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)

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Friday, January 25, 2013
12 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 Minneapolis), David Rubin

Members not attending: none

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

Chairperson Nancy Lind called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m.

I.   Approve minutes of September 20, 2012, meeting

        Phil Chidester moved, Chad Kahl seconded approval of minutes of the September 20, 2012, meeting. The motion carried.

II.   Update regarding ASPT V.B.1 and V.B.2 (salary increments):
        Communication with faculty member and ASPT workshop

        Sam Catanzaro reported that he communicated last fall with the faculty member who had raised concerns about salary increments the previous spring. Catanzaro said that he indicated to the faculty member that the University Review Committee had decided to address the broader issues of transparency, departmental flexibility, and faculty participation in formulating and implementing ASPT policies at an October 18, 2012, ASPT workshop. Catanzaro reported that he discussed the issue at the October 18 workshop, and the matter now seems resolved. Lind reported that she attended the workshop. She said the issue did not generate controversy there. Catanzaro thanked Lind for attending.

III.   Discussion: Digital storage of confidential ASPT data and use of vendors

        Catanzaro and Lind provided background regarding a request received on behalf of several faculty members from the English Department regarding use of digital reporting technologies for ASPT and faculty performance reports. (The document received from the faculty members is attached.)

        Lind explained that that matter comes to the University Review Committee from Academic Senate. The matter has been raised by one department (English) and seems to concern the manner in which the faculty performance reporting policy is being implemented in that department.

        Lind expressed concern about two passages of the document. While the document indicates that "Faculty sitting on a DFSC/SFSC during any particular year may not access FPR information for previous years," Lind said that the committees need to have access to cumulative records when considering promotion and tenure requests. Lind also questioned the statement in the document that "items entered for the purpose of ASPT/FPR evaluation <u>must</u>

never be generated for use outside the ASPT process." Lind said that she does not understand what is meant by that statement. David Rubin asked if the Provost's office might ask for the information. Catanzaro said that the Provost's office would be interested only in cumulative data, not information specific to an individual faculty member. Catanzaro stated that systems like Digital Measures are good because they help departments easily generate cumulative reports.

Catanzaro suggested that ASPT Article I.D. regarding confidentiality of ASPT documents applies to the program evaluation process regardless whether documents are transmitted in paper, electronically, or through other means.

Lind suggested a possible reply to the Academic Senate: The University Review Committee does not view use of digital reporting technologies like Digital Measures as inherently violating the ASPT confidentiality policy, that the issue is implementation on the local level and should be handled by the department.

Chidester suggested that this is a technology issue. The technology used by the department for this purpose should keep data confidential. The committee should indicate to the department that it is up to them not to violate ASPT confidentiality policy.

David Rubin suggested that the technology used be configured so that narrative information is never made public. Chidester suggested segregating quantitative data from qualitative measures.

Domingo Joaquin said that procedures used by departments should following the spirit of ASPT regardless of technology used.

Cyndee Brown said that this seems to be a procedural issue rather than a policy issue and should be referred back to the department for discussion and resolution. Lind noted that the University Review Committee is mandated to consider both policy and procedure but questioned whether the committee should consider revising ASPT policies in response to an issue raised by just one department.

Committee members offered suggestions for wording a reply to the Academic Senate. Lind said that if committee members agree with the general sentiment of the draft reply, she would work with Catanzaro and Bruce Stoffel to edit the response.

Chidester asked if the statement should also address the suggestion by the faculty members that they be allowed to opt out of using digital reporting technologies if they determine that its use would increase rather than decrease the amount of time they spend reporting.

Ron Meier offered that the College of Applied Science and Technology uses a digital reporting system similar to Digital Measures. He said he is not sure how it came to be used but that there have been no problems with it. He wondered what would be in a performance narrative that would be so sensitive. He said that student workers enter data in his department. It is up to each faculty member to decide who should enter data.

