

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 16, 2020
10:00 AM, Zoom teleconference

Minutes

Members present: Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Kevin Edwards, Rachel Shively, Marylyn Prasun, Melissa Oresky, Frank Beck, Miranda Lin, Borinara Park, Chad Buckley

- Call to Order
 - Buckley convened the meeting at 10:06 A.M.
- Review and approval of minutes of 9-2-20 meeting
 - Prasun moves to approve, Beck seconds, yes - 7, no - 0, abstain - 0.
- COVID considerations for promotion and tenure—Review of memo drafted by Catanzaro
 - Catanzaro presented a summary of the contents of the drafted memo and the rationale behind the language and content. Some issues with the memo were recently discussed with General Counsel.
 - The committee had several recommendations for revisions to the memo with respect to clarity and strength of the recommendations.
 - Edwards: Would missing an established quantitative metric for tenure be allowable under this memo? The word 'should' still allows either interpretation, in the sentence "ASPT committees should recognize and reward the full range of faculty productivity". Shively had similar concerns.
 - Catanzaro: use of quantitative metrics is primarily decided at the Dept/School level.
 - Buckley suggested to emphasize the concept of flexibility on the part of an FSC in evaluating productivity.
 - There was discussion about revising the language to accommodate faculty who may not have experienced negative impacts on their productivity.
 - Oresky expressed some concern with the use of the term “requirement” with respect to faculty providing a COVID impact statement.
 - Edwards had a question about the timeline discussed in the memo. Some departments may have established earlier timelines. Would this timeline overrule those?
 - Catanzaro: Note that no ASPT document revision can alter 2020 submissions for tenure, due this fall.
 - Beck asked about the how the memo will be presented to the senate. Will that body be asked to comment for revisions? Catanzaro replied that this memo was developed with input that was forwarded from the senators, so he hopes that it will not need to go through an additional round of revisions.
 - The group discussed whether to vote now or following a period during which the members could further review the draft. It was decided that Catanzaro would make a few additional edits and post the draft on the Teams site for review. The members would vote by 9AM on the morning of Sept. 17, 2020. Update: the memo was endorsed unanimously (8-yes votes).
- Non-policy complaint D/SFSC elections – this item was tabled until the next meeting because there was not enough time left to discuss it at this meeting.
- Meeting schedule – it was agreed that the group would meet every other Wednesday during the Fall schedule from 10-11:30.
- Adjournment
 - Oresky moved that the meeting be adjourned. Beck seconded. A.M. Motion passed with 8 voting in favor. Meeting adjourned at 11:32