

SUBGROUPS, ASPT 2022, UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE, FALL 2019

Notations in parentheses after each issue refer to sections and page numbers in *Suggestions and Ideas for ASPT Revisions to be Effective January 1, 2022, By Topic* (attached)

SUBGROUP	ISSUES
Subgroup 1 Edwards Ma Shively	<p><u>Higher + Shorter</u> Conflicts of Interest (Catanzaro, p. 1, Kalter et al., p. 4) Faculty Assignments (Catanzaro, p. 1)</p> <p><u>Higher + Slower</u> Service (Catanzaro, p. 2, Kalter et al., p. 5, URC, p. 8) Confidentiality (Kalter et al., p. 3) Program Faculty Status Committee (Kalter et al., p. 5)</p> <p><u>Lower + Shorter</u> Policy Development and Revision, CFSC and DFSC/SFSC (Catanzaro, p. 2) Reporting Requirements (Catanzaro, p. 2, Kalter et al., p. 5)</p>
Subgroup 2 Buckley Novotny Oresky	<p><u>Higher + Shorter</u> AFEGC, Complaints to (Kalter et al., p. 3) Promotion, Common Standards (Catanzaro, p. 2)</p> <p><u>Higher + Slower</u> Mid-Probationary Review (Catanzaro, p. 1) Promotion, External Reviewers (Catanzaro, p. 2) Salary Incrementation, Stepped Salary System for Full Professors (Kalter et al., p. 5)</p> <p><u>Lower + Slower</u> Tenure, Residency Requirement (Kalter et al., p. 6) Clinical Professorship (Kalter et al., p. 3) Counteroffers (Kalter et al., p. 4)</p>
Subgroup 3 Beck Dean Goodman	<p><u>Higher + Shorter</u> Performance Evaluation, Timing and Documentation (Kalter et al., p. 4, URC, p. 7)</p> <p><u>Higher + Slower</u> Performance Evaluation, Guidelines and Criteria (Catanzaro, p. 2) Performance Evaluation, Teaching (Kalter et al., p. 4, URC, p. 6) Appeals, General (Catanzaro, p. 1)</p> <p><u>Lower + Shorter</u> Integrity in Research (Kalter et al., p. 4)</p> <p><u>More information needed</u> Appeals, Non-Reappointment (Catanzaro, p. 1, Kalter et al., p. 3) Salary Incrementation (URC, p. 7)</p>

**SUGGESTIONS AND IDEAS FOR ASPT REVISIONS
TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2022
BY TOPIC**

CATANZARO

APPEALS, GENERAL

The entire article on Appeals could use a thorough review with an eye toward clarification and streamlining. Also, I think we might consider developing and requiring a standardized form for the two steps in every appeal, with the goal to help faculty understand just what is needed or not needed at each step.

Section(s): XVII, XVII.B (request of a formal meeting), XVII.C (appeal statements)

APPEALS, NON-REAPPOINTMENT

Consider clarifications as needed given that these are relatively new provisions. (Note that, currently, Catanzaro recommends against expanding CFSC review of DFSC/SFSC non-reappointment recommendations, in contrast to Kalter).

Section(s): XVII.K

[See also Kalter et al. in this document]

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Add more explicit language about conflicts of interest and their management.

Section(s): I.B

DISCIPLINARY POLICIES

Review Disciplinary Policies in light of any experience with them (because they are relatively new).

Section(s): XII through XV

FACULTY ASSIGNMENTS

Clarify chair/director role and responsibilities in making faculty assignments.

Section(s): VII.B

MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW

Consider developing a requirement of, and attendant guidelines for, mid-probationary review. Probably not to go beyond department unless it results in non-reappointment, in which instance the non-reappointment policies in XI and appeals policies in XVII.K apply and there is no need for additional policies. Use CAS as a model.

Section(s): IX

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA

Thorough review for clarity and to update items. Add language emphasizing more strongly that the list is considered illustrative, not exhaustive. Consider including guidelines for faculty presenting evidence not included in list.

Section(s): Appendix 2

[See also URC in this document]

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND REVISION, CFSC AND DFSC/SFSC

Consider clarification of CFSC and DFSC/SFSC responsibilities for policy development, college/department/school procedures, and timelines for changes.