Catanzaro said that health concerns would be one matter that might appear in a performance narrative that a faculty member would likely want to remain confidential. Another might be matters pertaining to faculty/student dynamics.

Chad Kahl said that we need to be more generic with regard to technologies. Those raising this issue are confusing policy and process, he said.

Lind read ASPT Article VII.D., which allows DFSC/SFSC guidelines to require electronic submission of activities reports with the caveat that "items that are difficult or impossible to document electronically may be submitted directly." She said that this passage makes it clear that guidelines may preclude faculty members from opting out of electronic submission. Committee members concurred.

Brown moved, Chidester seconded that the committee approve in principal the response drafted by the committee and that the committee charge Lind with editing the response and sending it to the Academic Senate. The motion carried.

Lind said that if the intent of the statement changes during the editing process, she will consult committee members again before sending the response to the Academic Senate.

Lind asked that the meeting minutes include the version of the statement as revised by Lind, working with Catanzaro and Stoffel. The revised statement is as follows.

> *The University Review Committee believes that ASPT Article I.D., on confidentiality, applies to any technology used in ASPT processes, including faculty performance reporting. All information and supporting narrative, while integral to the faculty evaluation process, should be submitted in a manner consistent with Article I.D. regardless of the technology used. The University Review Committee does not view use of digital reporting technologies, whether hosted by third party vendors or not, as inherently violating Article I.D. Indeed, the use of digital reporting technologies is encouraged by ASPT Policies and may be required by DFSC/SFSC guidelines consistent with Article VII.D. subject to the stated exception that "items difficult or impossible to document electronically may be submitted directly." With regard to departments or schools using digital reporting technologies, the committee finds nothing in ASPT policies to prohibit a faculty member from entering his or her own faculty performance information rather than having someone else, such as a student worker, enter it on behalf of the faculty member. It would be the faculty members' responsibility to inform the Chair when they want to enter their own data and to do so consistent with ASPT VII.D. that allows departments and schools to mandate the use of technology in preparing the ASPT report. More generally, the faculty may introduce language in the DFSC/SFSC guidelines prescribing procedures aimed at preserving confidentiality of the ASPT process, provided that such language is consistent with ASPT VII.D.*
>
> *In sum, the concerns raised are interpreted by the URC to be local implementation issues, best handled at the department level, and do not violate (nor necessitate revision of) current ASPT policies.*

IV.   Action item: ASPT calendar, 2013-2014

Draft ASPT calendars for 2013-2014 have been included with the meeting packet (attached) and must be approved by the University Review Committee before they can be disseminated.

Lind said that the drafts will be considered by the committee at its next meeting, since members just received the drafts in the last day.

V.   Other business

Lind reported that Meier has submitted an issue for discussion by the University Review Committee at its next meeting. Lind asked Meier to explain.

Meier said that faculty of the College of Applied Science and Technology who teach hybrid courses are evaluated by their students using the same teaching evaluation instrument used for evaluating face-to-face instruction (IDEA). Several faculty members in the college have asked if this is fair, since response rates for the online version of the instrument are generally lower than when implemented face-to-face. IDEA results for instruments administered online sometimes include the notation "not reliable" due to low response rates. Meier noted that the issue could effect a professor in his department who plans to request promotion to full professor next year.

Lind asked whether this matter is in the jurisdiction of the University Review Committee. She noted that ASPT policies require multiple methods of evaluating teaching, one of which must involve student feedback. Beyond that, how teaching is to be evaluated is a shared governance matter. ASPT does not dictate the tools used in teacher evaluation. That is a matter for department discussion.

Catanzaro concurred. He said that raising the issue for department faculty discussion would be appropriate.

Brown suggested contacting the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology for assistance with online teaching evaluation instruments. CTLT may already have one, she said.

Meier said that he likes the idea of going to CTLT for help with this. He will check with them to see what assistance they might be able to provide.

