

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE  
Thursday, September 20, 2012  
12:30 p.m., Hovey 401D

MINUTES

Members present: Cyndee Brown, Sam Catanzaro (ex officio), Phil Chidester, Chad Kahl, Nancy Lind, Domingo Joaquin, Ron Meier (via Skype from Milwaukee)

Members not attending: David Rubin

I. Welcome and introductions

Sam Catanzaro welcomed committee members, and members introduced themselves.

II. Orientation/overview of committee responsibilities

Catanzaro described the purpose of the committee and its responsibilities. Committee members were referred to the committee description in *Committee Structure of the Academic Senate at Illinois State University (Supplement to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate)*, dated November 2011.

III. Election of officers

Catanzaro opened nominations for the position of URC chairperson for 2012-2013. Chad Kahl moved to nominate Nancy Lind. Cyndee Brown seconded the motion. Lind accepted the nomination with the condition that Kahl represent the committee before the Academic Senate when URC presence at the Academic Senate is necessary. Kahl agreed. Catanzaro closed nominations. The motion to elect Lind as URC chairperson for 2012-2013 carried.

In her capacity as newly-elected URC chairperson, Lind assumed responsibility for leading the meeting.

Lind opened nominations for URC vice chairperson for 2012-2013. Domingo Joaquin moved to nominate Kahl. Brown seconded the motion. In accepting the nomination Kahl noted that if 2011-2012 officers are all re-elected for 2012-2013, 2013-2014 officers will be new to their positions. Lind closed nominations. The motion to elect Kahl as URC vice chairperson for 2012-2013 carried.

Lind opened nominations for URC secretary for 2012-2013. Brown moved to nominate Joaquin. Phil Chidester seconded the motion. Joaquin accepted the nomination. Joaquin moved to nominate Brown for secretary. Brown noted that electing someone other than her to the position would address Kahl's concern regarding leadership continuity. The motion died for lack of a second. Lind closed nominations. The motion to elect Joaquin as URC secretary for 2012-2013 carried.

IV. Approve minutes of May 8, 2012 meeting

Brown moved, Joaquin seconded approval of minutes of the May 8, 2012 meeting. The motion carried.

V. Possible campus communication regarding ASPT V.B.1 and V.B.2

Catanzaro reviewed the matter that came before the committee in spring 2012 regarding establishing salary increments for faculty in the ASPT system. The matter was initiated by a faculty member requesting URC review of salary incrementation policies and procedures used in the faculty member's department. Upon resolution of the specific instance in question, the committee discussed the possibility of communicating with members of the ASPT community campus wide to explain how salary incrementation policies and procedures are established and to urge transparency in the process.

At its May 8, 2012 meeting, the URC opted to defer further discussion of the matter until fall 2012, when more committee members could participate. Catanzaro explained that the issue before the committee at this time is whether to communicate with the campus community regarding this matter and, if so, how.

To further frame the issue before the committee, Lind referred committee members to a statement in the April 24, 2012 committee minutes attributed to Catanzaro.

In considering the issue of how salary increments should be determined, URC considered two overarching principles: transparency/participatory governance and the decentralized nature of the ASPT system. URC advises that, when developing department/school guidelines, faculty members should keep in mind that broad statements empowering DFSCs/SFSCs to implement procedures without specifying those procedures are allowable but may have unintended consequences as DFSC/SFSC membership changes. Departments/schools may choose to be more or less explicit in specifying methods used to translate performance evaluations into salary increments.

Lind recommended that the committee take no further action in the matter at this time. She noted that the issue raised by the faculty member had not been raised during the previous five years, suggesting to her that the matter is an isolated occurrence rather than a wider concern.

Chidester noted that a statement of transparency might prevent future problems regarding salary incrementation. He said he could support either communicating campus wide or not.

Lind expressed concern that sending a campus wide message regarding transparency might needlessly raise speculation and concern among some campus faculty members about the nature, source, and extent of the issue.

Ron Meier said he could support sending a letter to all departments urging transparency in the process.

Catanzaro noted that he is planning a professional development workshop about the ASPT system. The target audience for the workshop includes CFSC and DFSC/SFSC members in all colleges and departments. The workshop is scheduled for October 18. Catanzaro said he could raise the issue at that time.

Chidester supported the idea, suggesting that Catanzaro use the setting to remind faculty involved in the ASPT system of the importance of transparency. Meier said he could support such an approach.

Committee members agreed to Catanzaro's suggestion, asking him to include discussion of the matter at the October 18 ASPT workshop.

Lind offered to attend the workshop to represent URC. She noted that in past ASPT workshops, questions were occasionally addressed to the URC chairperson regarding committee positions and concerns. Catanzaro thanked Lind for her offer. He said that the workshop will be held at the Alumni Center beginning at 2:30 p.m. A reception will follow at about 4:30 p.m.

Joaquin asked if the committee should communicate with the faculty member who requested URC review of the matter, to inform her about how the committee has decided to follow up. Committee members agreed that this should be done. Catanzaro offered to draft an email for review by Lind.

VI. Review of tenure and promotion timeline

Stoffel explained that the draft tenure and promotion timeline included with the meeting reminder email is intended to replace a similar timeline that had been available on the university website but was removed in early 2012 because it was not fully consistent with new ASPT policies that took effect January 1, 2012. Catanzaro noted that the draft timeline is not intended to be an official document but is intended to aid tenure and promotion candidates working through the process.

Lind said that because committee members have not all had the opportunity to review the draft, the matter would be deferred to a future committee meeting. She asked committee members to review the draft carefully and send her changes.

VII. Other business

Lind said that the committee would not meet on September 27 due to lack of new agenda items. The committee is tentatively scheduled to meet on October 4. If there are no agenda items for the October 4 meeting other than the tenure and promotion timeline, she suggested canceling that meeting as well and revising the draft timeline via email. Committee members agreed.

Brown moved adjournment. Joaquin seconded the motion. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Joaquin Domingo, Secretary  
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

NEXT MEETING: 12:30 p.m., Thursday, October 4, 2012, Hovey 401D (tentative)