dean or Chair/Director report would be to meet with the entire CFSC or DFSC/SFSC rather than with just one person. Catanzaro responded that the Faculty Caucus members raising the issue want the action in the better interest of the faculty member listed first. Catanzaro added that he agrees with Horvath that the order should remain unchanged. Horvath pointed out that if the order of XIII.E.2 and XIII.E.3 were to change, the introductory clause “As an alternative ...” in XIII.E.3 would have to be deleted.

Bonnell said she had been thinking whether a faculty member is permitted to do both XIII.E.2 and XIII.E.3 (i.e., meet with the full committee and meet with the Dean or Chair/Director one-on-one). Catanzaro explained that having both meetings was never the intent of URC. Goodman agreed.

Committee members discussed whether the chances of a faculty member changing a negative minority report were better if the faculty member were to meet with the full CFSC or DFSC/SFSC or if the faculty member were to meet one-on-one with the Dean or Chair/Director. Catanzaro said that whatever is decided regarding the order of the two passages, the faculty member has a choice. Goodman asked if any data exists regarding outcomes by type of meeting (full committee or one-on-one). Catanzaro replied that he is aware of only one instance of a one-on-one meeting. Catanzaro suggested preserving the order of the passages in XIII.E (i.e., in the order that had been recommended by URC). Dean and Boser agreed. Goodman said that the order is important, as it suggests that the first approach listed is the recommended approach.

Horvath moved that all editorial changes suggested by Caucus members, except items 19 and 22, be accepted by URC (i.e., accepting items 7, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 24, and 26). Boser seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Boser moved that the change described in Item 19 (to separate “CFSC” and “DFSC/SFSC” in the reference to “CFSC/DFSC/SFSC”) be approved but that the syntax used throughout the ASPT document read “DFSC/SFSC or CFSC” rather than “CFSC or DFSC/SFSC” as had been suggested by Caucus members. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Horvath moved not to accept the suggestion described in Item 22 (to reverse the order of XIII.E.2 and XIII.E.3). Goodman seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Boser asked that URC representatives working directly with the Caucus provide the rationale for the committee decision regarding Item 22.

B. Substantive items

Item 1

Sheryl Jenkins reported that she has spoken with Mennonite College of Nursing (“Mennonite”) tenure track faculty members. They have asked to communicate their preferences regarding “Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty” and related passages of the ASPT document through Jenkins rather than in person at a URC meeting. Jenkins explained that she has drafted proposed changes and has asked Mennonite tenure track faculty members to submit any feedback to her by 9 a.m., November 17 (2015).

Based on feedback she has received from Mennonite faculty, Jenkins recommended deleting “Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty” on page 5 of the current ASPT document. Jenkins further recommended deleting IV.A.3 (on page 12 of the current document), because Mennonite now has “an appropriate number of tenured faculty members” (quotation from IV.A.3). Jenkins further recommended adding the following sentence to V.A.1 (at the bottom of page 17 of the current document): “For MCN, the dean’s designee (who must be tenured) will serve as chair of the DFSC.” Jenkins added that the recommended changes are intended to reflect what is happening with regard to the number of faculty members in Mennonite and with regard to membership of ASPT committees in the college.

Catanzaro expressed concern that there might be a need to retain IV.A.3 to provide guidance to a college other than Mennonite. He suggested retaining IV.A.3 but changing the first sentence from “The following stipulations shall apply to the Mennonite College of Nursing until it has an appropriate number of tenured faculty members” to “The following stipulations shall apply to any college until it has an appropriate number of tenured faculty members.” Jenkins said that Mennonite would not object to retaining IV.A.3 if it were a global policy as Catanzaro has suggested.

Bonnell noted that Milner Library (“Milner”) could be subject to IV.A.3 if it is modified to apply to all colleges, but Milner faculty might not want that. She noted that having a sufficient number of tenured faculty members has been a concern at Milner, because Milner has not been allocated new tenure lines. Boser asked about the number of tenure lines and departments at Milner. Bonnell said that Milner has about 15 tenure-line faculty members and, according to the ASPT document, has zero departments.

Horvath noted that if IV.A.3 is deleted, Mennonite would have to follow the same rules set forth elsewhere in the ASPT document applicable to other colleges. He asked Jenkins if that would be acceptable to Mennonite. Jenkins responded that it would.

Horvath suggested either recrafting IV.A.3 to cover exigent circumstances or deleting it. Recrafting the section would take time, he noted. Catanzaro pointed out that IV.A.2

is related to Milner Library. Perhaps a revised IV.A.3 could apply only to any new college, leaving IV.A.2 to guide Milner Library CFSC membership, he said.