Brown moved adjournment. Meier seconded the motion. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 1 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joaquin Domingo, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

NEXT MEETING: 12 p.m., Thursday, February 8, 2013, Hovey 401D (tentative)

ATTACHMENTS:

Document titled "For URC re Digital storage of Confidential ASPT data and use of vendors"
ASPT Calendar 2013-2014, by Category of Activity, DRAFT
ASPT Calendar 2013-2014, Chronological, All Activities, DRAFT

For URC re Digital storage of Confidential ASPT data and use of vendors

Reports for items entered for the purpose ASPT/FPR evaluation <u>must never</u> be generated for use outside of the ASPT process. Digital technologies must be segregated so that technologies used for evaluation are never used for public reporting. If there are links between the technologies, the faculty member must have sole and complete control over the transfer of information from ASPT-intended technologies to non-ASPT/reporting technologies.

Graduate students, other student workers, staff, and faculty not sitting on the DFSC/CFSC during any particular year may not enter FPR information into faculty's profiles

Faculty sitting on a DFSC/CFSC during any particular year may not access FPR information for previous years

There must be options at all levels of the process for individual faculty and departments to refuse use of digital technologies during the ASPT process that they feel could put their own personnel information online or on servers in ways that could potentially put them at risk for "going viral"; likewise, there must be options for faculty to protect their relationship with students by refusing to put student or student-faculty relationship data online or on servers.

Additionally, faculty must be able to refuse use of digital technologies that they determine will increase rather than decrease the amount of time spent reporting scholarship/teaching/service rather than performing those core duties

There must be options within the ASPT process for narrative and contextualizing information and file uploading; digital technologies may not be used to reduce annual productivity reports to objectifying "measures" and mere raw data or "product"

Digital technologies should be tested for usability and efficiency prior to wide-spread use and departments should not adopt a particular technology if it will increase time spent in reporting activities compared to existing technologies already in use

ASPT Calendar 2013-2014
By Category of Activity
posted at http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/faculty/tenure.shtml

CALENDAR FOR PROMOTION & TENURE

This calendar for 2013-2014 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, approved May 2011, effective January 1, 2012, and amended on December 19, 2011, and August 14, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies.*

ASPT Policies prescribes that If the University is officially closed on any date for action described in the policies, the action scheduled for that date must be completed on the next working day after the closing. Entries in the "Date for 2013-2014" column of this calendar have been modified to comply with that provision where necessary.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per *ASPT Policies*
Friday, November 1, 2013	November 1	Candidates for promotion and tenure must file application materials. In those situations in which a faculty member chooses to extend a shortened probationary period, notification to add the credited years or a portion of the credited years to the probationary period shall be made to the Department/School Chairperson/Director prior to November 1 of the year previously scheduled for the summative review for tenure.
Prior to Monday, December 16, 2013	Prior to December 15	DFSC/SFSC may notify promotion and tenure candidates and the CFSC, in writing, of recommendations at any time prior to December 15, but must notify candidates of intended recommendations at least 10 working days prior to submitting the final DFSC/SFSC recommendations to the CFSC. The DFSC/SFSC must provide opportunity, if requested, for the candidates to hold a formal meeting with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting of the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) working days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.
Monday, December 16, 2013	December 15	DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to the candidates and to the CFSC.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per *ASPT Policies*
Monday, February 3, 2014	February 1	CFSC must notify candidates of intended recommendations and provide opportunity, if requested, for candidates to meet with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the CFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting with the CFSC within 10 working days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.D.
Monday, March 3, 2014	March 1	CFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to the Provost, DFSC/SFSC, and candidates.
Monday, March 17, 2014	March 15	In the event of a negative recommendation by the DFSC/SFSC or the CFSC, a candidate who wishes a University-wide appeal of his/her credentials must file a request for a review by the Faculty Review Committee (FRC).
Friday, March 21, 2014	March 21	Provost's recommendation for non-appealed candidates must be reported to the President, CFSC, DFSC/SFSC, and candidates.
Tuesday, April 15, 2014	April 15	The FRC must complete its review of promotion and tenure appeals and report to the President, candidate, DFSC/SFSCs, CFSCs, and Provost unless an interim report is appropriate under provisions of Article XIII.F.3.
Wednesday, April 30, 2014	April 30	Provost's decision for appealed cases must be reported to the President, candidates, DFSC/SFSC and CFSC.
Thursday, May 15, 2014	May 15	Notifications of the promotion and tenure decisions by the President shall be sent to the candidates, CFSCs, DFSC/SFSCs, and the Provost.

