

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Wednesday, April 8, 2020

1 PM, Zoom teleconference

Minutes

Members present: Chad Buckley, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Kevin Edwards, Rachel Shively, Diane Dean, Melissa Oresky, Frank Beck, Yoon Jin Ma, Joe Goodman

Absent: Nancy Novotny

1. Call to Order

Chairperson Shively called the meeting to order (via Zoom teleconferencing) at 1:03

2. Approval of minutes from March 24, 2020 meeting

The previously distributed minutes were considered. Catanzaro requested a small revision to change “particular” to “exceptional.” Dean moved to approve minutes. XX?? seconded the motion. The motion passed with eight ayes.

3. Updates (e.g., ASPT interpretations in light of coronavirus; equity review)

- **Equity review** - *Catanzaro* hasn't heard anything since our last meeting. Brief review of discussion last time - he had sent PRPA a memo laying out some proposed approaches. Had a meeting with them. *Catanzaro* updated that memo, and as of this morning asked if they have any feedback. So, we are waiting on them. *Catanzaro* anticipates that once it is determined what PRPA can or can't do, then the memo will send out the particular request. *Shively* - What are some of the huddles? *Catanzaro* - base salary as a starting place - it turns out that for a small percentage of the faculty these data don't exist anymore (e.g., salaries prior to 1990). Years since tenure - not consistently coded or available in the dataset in place today (lost in transition from mainframe to iPeople system). Plan is to identify bands of residuals and identify faculty within those bands. This can be used to compare with performance and identify discrepancies. Then this can be used by OEOA. *Shively* asks, at what point would URC get this data? *Catanzaro* - we would get the reports from OEOA. Could also get the reports that are generated by the CFSCs. (may need both to provide complete context). *Beck* asks - given that some of us on the committee with specific knowledge of analyses, will we get the underlying statistical model - *Catanzaro* - yes, at least a description of the analyses (but not necessarily the formulae). This committee has responsibility for the oversight of the process. So, it is consistent with that that we have a full picture of the whole thing.
- **ASPT interpretations in light of coronavirus** – At the last meeting we looked at memo, gave feedback, edited memo and URC voted to approve it. Senator Kalter was sent a copy of the memo and wants the Faculty Caucus to review the memo and provide input. What is the status of the memo? *Catanzaro* - Executive faculty caucus discussed this a little over a week ago. They generated a list of questions. Some of those questions may have been answered had we attended a meeting, but overall there were enough questions that it is now going to be discussed at caucus this evening. *Catanzaro* generated a response to the list of questions and distributed it the senators in advance of tonight's meeting. The process is that URC proposes ASPT policy and then Senate faculty caucus discuss/edit/and vote for the policy. *Catanzaro's* preference in this case is that there is enough flexibility and transparency with the current policy and the interpretations of that policy in the memo, that the policy approval process can be expedited under the current context. *Catanzaro* gave a brief review of the major issues that will be discussed. Some of the issues are about teasing apart what is overarching policy versus local governance. One example is an idea to accept rolling tenure submissions this year, off the defined schedule. *Catanzaro* weighed this against the concern that it would generate confusion about downstream processing of tenure packages, and the required solutions would consume valuable time when there are more pressing issues to deal with. For student responses to teaching, any changes to their handling is a dept. or college-level issue; University ASPT only requires that some are collected each year, so the units have flexibility in designing and collecting them. *Goodman* - speaking from his department, he has not seen a raise threshold change over last 12 years. *Dean* - I think that the conversation is important, but there are issues here that go beyond the current scope/context. The COVID context will have implications for future evaluations as well. How we will handle