Catanzaro then noted that creating a new college would be a long process that would likely include discussions regarding application of ASPT policies to the new college. Perhaps it would be better to just delete IV.A.3 at this time. Jenkins agreed, suggesting that the ASPT document be kept as concise and as helpful as possible. Dean pointed out that if a revised IV.A.3 were to refer to a new college, it would be the only such reference in the ASPT document.

Jenkins moved to strike “Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty” on page 5 of the current ASPT document. Boser seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Jenkins moved to remove IV.A.3 on page 12 of the current ASPT document. Bonnell seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Jenkins moved to add the following sentence to the end of V.A.1 on page 17 of the current ASPT document: “For MCN, the dean’s designee (who must be tenured) will serve as chair of the DFSC.” Horvath seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Horvath asked that when reporting URC recommendations regarding Item 1 to the Caucus, URC representatives explain that other provisions of the ASPT document would now apply to Mennonite since the college has enough faculty members to comply with those provisions.

Item 6

Dean explained that one reason Caucus members suggested removing or modifying the parenthetical clause in X.D. is concern that the clause may be interpreted to obligate a department to provide resources when the department may not have funds to do so. Catanzaro added that some Caucus members expressed concern that the parenthetical clause may imply that faculty members who have not been determined to have deficiencies are not eligible for those resources when they should be. He added that some other Caucus members expressed satisfaction with that interpretation, expressing the opinion that only faculty members who have been determined to have deficiencies should have access to such resources.

Catanzaro said he supports X.D. with the wording changes URC has previously recommended. Bonnell agreed, noting that information in the parenthetical clause is not new and that processes now in place work. Dean concurred.

Goodman suggested that “e.g.” at the beginning of the parenthetical clause does not mean that the examples cited in the clause are the only resources that could be made available to a faculty member. Horvath pointed out that some faculty members reading the passage might interpret the clause as suggesting that it does.

Discussion ensued regarding deleting the parenthetical clause. Horvath said he prefers retaining the clause. He expressed the opinion that the list of resources in parentheses may indeed suggest that a college should offer those sorts of resources to a faculty

member and may help a faculty member understand the types of resources that could be provided to help the faculty member remedy deficiencies. Catanzaro agreed, adding that retaining the list of resources may signal what it might cost a unit to remediate deficiencies. Dean concurred with retaining the list, saying it would be beneficial for both the faculty member and the department.

Goodman moved, Jenkins seconded to retain X.D as it had previously been recommended to the Caucus by URC. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Dean asked if the URC representatives attending the next Caucus meeting (scheduled for November 18, 2015) should be prepared to report actions taken by URC at this meeting. Bruce Stoffel reported that Houston has asked Caucus Chairperson Susan Kalter when and how she wants URC to report its recommendations. Kalter has asked that URC report its response to each Caucus suggestion during the subsequent Caucus discussion of the affected section. Each section of the ASPT document is scheduled for Caucus discussion at least twice. Second discussions of ASPT document sections will occur no earlier than December 2 (2015).

IV. Other business

Dean reminded committee members that URC is scheduled to meet next on December 1, 2015.

V. Adjournment

Horvath moved, Rubin seconded that the meeting adjourn. The motion was approved on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rick Boser, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachment: *Status of ASPT Document Changes as of November 13, 2015*

STATUS OF ASPT DOCUMENT CHANGES

As of November 13, 2015

SUGGESTIONS AND REQUESTS BY FACULTY CAUCUS

Green denotes a substantive item

Blue denotes an editorial item

Gray denotes an item that has been decided by URC

- 1** **Reference:** Overview, Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty (p. 5)
Date of suggestion/request: October 7, 2015
Suggestion/request: Revise to reflect current practice
Date(s) of URC review: October 20, 2015; November 3, 2015
URC action: Initially URC decided to refer the issue to Mennonite College of Nursing for a recommendation back to URC; at its November 3, 2015 meeting, URC decided to invite members of the Mennonite DFSC and CFSC to the December 1, 2015 URC to discuss this matter
Status: Prior to Houston sending a letter of invitation to Mennonite DFSC and CFSC members, Jenkins contacted Mennonite tenure track faculty members to solicit their input regarding their preferences for revisions to this passage. Jenkins will report her findings at the November 17, 2015 URC meeting.
- 2** **Reference:** I.E (p. 8)
Date of suggestion/request: October 7, 2015
Suggestion/request: Consider replacing “obtain” with “consider”
Date(s) of URC review: October 20, 2015
URC action: URC approved a motion to replace the word “obtain” with the word “consider”
Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus
Note: Revised passage reads “All committees and officials within the faculty status system process will make every possible effort to consider the most reliable evidence available for use in their deliberations.”