CALENDAR FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REVIEW

This calendar for 2013-2014 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, approved May 2011, effective January 1, 2012, and amended on December 19, 2011, and August 14, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

ASPT Policies prescribes that If the University is officially closed on any date for action described in the policies, the action scheduled for that date must be completed on the next working day after the closing. Entries in the "Date for 2013-2014" column of this calendar have been modified to comply with that provision where necessary.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies,* Appendix 1	Action per A*SPT Policies*
Monday, January 6, 2014	January 5	All faculty members eligible for performance-evaluation salary increment must submit files in support of their request for performance-evaluation adjustments.
Monday, February 3, 2014	February 1	DFSC/SFSC recommendations for performance evaluation must be reported to the faculty member by February 1 in each year that the faculty member is performance-evaluation eligible. DFSC/SFSC must notify faculty members of intended recommendations to CFSC at least 10 working days before submitting these recommendations to CFSC and provide opportunity, if requested, for the faculty members to meet with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the faculty member wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, then the faculty member must request a meeting with the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) working days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.B.
Monday, February 17, 2014	February 15	DFSC/SFSC must transmit final recommendation for performance-evaluation review to the faculty member and to the CFSC.
Monday, March 3, 2014	March 1	Faculty members must file with the CFSC* any appeal of the DFSC/SFSC performance-evaluation recommendation. (* FRC in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC)
Monday, March 31, 2014	March 31	All appeals to the CFSC* of performance-evaluation recommendations must be completed and CFSC* decisions reported to the Provost and to the faculty member. Appeals will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.H. (* FRC in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC)

CALENDAR FOR CUMULATIVE POST-TENURE REVIEW

This calendar for 2013-2014 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, approved May 2011, effective January 1, 2012, and amended on December 19, 2011, and August 14, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

ASPT Policies prescribes that If the University is officially closed on any date for action described in the policies, the action scheduled for that date must be completed on the next working day after the closing. Entries in the "Date for 2013-2014" column of this calendar have been modified to comply with that provision where necessary.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per A*SPT Policies*
Monday, January 6, 2014	January 5	All faculty members scheduled for cumulative post-tenure review must submit their materials.
Monday, February 17, 2014	February 15	The DFSC/SFSC must inform the faculty member of cumulative post-tenure review evaluation and, if applicable, a plan for remediation.
Tuesday, February 25, 2014	February 25	Faculty member's last day to request meeting with DFSC/SFSC to consider DFSC/SFSC response and/or remediation plan.
Monday, March 10, 2014	March 8	DFSC/SFSC gives final outcome of review and/or remediation plan to faculty member.
Monday, March 24, 2014	March 22	A faculty member must file, to the CFSC chairperson, a written appeal to the cumulative post-tenure review. The CFSC chairperson shall acknowledge receipt of the appeal to the appellant and the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) working days. Appeals will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.I.
Tuesday, April 15, 2014	April 15	Each CFSC shall submit to each appellant faculty member and to the appropriate DFSC/SFSC a written report that describes the disposition of the cumulative post-tenure review appeal.