Section(s): IV and V

PROMOTION, COMMON STANDARDS

Rewrite last two sentences to clarify two distinctions: (1) the difference between criteria for promotion (provided in VIII.F1 and VIII.F2) and the evidence presented that the criteria have been met (provided in Appendix 2), and (2) how Appendix 2 should and should not be used.

Section(s): VIII.F

PROMOTION, EXTERNAL REVIEWS

Require external review of scholarly/creative contributions for promotion (see IX.D). Use CAS as a model.

Section(s): VIII.E, IX.D

REFERENCES (TO OEOA)

Update name of OEOA.

Section(s): throughout the document

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Consider clarification of reporting requirements and process for each committee (FRC, CFSC, DFSC/SFSC).

Section(s): III through V

[See also Kalter et al. in this document]

SERVICE

Clarification of expectations about service as part of faculty role (in general) and faculty assignments.

Consider explication of service expectations in light of language about assignments.

Section(s): Overview, VII

[See also Kalter et al. and URC in this document]

AFEGC, COMPLAINTS TO

Make sure ASPT policies explicitly permit a faculty member to individually enter a complaint with AFEGC regarding performance evaluations, tenure and promotion decisions, and post-tenure review rather than just permitting an ASPT committee to do so. Follow national standards in this regard.

Section(s): VII.F, XVII.G.2-4, XVII.I.1, XVII.J.1 and elsewhere

Make sure ASPT Article XII [sic] (Appeals Policies and Procedures) conforms to the referrals part of the jurisdiction of AFEGC in University Policy 3.3.8.

Section(s): XVII

Make sure AFEGC is mentioned where needed whenever violations of academic freedom are mentioned, or make sure the reader is referred to an appeals section where AFEGC is mentioned.

Section(s): throughout the document

Compare mention of AFEGC in ASPT policies with current AFEGC policy to identify gaps and conflicts.

Section(s): throughout the document

APPEALS, NON-REAPPOINTMENT

Consider expanding the right to file an appeal with CFSC to include a general appeal, in addition to a procedural appeal, so CFSC may correct or call attention to any potential bad situation with a DFSC that might arise.

Section(s): XVII.K

[See also Catanzaro in this document]

In non-reappointment policies, make sure the timeline and notifications processes for AFEGC appeals (whether referrals or complaints) is quite clear (so that the Provost does not prematurely send out a final notification).

Section(s): XVII.K.4, Appendix 8

CLINICAL PROFESSORSHIP

Adding a Clinical Professorship to the faculty ranks. In ASPT policies and also as an amendment to 3.3.3.

Section(s): Overview and throughout the document

CONFIDENTIALITY

Consider rewording Section I.D (regarding confidentiality) to clarify that DFSCs, SFSCs, and CFSCs may openly talk about ASPT policies and other committee business for which there is no need for confidential treatment.

Consider clarifying that the confidentiality of the ASPT process cannot be used as a gag rule that prevents AFEGC from thoroughly investigating referrals/complaints regarding ethics or academic freedom violations in ASPT deliberations. AFEGC hearings must be conducted in ways that keep confidential issues confidential, but that allow the AFEGC hearing panel into the confidences (with the same expectation of keeping those confidences).

Section(s): I.D

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Regarding the last sentence of Section I.B: "No persons at any level may participate in deliberations regarding their own evaluations or those of spouses or other relatives by law or by consanguinity." Should this exclusion be expanded in light of discussions by the Academic Senate regarding the proposed Amorous Relations policy (nee Consensual Relations policy)?

Section(s): I.B

COUNTEROFFERS

When making a counteroffer to retain a faculty member who has a job offer another institution, consider allowing the Provost to raise the salaries of similarly situated faculty members in the same department (not just the faculty member to whom the counteroffer was made).

Section(s): XVI and elsewhere

INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH

Compare the Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities policy to ASPT policy and identify areas in the ASPT policy where the integrity policy may need to be mentioned. Just as we mention AFEGC in ASPT, and just as URC has been charged with making sure these AFEGC references appear in all the right places and are consistent with national norms, URC might recommend changes to the AFEGC policy or the integrity policy if either policy is inadequate in this regard.