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank]

3 Reference: V.B.1 (p. 19)

Date of suggestion/request: October 7, 2015

Suggestion/request: Consider requiring department/school review of department/school ASPT documents at least every five years rather than at least every three years.

Date(s) of URC review: October 20, 2015; November 3, 2015

URC action: URC is considering retaining the requirement for review at least every three years while clarifying that departments/schools need not revise their ASPT documents unless deemed necessary by department/school faculty. URC is also considering asking DFSCs/SFSCs to report annually to their college office and CFSC regarding the status of their ASPT policies and any changes made to them during the previous year, adding that provision as a new Article V.D.3. Catanzaro offered to draft a revision for review by URC at its November 17, 2015 meeting.

Status: Revision drafted by Catanzaro, with track changes:

V.B.1

Following appropriate faculty input, each DFSC/SFSC shall develop Department/School policies and procedures for appointment, reappointment, performance evaluation, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews. These policies and procedures shall be approved by the majority vote of the eligible Department/School faculty prior to January 1 of the year in which the policies and procedures take effect. Department/School ASPT policies and procedures shall be reviewed at least every three years. Any changes resulting from such reviews will be subject to vote of the eligible Department/School faculty, with approval requiring a majority of those voting. If no changes are made, no vote is necessary. ~~and approved by the majority vote of the eligible Department/School faculty.~~ Copies of these policies and procedures shall be distributed to each Department/School faculty member. These policies and procedures are left to the discretion of each Department/School but they shall be submitted to the appropriate CFSC, which will approve them for conformity to College standards and University policies and procedures (see IV.B.1). The DFSC/SFSC shall report annually to the CFSC whether they reviewed their Department/School policies (See V.D.3)

V.D.3 (new)

The DFSC/SFSC shall report annually to the CFSC whether they reviewed their Department/School policies. Any changes must be approved by the CFSC (see IV.B.1 and V.B.1).

4 Reference: VIII (p. 28)
Date of suggestion/request: October 21, 2015
Suggestion/request: Consider inserting a new Article VIII.C based on IV.C.2: “In all situations involving a positive DFSC/SFSC recommendation for promotion, the CFSC shall review the promotion application of the individual involved and either endorse the DFSC/SFSC’s recommendation or reach an alternate recommendation. A faculty member may withdraw an application for promotion at any time during the review process prior to review by the President. Negative DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion shall not be forwarded beyond the Department/School to the CFSC unless the faculty member requests, in writing, to the Department/School Chairperson/Director, additional review.” See also new Article XVI (current Article XIII) for possible addition of the same passage as new B.1.B or D.1.B.
Date(s) of URC review: November 3, 2015
URC action: URC approved a motion to add the following as new Article VIII.C (with existing Article VIII.C renumbered Article VIII.D, existing Article VIII.D renumbered Article VIII.E, and so on):
“In all situations involving a positive DFSC/SFSC recommendation for promotion, the CFSC shall review the promotion application of the individual involved and either endorse the DFSC/SFSC’s recommendation or reach an alternate recommendation. A faculty member may withdraw an application for promotion at any time during the review process prior to review by the President. Negative DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion shall not be forwarded beyond the Department/School to the CFSC unless the faculty member requests, in writing, to the Department/School Chairperson/Director, additional review. See also Article IV.C.2.”
Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

5 Reference: IX.B.2 (p. 32)
Date of suggestion/request: October 21, 2015
Suggestion/request: Consider adding the following passage from Article IX.B.3 to Article IX.B.2: “A stop-the-clock period will not count toward tenure or against the length of the probationary period.”
Date(s) of URC review: November 3, 2015
URC action: URC approved a motion not to add said sentence from Article IX.B.3 to Article IX.B.2, because those two articles address different issues.
Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

6 Reference: X.D (p. 40)
Date of suggestion/request: October 21, 2015
Suggestion/request: Reconsider the parenthetical passage. Consider removing it. Consider keeping it. Consider keeping it but adding qualifying language to the effect that a department might not be able to provide resources, that resources are available to other faculty members (e.g., faculty members who have not been deemed deficient), and that other types of support are potentially available to assist the faculty member (i.e., types of support not already listed in the parentheses)
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes: The passage as initially recommended by URC reads as follows: “Plans for remediation of deficiencies, especially plans whose implementation will require commitment of department/school resources (e.g., for travel to conferences, for new teaching equipment or materials, or for release or reassigned time or other workload changes), shall be written and shall be communicated to and signed by the relevant parties, including the dean.”