CALENDAR FOR REAPPOINTMENT

This calendar for 2013-2014 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, approved May 2011, effective January 1, 2012, and amended on December 19, 2011, and August 14, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

ASPT Policies prescribes that If the University is officially closed on any date for action described in the policies, the action scheduled for that date must be completed on the next working day after the closing. Entries in the "Date for 2013-2014" column of this calendar have been modified to comply with that provision where necessary.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per A*SPT Policies*
Monday, February 3, 2014	February 1	Provost issues notification of non-reappointment by February 1 to faculty member in the second academic year of service, notifying candidate that the last employment date is May 15 or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
Monday, March 3, 2014	March 1	Provost's notification of non-reappointment must be given by March 1 to candidate in the first year of service, notifying candidate that last employment date is May 15 or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.
Thursday, May 15, 2014	At least 12 months before the termination of an appointment after two (2) or more years of service	Provost notifies third and subsequent year faculty members who will not be reappointed, 12 months before the termination of the appointment, that the candidate's last employment date is May 15 of the following year. If the appointment is at least 12 months and terminates during an academic year, notification must take place at least 12 months in advance of the end of the appointment period.

CALENDAR FOR ASPT ELECTIONS
(for 2014-2015 Academic Year)

This calendar for 2013-2014 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, approved May 2011, effective January 1, 2012, and amended on December 19, 2011, and August 14, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

ASPT Policies prescribes that If the University is officially closed on any date for action described in the policies, the action scheduled for that date must be completed on the next working day after the closing. Entries in the "Date for 2013-2014" column of this calendar have been modified to comply with that provision where necessary.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per *ASPT Policies*
Tuesday, April 15, 2014	April 15	Members of the University Review Committee, Faculty Review Committee, and College Faculty Status Committee must have been elected.
Thursday, May 1, 2014	May 1	Members of the Department/School Faculty Status Committee must have been elected.

ASPT Calendar 2013-2014
Chronological, All Activities
posted at http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/faculty/tenure.shtml

This calendar for 2013-2014 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, approved May 2011, effective January 1, 2012, and amended on December 19, 2011, and August 14, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