Section(s): throughout the document

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, TEACHING

Incorporate changes recommended by URC to Appendix 2 since adoption of ASPT 2017 regarding evaluation of teaching. Related review the report of the ad hoc Teaching Learning Community group that met in 2018-2019 (at the request of the Faculty Caucus?) to examine student responses to instruction. See the Academic Senate office or Dr. Kalter for the report.

Section(s): Appendix 2

[See also URC in this document]

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, TIMING AND DOCUMENTATION

For tenured professors, consider evaluating scholarship once every three years, teaching once every three years, and service once every three years.

Section(s): VII, XVI

[See also URC in this document]

Consider relaxing the deadline for DFSC/SFSC completion of performance evaluations to give those committees more time to complete their work. Perhaps extend the deadline for completion of tenured persons' letters.

Section(s): Appendix 1

PROGRAM FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE

Consider providing for establishment of Program Faculty Status Committees for evaluation of faculty members hired to teach interdisciplinary programs (e.g., Arts Technology, African American Studies, Women and Gender Studies). The idea is that such committee could only apply to programs that are not wholly housed in a single department. Consider inviting Provost Murphy to share her thoughts regarding this suggestion.

Section(s): ASPT Committee Structure and elsewhere throughout the document

REFERENCES (TO ACADEMIC SENATE)

Replace references in ASPT policies to “Academic Senate” with references to “Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate.”

Section(s): throughout the document

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Review item 5) in Section II.E to clarify its intent and meaning and to clarify what the report is to consist of and why. Is this being done? Should it be? If so, what processes and procedures should be followed?

Section(s): II.E

[See also Catanzaro in this document]

SALARY INCREMENTATION, DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR AND UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR

Discuss whether the practice of granting a rise in base salary to faculty members granted Distinguished Professor or University Professor status should be addressed in ASPT policies (through the addition to the ASPT document of policies and procedures for doing so).

Section(s): VIII and XVI

SALARY INCREMENTATION, STEPPED SALARY SYSTEM FOR FULL PROFESSORS

Explore the wisdom and feasibility of a stepped salary system at the full professor rank, such as those negotiated at other state universities through unions. The idea is that once an individual receives the full professor rank, they would stay at that rank, but their productivity afterward would make them eligible for a bump increase after a certain set number of years and stated productivity expectations, similar to a promotional increment, with limits on the number of bumps and their spacing. It is quite possible that this system is either not wise or not feasible here at ISU, or both, but we should find out and see if we can be more competitive if we adopted such a system.

Section(s): VIII, XVI

[See also URC in this document]

SERVICE

Provide clarification in ASPT policies regarding expectation of faculty regarding service contributions, how service is assigned, and how service is evaluated in annual performance evaluations.

Section(s): Overview (page 2), VII

[See also Catanzaro and URC in this document]

TENURE, RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT

Consider a residency requirement for tenure eligibility. That is, consider requiring that a faculty member come to campus to teach and serve on a regular basis and not allow the granting tenure to a faculty member who Skypes into their classes and serves only virtually on committees or not at all.

Section(s): IX.C

URC

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, TEACHING

The Working Group on Students Evaluations (Christopher Horvath and Andy Rummel, Spring 2016) recommended against referring to end-of-term course surveys as evaluative, rather referring to them as opportunities for student responses regarding their experiences with a particular instructor or course. The working group recommended against requiring equal weighting of the sources of input used by an ASPT committee to evaluate teaching performance. The working group suggested adding language to the ASPT document that “encourages schools/departments to develop methods of teaching evaluation that take into consideration multiple sources of input over an extended period of time and weight the various sources of data in ways appropriate to the particular the faculty member, course load, pedagogy, course content, and discipline.” URC approved the working group report on May 13, 2016.

The Working Group on Teaching Evaluations (Michael Byrns, Rachel Shively, and Sarah Smelser, Fall 2017) reviewed recommendations of the Working Group on Student Evaluations and concurred with them. The working group recommended modifying Appendix 2 to encourage units to adopt a holistic approach to evaluation of teaching and to include self-reflection among possible methods of evaluation. At its November 10, 2017 meeting, URC approved a motion to recommend replacing the passage in Appendix 2 headed “Factors Used for Evaluation of Teaching” (on pages 96-97 of ASPT 2019) with the following passage.

