

APPROVED

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2021  
11:00 AM ZOOM

Members Present: Roberta Trites (non-voting); Chad Buckley, Miranda Lin, Kevin Edwards, Bo Park, O. Erin Reitz, Melissa Oresky, Joyce Walker

Absent: Frank Beck

#### Minutes

Chad Buckley called the meeting to order at 11:04 a.m.

The minutes from September 9<sup>th</sup> meeting were presented, correction made to member Erin Reitz's name. Motion to approve the revised minutes was made by Miranda Lin and seconded by Melissa Oresky. Vote: Yea 7, Nay 0, Abstain 0. Motion carries.

Motion to approve the minutes of September 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting was made by Erin Reitz and seconded by Miranda Lin. Vote: Yea 7, Nay 0, Abstain 0. Motion carries.

The group began the meeting picking up with the AY20-21 subgroup revisions. Revisions continued with the AFEGC section from subgroup 2. The majority of the revisions were pretty straight forward and primarily clarifying language.

Subgroup 3 had been reviewing the appeals, general process section. Changes were also clarifying language. Discussion regarding the appeals process and whether verbal or email notification of appeal should be considered. Clarified the language of requesting a formal meetings and appeals.

Also reviewed the tables that will be added to clarify/summarize the timelines for promotion and tenure appeals process. But have decided that these tables are not necessary. Information is contained in Appendix 1 and therefore this group feels it unnecessary to add the tables and could create problems with future updates and making sure all updates are made throughout. Will add refer to Appendix 1 where needed.

This wraps the 2020-2021 revisions that have been reviewed.

Moving on to the Promotion Statement when it was discussed between quantitative/qualitative data in p.24 VIII.A... adding the comment submitted by Kevin to this just clarifies better and helps with those that don't use quantitative/qualitative data in evaluation practice because of the nature of the work.

– Oresky and Reitz had to leave.

Moving to the proposal ASPT clarification on persons hired with tenure. This has not been common practice previously, but will make hiring competitively in fields easier. Will accept recommendations for language to this section. DFSC/SFSC's should be weighing in on 'tenurability' of candidates for hires during the hiring process.

APPROVED

12:18 called for a break, reconvened at 12:25.

Resuming work on reviewing the ASPT Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching.

Buckley will watermark all items discussed thus far with respect to Appendix A – the Teaching and submit to the Academic Senate chair. If as many as possible if you can attend the faculty caucus next week that would be great. Buckley will be presenting, Trites will be there but the Senate office would prefer to hear from faculty. Next Wed. the 13<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 in the Old Main room.

Meeting adjourned at 1:50 pm.