ASPT Policies prescribes that If the University is officially closed on any date for action described in the policies, the action scheduled for that date must be completed on the next working day after the closing. Entries in the "Date for 2013-2014" column of this calendar have been modified to comply with that provision where necessary.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per *ASPT Policies*
Friday, November 1, 2013	November 1	**Promotion & Tenure**: Candidates for promotion and tenure must file application materials. In those situations in which a faculty member chooses to extend a shortened probationary period, notification to add the credited years or a portion of the credited years to the probationary period shall be made to the Department/School Chairperson/Director prior to November 1 of the year previously scheduled for the summative review for tenure.
Prior to Monday, December 16, 2013	Prior to December 15	**Promotion & Tenure:** DFSC/SFSC may notify promotion and tenure candidates and the CFSC, in writing, of recommendations at any time prior to December 15, but must notify candidates of intended recommendations at least 10 working days prior to submitting the final DFSC/SFSC recommendations to the CFSC. The DFSC/SFSC must provide opportunity, if requested, for the candidates to hold a formal meeting with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting of the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) working days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.
Monday, December 16, 2013	December 15	**Promotion & Tenure:** DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to the candidates and to the CFSC.
Monday, January 6, 2014	January 5	**Performance Evaluation Review**: All faculty members eligible for performance-evaluation salary increment must submit files in support of their request for performance-evaluation adjustments.
Monday, January 6, 2014	January 5	**Cumulative Post-Tenure Review:** All faculty members scheduled for cumulative post-tenure review must submit their materials.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per *ASPT Policies*
Monday, February 3, 2014	February 1	**Promotion & Tenure:** CFSC must notify candidates of intended recommendations and provide opportunity, if requested, for candidates to meet with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the CFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting with the CFSC within 10 working days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.D.
Monday, February 3, 2014	February 1	**Reappointment:** Provost issues notification of non-reappointment by February 1 to faculty member in the second academic year of service, notifying candidate that the last employment date is May 15 or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
Monday, February 3, 2014	February 1	**Performance Evaluation Review**: DFSC/SFSC recommendations for performance evaluation must be reported to the faculty member by February 1 in each year that the faculty member is performance-evaluation eligible. DFSC/SFSC must notify faculty members of intended recommendations to CFSC at least 10 working days before submitting these recommendations to CFSC and provide opportunity, if requested, for the faculty members to meet with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the faculty member wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, then the faculty member must request a meeting with the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) working days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.B.
Monday, February 17, 2014	February 15	**Performance Evaluation Review**: DFSC/SFSC must transmit final recommendation for performance-evaluation review to the faculty member and to the CFSC.
Monday, February 17, 2014	February 15	**Cumulative Post-Tenure Review:** The DFSC/SFSC must inform the faculty member of cumulative post-tenure review evaluation and, if applicable, a plan for remediation.
Tuesday, February 25, 2014	February 25	**Cumulative Post-Tenure Review:** Faculty member's last day to request meeting with DFSC/SFSC to consider DFSC/SFSC response and/or remediation plan.
Monday, March 3, 2014	March 1	**Promotion & Tenure**: CFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to the Provost, DFSC/SFSC, and candidates.
Monday, March 3, 2014	March 1	**Reappointment:** Provost's notification of non-reappointment must be given by March 1 to candidate in the first year of service, notifying candidate that last employment date is May 15 or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies,* Appendix 1	Action per *ASPT Policies*
Monday, March 3, 2014	March 1	**Performance Evaluation Review**: Faculty members must file with the CFSC* any appeal of the DFSC/SFSC performance-evaluation recommendation. (* FRC in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC)
Monday, March 10, 2014	March 8	**Cumulative Post-Tenure Review:** DFSC/SFSC gives final outcome of review and/or remediation plan to faculty member.
Monday, March 17, 2014	March 15	**Promotion & Tenure:** In the event of a negative recommendation by the DFSC/SFSC or the CFSC, a candidate who wishes a University-wide appeal of his/her credentials must file a request for a review by the Faculty Review Committee (FRC).
Friday, March 21, 2014	March 21	**Promotion & Tenure:** Provost's recommendation for non-appealed candidates must be reported to the President, CFSC, DFSC/SFSC, and candidates.
Monday, March 24, 2014	March 22	**Cumulative Post-Tenure Review:** A faculty member must file, to the CFSC chairperson, a written appeal to the cumulative post-tenure review. The CFSC chairperson shall acknowledge receipt of the appeal to the appellant and the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) working days. Appeals will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.I.
Monday, March 31, 2014	March 31	**Performance Evaluation Review**: All appeals to the CFSC* of performance-evaluation recommendations must be completed and CFSC* decisions reported to the Provost and to the faculty member. Appeals will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.H. (* FRC in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC)
Tuesday, April 15, 2014	April 15	**Promotion & Tenure:** The FRC must complete its review of promotion and tenure appeals and report to the President, candidates, DFSC/SFSCs, CFSCs, and Provost unless an interim report is appropriate under provisions of Article XIII.F.3.
Tuesday, April 15, 2014	April 15	**Cumulative Post-Tenure Review:** Each CFSC shall submit to each appellant faculty member and to the appropriate DFSC/SFSC a written report that describes the disposition of the cumulative post-tenure review appeal.
Tuesday, April 15, 2014	April 15	**ASPT Elections:** Members of the University Review Committee, Faculty Review Committee, and College Faculty Status Committee must have been elected.
Wednesday April 30, 2014	April 30	**Promotion & Tenure:** Provost's decision for appealed cases must be reported to the President, candidates, DFSC/SFSC and CFSC.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per *ASPT Policies*
Thursday, May 1, 2014	May 1	**Reporting Requirements (CFSC):** Each CFSC shall submit an annual report (Promotion and Tenure) to its College Council and the URC (Article IV.D.). Also, each CFSC shall submit an annual written report to the URC and the Provost that enumerates all cumulative post-tenure review appeals and describes their disposition (see Article XIII.I.9).
Thursday, May 1, 2014	May 1	**Reporting Requirements (CFSC):** The fifth-year review of College Standards or, in the interim, proposed revisions to College Standards must be submitted to the URC.
Thursday, May 1, 2014	May 1	**ASPT Elections:** Members of the Department/School Faculty Status Committee must have been elected.
Thursday, May 1, 2014	May 1	**Reporting Requirements (FRC):** The FRC shall submit to the URC a final report summarizing the number of appeals by Department/School and College, the type of appeals, and the disposition of these appeals (see Article III.F).
Thursday, May 15, 2014	May 15	**Promotion & Tenure:** Notifications of the promotion and tenure decisions by the President shall be sent to the candidates, CFSCs, DFSC/SFSCs, and the Provost.
Thursday, May 15, 2014	At least 12 months before the termination of an appointment after two (2) or more years of service	**Reappointment:** Provost notifies third and subsequent year faculty members who will not be reappointed, 12 months before the termination of the appointment, that the candidate's last employment date is May 15 of the following year. If the appointment is at least 12 months and terminates during an academic year, notification must take place at least 12 months in advance of the end of the appointment period.