Factors Used for Evaluation of Teaching

Guidelines and criteria for the evaluation of teaching are based on common teaching activities such as those listed above. Those who evaluate teaching should take into consideration multiple types of evidence over an extended period of time and weigh the various sources of data in ways appropriate to particular faculty members and their situations. One such source of data must be student reactions to teaching performance. When evaluating student reactions to teaching, reviewers should consider factors that can influence the data collected, including course load, instructional method, course content, discipline, potential sources of bias, etc. In addition to student reactions, other sources of evidence that may be used to identify meritorious teaching include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. A record of solidly favorable student reactions to teaching performance;
2. Favorable teaching ratings by peers through review of instructional materials;
3. Favorable teaching ratings by peers through classroom observation;
4. Favorable teaching reactions by alumni;
5. A narrative self-reflection on teaching performance;
6. Evidence that the faculty member’s students experience cognitive or affective gain as a result of their instruction;
7. Syllabi from various courses that feature clarity of instructional objectives, clear organization of material, and equitable and understandable criteria for the evaluation of student work;
8. Breadth of teaching ability as this is illustrated by effective teaching in different classroom settings, effective teaching of different types of students, preparation of new courses, or significant modification of established courses;

9. Evidence of meritorious supervision of students in independent studies, internships, clinical experiences, laboratories, and field work;
10. Credible advising and mentoring of students in their preparation of research projects, theses, and dissertations;
11. Significant involvement in sponsoring student organizations and co-curricular activities;
12. Development or review of teaching materials (textbooks, workbooks, reading packets, computer programs, curriculum guides, etc.);
13. Development of new teaching techniques (videotapes, independent study modules, computer activities, instructional technologies, etc.);
14. Service as a master teacher to others (conducting teaching workshops, supervising beginning teachers, coaching performances, etc.);
15. Recognition of meritorious teaching by winning teaching awards;
16. Submitting successful competitive grant proposals related to teaching.

Section(s): VII, XVI.B, Appendix 2

[See also Kalter et al. in this document]

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, TIMING AND DOCUMENTATION

The URC Working Group on Annual Performance Evaluations (Angela Bonnell, Rick Boser, and Sheryl Jenkins, Spring 2016) recommended against conducting performance evaluations every other year rather than every year, recommended against conducting performance evaluations annually for probationary faculty but every other year for tenured faculty, and recommended against introducing language in the ASPT document for reducing the extent of performance evaluation documentation submitted by faculty members. The working group recommended that departments/schools review and revise as necessary policies and procedures regarding faculty activity reports, taking into consideration the time faculty spend in preparing the required elements of the reports. The working group recommended sharing of individual unit practices with regard to activity reporting in a university-wide setting. URC approved the working group report on May 13, 2016.

Section(s): VII, XVI.B

[See also Kalter et al. in this document]

SALARY INCREMENTATION

The Working Group on Tenure and Promotion Salary Increases (Joe Goodman and David Rubin, Spring 2016) concluded that a full departure from the precedent at the University of using fixed monetary salary increments (rather than percentage-based increments) appears unwarranted. The working group recommended a full peer group compensation survey be conducted to examine salary increment amounts at Illinois State, which, the working group, observed are below the mean and median of the IBHE peer comparison group. The working group recommended a full evaluation of faculty turnover rates and costs by academic rank. The working group report cited the "salary enhancement policy" utilized by West Virginia University. URC approved the working group report on April 27, 2016.

Section(s): VIII, XVI.A

[See also Kalter et al. in this document]

SERVICE

URC discussed service assignments in fall 2018. Committee members reviewed DFSC/SFSC guidelines to determine current policies and practices regarding service. Committee members discussed their findings at the October 18, 2018 URC meeting. No report regarding service was placed on record and no motions were made regarding the issue. Suggestions of individual committee members cited in URC meeting minutes include citing in the ASPT document that service is an implicit responsibility of faculty (with or without further citing service in the ASPT document), asking CFSCs to determine if there are concerns in their units regarding service and, if so, to address them, not prescribing in the ASPT document a point system for service assignments or evaluation, asking that units be clear about their service policies in their ASPT guidelines.

Section(s): Overview (page 2), VII

[See also Catanzaro and Kalter et al. in this document]

BRS, Revised 9-28-19