

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, December 1, 2015  
11 a.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Rick Boser, Diane Dean, Christopher Horvath, Doris Houston, Sheryl Jenkins, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting)

Members not present: Joe Goodman, David Rubin

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

I. Call to order

Chairperson Doris Houston called the meeting to order at 11:02 a.m.

II. Approval of minutes from the November 17, 2015 meeting

Diane Dean moved, Angela Bonnell seconded approval of minutes from the November 17, 2015 meeting as distributed prior to the meeting. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

III. Continued discussion of ASPT suggestions and requests from Faculty Caucus

The committee continued its discussion from the last committee meeting regarding ASPT suggestions and requests from the Faculty Caucus (see the attached *Status of ASPT Document Changes as of November 19, 2015*).

Item 3 (re Article V.B.1)

Houston referred committee members to wording changes drafted by Sam Catanzaro based on discussion at the November 3, 2015 URC meeting.

Christopher Horvath asked if approving changes to a DFSC/SFSC document by vote of all eligible faculty members is consistent with procedures articulated elsewhere in the ASPT document. Catanzaro responded that it is.

Catanzaro asked if committee members had indeed decided to retain the requirement for review of department/school ASPT policies and procedures at least every three years or if the committee had decided to change the requirement to at least every five years as had been suggested by some Faculty Caucus (“Caucus”) members. Consensus of URC members present was to require the review at least once every three years. Houston explained that some Caucus members expressed concern that requiring review at least every three years would place an undue burden on faculty members. Rick Boser noted that the three-year review could occur midway between the five-year review of department/school policies and procedures necessitated by changes to the university-wide ASPT document. Houston asked about the process by which DFSCs and SFSCs will report to their CFSC regarding the status of their department/school policies and procedures. Catanzaro responded that DFSCs and SFSCs will be asked to submit a memorandum to their CFSC annually.

Horvath moved to modify the URC recommendation to the Caucus regarding Article V.B to read as follows:

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. 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 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).

Boser seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Item 8 (re Article XII.A.5)

Horvath expressed the opinion that changing how the ASPT document defines salary increments for promotion is significant. He asked why the change has been suggested. Catanzaro responded that using percentages may preserve salary differences, which, he added, may be significant for departments experiencing salary compression.

Catanzaro said he has not yet had time to fully analyze the proposal, so he does not yet know its cost implications. From the analysis he has done thus far, he has found that the increments prescribed in the current ASPT document equate to between 4 percent and 7 percent of average salary within a rank depending on the unit. He said he is willing to continue his analysis and report back to the committee.

Diane Dean said she prefers retaining the current policy of defining increments by dollar amount. She noted that it is easier to budget for raises when increments are defined by dollars rather than by percentages. She added that changing from use of dollar amounts to percentages is not the appropriate mechanism to address salary equity issues. She noted that using percentages could advantage faculty members in units with average salaries higher than other units, thus exacerbating differences in salaries across units. She said she values having all promoted faculty members treated equally by providing them the same salary increase in terms of dollar amount. Horvath noted that the salary increment may be more significant to faculty members with lower salaries than their peers. From that perspective, one might feel that providing equal dollar amounts to all faculty members might not be valuing all faculty members equally.

Houston said that having data regarding the implications of a change to using percentages could help the committee in its deliberations. She asked Catanzaro about the method he is using to analyze the potential impact of the change. Catanzaro explained that he is first determining the average faculty salary by rank by department. Then he is calculating the percentage increase to which the current increment translates. He said he has considered asking for help with the

analysis from the Office of Human Resources or the Office of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis. Houston said she likes Catanzaro's approach, adding that it would also be useful to calculate how much money would be needed for salary increases at various percentages.

Horvath said the issue is big enough to merit its consideration by other groups (in addition to URC). Administration needs to look at budget implications of the proposed change, he added, including the consequences such a change may have 20 years from now. Catanzaro agreed, noting that the Caucus could ask administration to investigate the matter.

Dean suggested considering changes in the dollar amount of raises in addition to considering a change from defining raises by dollar amount to defining them by percentage. Boser agreed, noting that the promotion raises of \$3,000 and \$5,000 have been the same since at least 1991, at least in his memory, and, in the interest of faculty retention, should probably be revisited. Dean asked if the increments set forth in Article VII.A.5 are minimum amounts that may be adjusted upward on an individual basis or whether the amounts are granted equally to all eligible faculty members. Catanzaro said the practice has been to apply the increment equally to all eligible faculty members.

Horvath said that he prefers to send this matter back to the Caucus with the suggestion that the Caucus ask the administration to analyze the proposal. Horvath said another option might be for central administration and the Academic Senate to advise URC what funds will be available for promotions and then have URC consider methods of distributing them. Discussion ensued whether URC should ask the Caucus to discuss this matter or to discuss this matter and analyze its implications. Houston said she prefers referring the matter to the Caucus for further discussion and analysis, because she believes the proposal is worthy of analysis by other groups in addition to URC.