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Friday, February 8, 2013
12 p.m., Hovey 401D

MINUTES

Members present: Sam Catanzaro (ex officio), Phil Chidester, Nancy Lind, Domingo Joaquin, David Rubin

Members not attending: Cyndee Brown, Chad Kahl, Ron Meier

Others present: Susan Kalter, Associate Professor, Department of English, and Secretary, Academic Senate; Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

Chairperson Nancy Lind called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m.

I.   Approval of minutes from January 25, 2013 meeting

        Domingo Joaquin moved, David Rubin seconded approval of minutes of the January 25, 2013 meeting. The motion carried.

II.   Digital storage of confidential ASPT data and use of vendors

        Persons present introduced themselves.

        Chairperson Lind updated the committee on the memorandum she sent to Dan Holland and Susan Kalter on behalf of the committee regarding digital storage of confidential ASPT data (see the attached memorandum dated January 28, 2013).   Lind reported that Susan Kalter subsequently contacted her with questions regarding the memorandum. Lind invited Kalter to attend a URC meeting to discuss the matter with the group.

        Lind also noted that she received a related email from Kalter which included a message sent by Jan Susina of the English Department to interim department chairperson Jim Skibo expressing concerns about use of digital reporting technologies (see attached email dated February 5, 2013).

        Kalter then addressed the committee.

        Kalter explained that, in the English Department, annual evaluation papers submitted to DFSC include a faculty productivity report, an optional narrative intended to contextualize productivity data and teaching evaluations, and a vita. Digital Measures was introduced in her department last year, although faculty has not formally voted to adopt it.

        Kalter asked the committee whether information in the annual performance evaluation submission, including the faculty productivity report entered into Digital Measures, is confidential. Kalter explained that this issue was raised in her department last year when student workers were provided annual evaluation papers of faculty in the department and asked to enter pertinent information into Digital Measures. This was done without prior approval from faculty members. Kalter said that this action seems to have violated ASPT Article I.D. regarding confidentiality.

Kalter referred to the passage in the January 28, 2013, memorandum stating that "It would be the faculty members' responsibility to inform the Chair when they want to enter their own data." Kalter said she believes it should be the Chair's responsibility to notify faculty members if confidential information is being released to anyone, including student workers or graduate assistants.

Citing the passage in the January 28, 2013, memorandum that "items difficult or impossible to document electronically may be submitted directly," Kalter asked if this includes something a faculty member does not want anyone other than a DFSC member to see because the faculty member considers it sensitive and private. If so, can URC direct DFSCs to protect individual faculty members when and if their departments decide to adopt Digital Measures, she asked.

Kalter said that use of faculty productivity data for generation of aggregate reports may be in violation of Article I.D. Kalter said that faculty members in the English Department did not know that their faculty productivity reports were being used in this manner by the University, otherwise they may have objected.