the long-term effects of faculty's research infrastructure being disrupted, to different extents for different people (e.g., stopping research now will have implications potentially for several years down the road). *Catanzaro* - agrees, overall productivity may be suppressed, but there should still be variability that can be used to make differentiations. These relative differences in performance will still appear, as they would without the COVID disruption. That is part of this conversation, but more work/thought need be put into how to deal with impacts of the current context. It is a complicated issue, and we don't know how much of an issue it will be (e.g., don't know what percentage of the faculty will opt to stop the clock. 10% vs. 90% lead to different solutions.). *Goodman* - do we anticipate a lot of ABD incoming faculty. *Catanzaro* - most of the folks who we have hired either have their doctorates or were scheduled to be complete by the time they get here. The question is relevant because ABD hires need to complete their doctor by May 15 of their first year. There are exceptions/extensions and this context would qualify for this. *Shively* - follow-up on ripple effects that persist for longer times. Is the senate talking about a temporary change? The memo that we proposed was one of interpretation rather than actual policy change. *Catanzaro* - he doesn't know how they are approaching this. The ASPT process is fairly decentralized, different units do things differently. That's why the memo that we passed had language like "may" and "encouraged." *Catanzaro* describes hypothetical situations of different tenure cases that could have different reasons to stop the clock. That's why he prefers to have case-by-case rather than an across the board decision about stop the clock (and other decisions). *Oresky* - Is there a way that we can do more than "encourage" that particular things are measured/determined. *Catanzaro* - practice is that the chair/director is advocating/suggests for the faculty member to stop the clock (or other similar actions) as support for the faculty member. That said, across the university different units have different levels of experience with these sorts of actions. These kinds of practices are routinely covered in our ASPT workshops that we hold each year. *Oresky*: Work in the arts is strongly affected by COVID effects on art production, sales, exhibitions, etc. *Edwards* - On the student evals, what if different units make very different changes to their student ' responses to teaching' plans; should we give recommendations to keep them consistent? Can we give guidelines along these lines? *Catanzaro* the colleges tend to take the lead in this role. His understanding is that the College Councils review the student questionnaire/reactions. So, there is a level of oversight. The ASPT process just says that they need to be systematically collected but doesn't outline how they are used. DFSC/SFSC do need some sort of standardized process to make evaluations. Regarding tenure timing: Negative effects on research productivity can be expected to be very diverse and long term, and this should be considered when assessing tenure and promotion decisions and timing. However, delaying tenure should not be automatic; for example previous issues with productivity, on their own, do not qualify for the COVID-specific delay.

- *Catanzaro* - if you have further questions/thoughts please feel free to send those to *Catanzaro* (the meeting starts, he thinks, at 8:30 or so).

4. ASPT subgroup report back and discussion of time line (brief updates) - *Shively* points out that we have 2 more scheduled meetings and thinks that we should be able to dedicate longer discussions to these.

- Subgroup 1 (*Shively*, *Edwards*, *Ma*): were already address most of their items already (see meeting discussion from Feb 24). The group still needs to consult affected faculty regarding the proposal for Program-specific FSC committees.
- Subgroup 2 (*Buckley*, *Novotny*, *Oresky*): *Oresky* - have some pieces finished, or are very close. Some questions remain. *Buckley* - there are a number of things that we do have questions about. *Oresky* will share that document on Teams.
- Subgroup 3 (*Beck*, *Dean*, *Goodman*): see email that *Goodman* sent just prior to the meeting. Insert into Section XII.A.6

6. Salary Enhancement: Faculty with the rank of Professor are eligible for a salary enhancement review. The faculty member is eligible for up to a 10% salary enhancement in addition to standard merit increases. Faculty

may submit a condensed evaluation dossier in five (5) year increments following the promotion to Professor. Each evaluative dossier will include the following:

- a. A personal statement for consideration;
- b. A letter from the DFSC/SFSC noting the previous five (5) evaluation ratings; and
- c. An annotated curriculum vita for the five (5) year evaluation period.

The Provost shall review submissions in a timely manner and make recommendations to the President.

Beck - still have 2 things to work out. *Dean* is working on appeals - looking at some standardization of some of the appeals processes. Will combine two documents and "clean them up." will get those to *Shivley* before the next meeting.

5. Adjournment

Move to adjourn - *Oresky* moves that the meeting adjourn. *Beck* second the motion. Meeting adjourned at 1:53.

Other: *Dean* wanted to give a shout out to the graduate school. They were ahead of the game and things are going well.