Catanzaro expressed his opinion that more time may be needed for discussion and analysis of a change of this significance. He suggested that the Caucus might consider a mid-cycle revision of the ASPT document after more information is available. Dean asked if having the Caucus discuss the proposal now might delay the ASPT document revision process. Catanzaro said it might.

Horvath moved, Jenkins seconded that the question whether Article XII.A.5 should be modified to define raises by percentages rather than by dollar amounts be referred back to the Caucus for discussion and analysis. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

#### Item 9 (re Article XII.B.2)

Catanzaro reported having consulted the archive of ASPT documents in the Provost's office regarding use of the phrase "student reactions" when referring to student feedback regarding teaching performance. According to Catanzaro, the phrase "student input about the quality of teaching" was used in the 1979 ASPT document but the phrase was changed to "student reactions to teaching performance" in the 1980 ASPT document. The latter phrase has been used ever since, he said. Catanzaro opined that the change may reflect the perspective that students do not "evaluate" teaching rather they provide feedback regarding teaching performance. He suggested retaining the phrase "student reactions" because that phrase gives departments and schools latitude to decide what methods of obtaining student feedback make the most sense in their respective disciplines. Catanzaro noted that some departments use quantitative measures but some do not.

Houston said she likes the idea of equally weighing feedback gathered using different methods. Horvath noted that his department is considering a proposal to do so. Catanzaro expressed concern about weighing feedback equally when the number and extent of methods used to gather feedback may vary from one faculty member to another. Horvath agreed, suggesting that care needs to be exercised by DFSC members when weighing methods. Boser noted that his department requires at least one method of evaluating teaching performance other than student perceptions but then defers to the DFSC to weigh feedback as it deems appropriate. That works for his department, he added. Houston suggested checking whether the American Association of University Professors (“AAUP”) publishes best practices for teaching evaluation.

Horvath said that he usually argues that student feedback should not be used at all when evaluating faculty members, because research suggests that such feedback is not a reliable measure of teaching performance. Referring to that research, Horvath noted that faculty members who grade students lower than other faculty members tend to have less positive feedback from students regarding their teaching. Jenkins agreed, adding that if a student is not motivated to learn the course content, the student’s feedback regarding the course is less likely to be positive. Horvath noted research suggesting that, in general, female faculty members receive lower ratings from students than male faculty members. Houston said the same is true for minority faculty members. She suggested that student competency should instead be considered when evaluating faculty members. Jenkins agreed, but noted that it is hard to do. Bonnell referred to an article she found regarding a 1975 AAUP statement on teaching evaluation. She noted that the article references many of the same concerns raised by her committee colleagues. Bonnell said she would circulate the article to committee members.

Catanzaro said he believes some type of student feedback regarding teaching performance is warranted, especially at state-funded institutions, but that equally weighing feedback gathered using different methods concerns him. He noted that faculty members are elected to DFSCs to use their professional judgement in such matters. He suggested using stronger language in the ASPT document to ensure that a diversity of information related to teaching be considered by DFSCs but that DFSCs be allowed to use their judgement to weigh that information. Horvath agreed, stating that if “weighed equally” is intended to mean that a DFSC cannot consider student feedback as definitive, there must be a better phrase to use.

Houston asked if a small URC subcommittee might study this matter further. Catanzaro suggested that the committee might also invite Claire Lamonica of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology to discuss the state of the art regarding evaluation of teaching performance.

Boser said he prefers to return the matter to the Caucus, as this issue, like the issue of salary increments, may require discussion that could extend beyond the deadline for getting the new edition of the ASPT document published. Horvath agreed. He added that it would be consistent with the ethos of the institution to seek student comments regarding this matter before a decision is made.

Houston said she prefers asking CTLT to inform the committee about current practices for evaluating teaching performance before deciding whether to refer the matter back to the Caucus. Horvath reiterated his belief that others groups should be involved in this discussion. He said that learning about best practices from CTLT would not change his mind about that. Bonnell asked if there is an existing university policy that provides guidance regarding faculty evaluation, including evaluation of adjuncts. Catanzaro responded that he is not aware of any such policies.

Houston suggested, and committee members agreed, to pursue a modest amount of additional information gathering regarding the issue, such as requesting a presentation or looking at other policies, before deciding what to recommend to the Caucus in this matter. Houston asked committee members to come to the next committee meeting (scheduled for December 8, 2015) ready to dialogue the pros and cons of this and other items in the status report.

IV. Action item: Approval of the ASPT calendar for 2016-2017

Because the time allotted for the meeting had already expired, Houston deferred this item until the next committee meeting. Houston asked members to review the draft 2016-2017 ASPT calendar prior to the meeting. Bonnell asked if the draft 2016-2017 ASPT calendar is substantively different than the 2015-2016 ASPT calendar. Bruce Stoffel responded that only dates have been changed not the text. Horvath asked if the draft calendar should be reviewed against proposed ASPT policies or current ASPT policies. Stoffel responded that current ASPT policies apply.