7 **Reference:** XII.A.4 (p. 56)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Change “the Academic Senate” to “the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate.”
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

8 **Reference:** XII.A.5 (p. 56)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Consider defining salary increments by percentages rather than by dollar amounts.
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

9 **Reference:** XII.B.2 (p. 57) and throughout the document
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Should the term “student reactions” still be used, or should the phrase be replaced with “student evaluations” or some other term? Consider AAUP guidance. Look to recent research regarding use of student evaluations in evaluating a faculty member’s teaching. Consider adding a requirement that multiple methods of teaching evaluation be weighed equally.
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

10 **Reference:** XII.B.5 (p. 58)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Consider including in the written notification to the faculty member recommended (but not required) suggestions for addressing weaknesses. “This letter shall provide an assessment of the faculty member’s strengths and suggestions toward addressing weaknesses and ...”
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

11 **Reference:** XII.B (p. 58)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Remove extraneous period after XII.B.9.
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

12 Reference: XIII (p. 59) and throughout the document
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Should we stipulate in our policies that letters of decision by an ASPT body must include directions to the faculty member for appeal, or do we not add that to our policies (but continue to recommend that bodies do so as best practice).
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

13 Reference: XIII.A (p. 59)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Consider wording and sentence order of the first paragraph. Maybe change “An informal resolution may be effected ...” to “An informal resolution may also be effected ...” Maybe move the sentence beginning “An information resolution ...” to the end of the paragraph. Maybe both.
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

14 Reference: XIII.A (p. 59)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Replace “except as noted” with reference to Appendices 1 and 8.
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

15 Reference: XIII.B.3 (p. 60)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Consider flipping c and d (so the deadlines set forth in a-d are in chronological order).
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

16 Reference: XIII.B.3.c (p. 60)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Add a comma after “and/or plan” and the word “to” before “communicate.” “Formal meetings to discuss cumulative post-tenure reviews and/or remediation plans with the DFSC/SFSC must be scheduled to allow the DFSC/SFSC sufficient time to finalize its review and/or plan, and to communicate it to the faculty member and the appropriate Dean by the March 8 deadline.”
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

17 Reference: XIII.B.3.d (p. 60)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Change “CFSC/SFSC” to “CFSC.”
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

18 Reference: XIII.D.2 (p. 61)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Clarify whether bodies can disallow all witnesses (i.e., allow no witnesses). Clarify whether new information may be brought forth or if the hearing is restricted to discussing evidence that may have been ignored or misinterpreted. Clarify the word “perspective.”
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

19 Reference: XIII.E (pp. 61-62)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Change “CFSC/DFSC/SFSC” to “CFSC or DFSC/SFSC.”
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

20 Reference: XIII.E (p. 61)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Rewrite the heading to “make it more accessible.” Change “making” to “which made.”
Reword the clause “to an appeal of a dean or chair/director report ...”
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes: Two options are proposed.

Option 1:

E. Procedures for Meetings with Dean or Chair/Director Preliminary to an Appeal of a Dean or Chair/Director Report ~~Making~~ which made a Negative Tenure or Promotion Recommendation

Option 2:

E. Meeting Procedures Prior to Appealing a Negative Tenure or Promotion Recommendation Submitted by a Dean, Chair/Director

21 Reference: XIII.E.1 (pp. 61-62)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Rewrite this passage to clarify that the rationale for the negative recommendation is to be given to the faculty member (e.g., “The faculty member should be informed ...”). Add the word “may” before “have been ignored or misinterpreted.” Use active voice. For example, “The official who issues the report should deliver the recommendation so the faculty member is made aware of the rationale ...”
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes: Revision drafted by Catanzaro, with track changes.

1. The faculty member should ~~know~~ be informed of the rationale for the negative recommendation to be able to address the concerns raised in that recommendation and speak to factors or materials that have been ignored or misinterpreted. (See IV.C.4 and V.C.4).

22 Article/Section/Passage/Page: XIII.E.1 through XIII.E.6 (pp. 61-63)
Date of Faculty Caucus suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Faculty Caucus suggestion/request: Consider rearranging the items in XIII.E to help faculty members understand their options and to help them be strategic. Consider flipping XIII.E.2 and XIII.E.3.
Date(s) of additional URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

23 Reference: XIII.E.3 (p. 62)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Should the phrase “at the discretion of the dean/chair/director” be changed to “at the discretion of the committee”?
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

24 Reference: XIII.E.4 (p. 62)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Add “to be” before the word “available” on line 2.
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

25 Reference: XIII.K.4 (p. 70)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Rethink the five-day deadline for a faculty member to file a complaint with AFEGC. Is that time too short from the perspective of the faculty member? If URC decides to recommend a longer period, the period should not be too long so as to needlessly lengthen the entire process.
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

26 Reference: XIII.K.5 (p. 70)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Remove the word "its" on the last line.
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

ASPT DOCUMENT CHANGES APPROVED BY FACULTY CAUCUS

None