

APPROVED

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Friday, October 28, 2022

10:30 a.m.

Location: Hovey 401D

Members present: Craig Gatto (non-voting), Chad Buckley, Tom Buller, Kevin Edwards, Randall Reid, Erin Reitz, Julie Schumacher, Susan Sprecher

Absent: None

First order of business was to approve of past minutes of meetings. Copies of the May 6, 2022 minutes were distributed and reviewed. Motion to approve of these minutes was made by Chad Buckley and seconded by Kevin Edwards. The three members who had been on the URC in the spring semester voted yes to approve of the minutes. The other current members (who were not members in the spring semester) abstained. Copies of the Oct. 14, 2022 minutes were then distributed and reviewed. Motion to approve of the minutes was made by Kevin Edwards and seconded by Chad Buckley. All members (N = 7) voted yes to approve of the minutes.

The agenda distributed prior to the meeting (via email) had the following tasks:

- Review feedback from Faculty Caucus on proposed ASPT revisions
- Revisit the URC officers in light of sabbaticals
- Outline the annual tasks of URC that will be upcoming this year

We first discussed briefly the second issue. Kevin (in his role as Vice Chair) suggested that we revisit the URC officers at our next meeting and ask Miranda if she would be willing to be chair in the spring semester. In his role as Vice Chair of URC, Kevin was willing to chair the remainder of the meetings this fall semester.

Then, we turned to the first task above – to review feedback from the Faculty Caucus on the proposed ASPT revisions for Appendix 2/B (Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activities) and Appendix 2/C (Criteria for the Evaluation of Service). This discussion took most of the meeting. We went through the comments and track changes provided by Academic Senate chairperson Marth Horst and Academic Senate secretary Dimitrios Nikolaou. Craig Gatto edited the document and provided replies (to the comments). Committee members had consensus for each change made in the document, as well as when decisions were made not to make a recommended change.

Below are some of the changes made in response to comments from MH or DN (this is not an exhaustive list, but all changes and replies are noted in the track changes version that will be returned to Academic Senate):

Under Scholarship Activities:

- Based on the comment from Nikolaou, we changed “productivity” to “activities”, in the title of the appendix as well as adjusted throughout the appendices.

- Based on the comment from Nikolaou, and our own discussion of the issue, we deleted original #6 (Serving as a journal editor...) from scholarly activities. We agree that it is a service activity, although also acknowledged that there can be special circumstances in some departments where it is argued by a faculty member (and agreed upon by their D/SFSC) that their editorial work is a type of scholarship.

Under Service:

- We agreed to delete original entry 3, which is almost identical to #1.
- In response to a question about #2, we added “consulting” (to service) and “extra salary” instead of “fee,” to make it clear the type of work that should be considered outside employment and not part of the ASPT system. We wanted to distinguish that type of contractual work from when faculty members receive small fees for activities such as reviewing a book proposal.

Below are examples of changes not made (and why):

- Under scholarship, we did not add “virtual” to the entries referring to local, regional, national, and international meetings (suggested by Horst) because any conference could be virtual, in-person, or hybrid, but also be local, regional, national, or international. We discussed that the modality of the conference should not be the emphasis and that modality doesn’t preclude these designations.
- Under service, we did not combine original #7 (now #6) with original #11 (now #10), as questioned by Nikolaou, because they refer to different activities. Program chair is for the entire conference whereas chairing a session (in a conference) is a much more modest task.
- In service, we retained the last two items (that have emphasis on facilitating change to community organizations or institutions and making substantive contributions to public policy) as we were encouraged to have items that refer to civic engagement issues for our Carnegie designation.

We made a few additional changes (not necessarily prompted by a comment) including:

- Under Criteria for Scholarship, #1, we added a **book review**.
- Under Criteria for Service, #1, we added international: Holding office or completing a major assignment with a regional, national, or **international** professional organization.
- Under Criteria for Service, #4. We added “or professional”: Responsibility for planning workshops, seminars, or conferences for department/school, college, University, or **professional** groups.
- Under Criteria for Service, #7 we added “or another instrumental role” (in acknowledgement that there can be other major roles organizing conferences, including local arrangements chair): "Serving as program chair **or another instrumental role** for a professional state, regional, national, or international meeting or conference.”

We also discussed comments that appeared at the end of the document by Senator Bonnell. We were told that because they were suggested late in the process that we did not need to make changes in the current draft but could consider them in future revisions. For the record (and for the future), these comments are:

Faculty are encouraged, when possible, to make their scholarship available openly in digital format, online, and free-of-charge to readers. They may seek publishing venues with open policies (Platinum, Gold, or Green Open Access), are encouraged to deposit their work in an appropriate institutional or disciplinary repository, and apply a Creative Commons license to their work.

Consistent with goals of College and University strategic plans, faculty should include in their documentation of scholarly and creative productivity examples of their demonstrated work towards IDEA. Such examples might include, but are not limited to,

- Grants, research, or creative activity that address issues of IDEA, such as race, gender, Indigeneity, ability, sexuality, class, language justice, age, citizenship status;*
- Research or creative activity that addresses information access disparities, educational access and achievement, political engagement, economic justice, social mobility, civil and human rights, etc.;*
- Research or creative activity that addresses questions of interest to communities historically excluded by or underserved by higher education or libraries.*
- Artistic expression and cultural production that reflects culturally diverse communities or voices not well represented in the arts and humanities.*

We discussed whether these might actually be part of mission statements.

Upon completion of the discussion of the Appendices, we discussed an email that Craig Gatto had transferred to the URC on Oct 19th, which was an issue that came up in Chair council about the new ASPT policy considering DFSC/SFSC recusal. This is the statement: *Faculty members have the right to request that a member of the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC recuse themselves if they feel that this person has an undisclosed conflict of interest that will bias that committee member's professional judgment.*

As provided by Gatto, the questions that were raised in Chair Council were:

- 1. Will there be any parameters around how many DFSC members faculty can asked to recuse themselves?*
- 2. Should the DFSC include an alternate in case a member is asked to recuse themselves?*
- 3. By what standard will we determine that the assumed undisclosed conflict of interest is relevant? Or will we have no standard?*

Two members of the URC had provided thoughts in email prior to the 10/28 meeting. In our meeting, we considered the idea there could be widespread misuse of requests for recusal, but found it unlikely because such requests will be placed under high scrutiny; therefore, we did not think we needed to further address it. We believe that the right to recusal is a good thing, but we hesitate to articulate what the criteria would be and want to keep it at the discretion of individual cases. If there were to be further specification added, it might need to be at the level of all university policies and not just at the ASPT process, as it could apply to other issues as well.

We then discussed the annual tasks for our committee. Kevin noted the following:

- We will likely be reviewing any College changes in their ASPT documents.*
- We will likely receive a report from each college on the # of cases tenured/non-tenured.*

- We discussed briefly the issue of whether the annual performance calendar should be extended to Feb. 15th, but saw problems with doing so. (Discussion may continue in a future meeting.)
- We may be asked to consider a faculty equity review, and any data (current and future) on the determination of faculty pay raises and how we compare to other universities in the state.

Craig reminded us that he would send the updated appendices to us over the weekend and that we should try to look them over by Monday so that he could return them to Marth Horst.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:45 a.m.