V. Adjournment

Dean moved, Jenkins seconded that the meeting adjourn. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 12:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Rick Boser, Secretary  
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachment: *Status of ASPT Document Changes as of November 19, 2015*

# STATUS OF ASPT DOCUMENT CHANGES

As of November 19, 2015

## SUGGESTIONS AND REQUESTS BY FACULTY CAUCUS

**Green denotes a substantive item**

**Gray denotes an item that has been decided by URC**

*Page numbers in the Reference field of entries in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee to the Faculty Caucus in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document (effective January 1, 2012).*

*Article numbers in the Reference field of entries in this report refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document (effective January 1, 2012) rather than to article numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee to the Faculty Caucus in August 2015.*

- 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; November 17, 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 meeting to discuss this matter; following the November 3, 2015 URC meeting, URC member Sheryl Jenkins (the Mennonite representative on URC) met with Mennonite tenure track faculty members to discuss this issue and to invite them to a URC meeting so they could provide feedback directly to URC; Mennonite tenure track faculty members decided instead to submit their suggestions to URC via Sheryl; Sheryl drafted proposed ASPT document changes related to this matter and disseminated them to Mennonite tenure track faculty members for comment prior to the November 17, 2015 URC meeting; based on comments received from Mennonite tenure track faculty members and on discussion of this issue by URC members, URC approved the following motions at its November 17, 2015 meeting:
- 1) To strike the passage titled “Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty” from page 5
  - 2) To remove IV.A.3 from page 13
  - 3) To add the following sentence at the end of V.A.1 on page 18: “For MCN, the dean’s designee (who must be tenured) will serve as chair of the DFSC.”
- Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**Notes:** The two sections suggested for deletion (motions 1 and 2 above) had been placed in the current ASPT document to address issues that arose because Mennonite did not have a sufficient number of tenure track faculty members to meet its ASPT committee obligations. Because that is no longer the situation at Mennonite and is not likely to be the situation at Mennonite in the foreseeable future, URC members concur with Mennonite tenure track faculty members that the passages should be deleted. With deletion of those passages, the composition of the Mennonite CFSC and DFSC would be governed by the same ASPT document provisions that govern the composition of the CFSC and DFSC/SFSC in other units. The suggested addition to V.A.1 is intended to address Mennonite not having a department chair who would otherwise serve as chair of the DFSC.

**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 make the suggested change.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**Notes:** The 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.”

**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).

**Notes:**

**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  
**Notes:**

**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  
**Notes:**

**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:** November 17, 2015  
**URC action:** URC approved a motion to retain X.D as URC had recommended it to Faculty Caucus, i.e., to not remove the parenthetical clause.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**Notes:** Including examples of resources that might be made available by a unit is beneficial to both the faculty member and to the unit. For the faculty member, having such a list helps the faculty member understand the types of resources that could be made available to her/him and the types of resources the faculty might request from the unit. For the unit, having such a list helps the unit understand the types of resources it should be offering to the faculty member and might help the unit project the cost of remediating a deficiency.



**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:** November 17, 2015  
**URC action:** URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**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:** November 17, 2015  
**URC action:** URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**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:** November 17, 2015  
**URC action:** URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**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:** November 17, 2015  
**URC action:** URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**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:** November 17, 2015  
**URC action:** URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**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:** November 17, 2015  
**URC action:** URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**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:** November 17, 2015  
**URC action:** URC approved a motion to replace references to “CFSC/DFSC/SFSC” in XIII.E and throughout the ASPT document with references to “DFSC/SFSC or CFSC”.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**Notes:** URC suggests that committees within the reference be ordered by administrative level, from lower to higher, and that the syntax be applied consistently throughout the ASPT document.

**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:** November 17, 2015  
**URC action:** URC approved a motion not to accept the suggestion from Faculty Caucus members.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**Notes:** URC members feel that referring first to a meeting with the full DFSC/SFSC or CFSC (XIII.E.2) is preferable because that action is more likely to result in a complete and favorable hearing from the perspective of the faculty member than would meeting one-on-one with the Chair/Director or Dean. URC members feel that the order of these two items is important, as it may suggest that the first approach listed (meeting with the full DFSC/SFSC or CFSC) is the preferred approach from the perspective of the faculty member. URC members point out that, regardless of the order of XIII.E.2 and XIII.E.3, faculty members have a choice between the two approaches.

**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:** November 17, 2015  
**URC action:** URC approved a motion to accept the suggested change.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**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:** November 17, 2015  
**URC action:** URC approved a motion to accept the suggested change.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**Notes:**

### **ASPT DOCUMENT CHANGES APPROVED BY FACULTY CAUCUS**

None