

Illinois State University Professional Development Series Office of the Provost ASPT Workshop

Sam Catanzaro
Assistant Vice President for Academic Administration
401R Hovey Hall
438-7018
catanzar@ilstu.edu

Overview of Today's Workshop

- Some general comments
- Case studies/discussion
- Changes effective January 1, 2012:
Beige Book (selected highlights)
- Q & A

General Comments

- *Confidentiality is a critical aspect of all deliberations*
- *ASPT system exists in a broader legal context*
- *ASPT system intersects with other University policies (e.g., AFEG)*

Fictional Case Study #1

Dr. Easing

- What are the principles/specific policies at issue?
- What's gone wrong, if anything?
- What are the possible problems that might ensue?
- How might these problems have been prevented?
- What would have been better ways to approach the situation?
- What could still be done to rectify any problems?
- What structural or procedural changes might prevent recurrence of the problems?

ASPT Revision Acknowledgments

- URC
 - Rodger Singley, Chair
- Faculty Caucus
- Chuck McGuire

Transition from Blue Book to Beige Book

- *Beige Book effective January 1, 2012*
- *Blue Book in effect for evaluations of CY 2011 (annual and T&P)*
- *Beige Book available for interpretation when it does not contradict Blue Book*

Transition from Blue Book to Beige Book

- ***Revisions in place by January 1***
 - ***College Standards:*** Each department/school votes determined by majority vote of faculty; approved by URC
 - ***DFSC/SFSC Guidelines:*** Majority vote of faculty, approved by CFSC
 - Plan for possible revisions and second review before final approval

ASPT Revision—Highlights

- CFSC recusal from deliberations of School/Department Colleagues: IV.A.1
- Approval of CFSC guidelines by departments/schools, not by DFSC/SFSCs: IV.E.1
- Department/School should establish search policies consistent with University policies: VI.A

ASPT Revision—Highlights

- Letters of Intent aka “Offer Letters:” VI.I
- VII.E: Overall “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory” performance ***MUST*** be:
 - Defined in Department/School Guidelines
 - Determined in Annual Evaluation Process
 - Communicated in Annual Evaluation letter

Defining Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory

- Opportunity for discussion within department/school

What are the minimum expectations for faculty?

- Different approaches are allowed

Possible Approaches: Defining Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory

- Require Satisfactory in Teaching
- Require Satisfactory in Teaching and at least one other category (R or S)
- Require Satisfactory in any two
- Require Satisfactory in all three
- Identify specific triggers for Unsatisfactory, e.g., AFEGC finding
- Other....

ASPT Revision—Highlights

- Provisions regarding External Peer Evaluations for Promotion (VIII.D) or Tenure (IX.D)
- Extending the Probationary Period aka “Stop the Clock:” IX.B.3
 - Pregnancy/childbirth explicitly included
 - No longer limited to one extension
- Calendar for reappointment in second year: XI.A.2 (also Appendix 1.A.b)

ASPT Revision—Highlights

- Procedural clarifications in Appeals, including:
 - “Formal meeting” with DFSC/CFSC defined: XIII.B
 - “Appeal” defined as a written statement: XIII.C
 - “Faculty Advocate” role defined: XIII.D.2

The Importance of Annual Letters

- Documentation of feedback, especially pre-tenure and pre-promotion
- Specification of accomplishments AND concerns or problems in each area
- Make judicious use of “boilerplate” language—if there are concerns, don’t thank someone for a great year
- Review team-written letters carefully

Fictional Case Study #2

Dr. Skating

- What are the principles/specific policies at issue?
- What's gone wrong, if anything?
- What are the possible problems that might ensue?
- How might these problems have been prevented?
- What would have been better ways to approach the situation?
- What could still be done to rectify any problems?
- What structural or procedural changes might prevent recurrence of the problems?

Remember

- There are legal implications—observe policies, timelines, guidelines
- Confidentiality is of the utmost importance
- Don't make promises

Remember

- Annual letters are important opportunities:

Honest, evidence-based feedback is the most professional, collegial, and constructive response to concerns

- Establish guidelines/procedures outside the context of individual cases

Final Word:

When in doubt –

PLEASE CALL!

Sam Catanzaro
401R Hovey
438-7018
catanzar@ilstu.edu

Questions?
Thank You!