Kalter said that, from her perspective as an Academic Senator, the interest of the University is involved. She explained that her concern is to correct the situation so, in the future, University policies protect both faculty and the University.

In response to Kalter, the committee made some observations.

Lind explained that the committee does not believe that use of Digital Measures violates Article I.D. just as the traditional process of submitting performance evaluation documents in hard copy does not. She noted that the University has always used faculty productivity report data to compile aggregate reports that do not identify specific individuals, such as counts of faculty publications by department.

Phil Chidester clarified that Digital Measures is used only for faculty productivity reports. Because there is no place in Digital Measures for the optional narrative, it is submitted separately.

Sam Catanzaro cited two issues. First, in entering data into Digital Measures, student workers were given both confidential and public information. Confidential material should have been withheld from student workers, he said. Second, information entered by faculty into Digital Measures is not confidential information. It can be found through other public sources.

Rubin said that having student workers enter performance evaluation information into Digital Measures happened last year in other departments including his own.

Asked by Joaquin what would constitute an ideal reporting system in her department, Kalter responded that it would involve two reports, one to DFSC of information that would be kept confidential and one to the department with information for use in compiling its reports. The two submissions could happen at the same time, but it would be clear to faculty members which information would be kept confidential and which would be used for reporting. Faculty members in her department are not likely to approve use of Digital Measures, she said.

Kalter left the meeting at this point.

Committee members continued their discussion of the issues Kalter raised in her remarks.

Lind noted that Digital Measures is intended for aggregate reporting only. Chidester suggested that the issue might be resolved if faculty members could be assured that individuals would never be identified in the aggregate reports. He suggested clarifying with faculty that promotion and tenure documents are not entered into Digital Measures and are always kept confidential and that contents of faculty productivity reports are otherwise available publicly through other sources.

Catanzaro recommended that departments consider implications of opting out of digital reporting technologies. Opting out could put a department at a disadvantage relative to other departments, in terms of funding, for example.

Lind said that this issue would be an action item for the committee at its next meeting. She asked committee members to think further about this matter in light of the conversation at this meeting and consider whether the committee should revise its January 28, 2013 memorandum. Lind asked Catanzaro to further investigate ASPT policies for guidance with this issue.

III.   Action item: ASPT calendar, 2013-2014

Rubin moved, Joaquin seconded approval of ASPT calendars for 2013-2014 as distributed with the agenda for this meeting (see attached). The motion carried.

IV.   Other business

Lind announced that she and Catanzaro have been fielding ASPT questions from several colleges, consulting with the Faculty Review Committee chairperson and the Academic Senate chairperson in these matters. Catanzaro explained that immediate responses to the questions were needed, as time constraints were involved.

V.   Adjournment

Chidester moved, Rubin seconded to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 1 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joaquin Domingo, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

NEXT MEETING: 12 p.m., Thursday, February 22, 2013, Hovey 401D (tentative)

ATTACHMENTS:

Memorandum sent by Chairperson Lind to Dan Holland and Susan Kalter on behalf of URC,
    dated January 28, 2013
Email from Susan Kalter to Chairperson Lind, dated February 5, 2013
ASPT Calendar 2013-2014, by Category of Activity, DRAFT
ASPT Calendar 2013-2014, Chronological, All Activities, DRAFT

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dan Holland, Chair, Academic Senate
        Susan Kalter, Academic Senator

FROM: Nancy S. Lind, University Review Committee Chair

DATE: January 28, 2013

The University Review Committee met on January 25, 2013 to address the issues raised by the Academic Senate regarding the use of "Digital Measures" as an electronic reporting mechanism for ASPT purposes.

The University Review Committee believes that ASPT Article I.D., on confidentiality, applies to any technology used in ASPT processes, including faculty performance reporting. All information and supporting narrative, while integral to the faculty evaluation process, should be submitted in a manner consistent with Article I.D. regardless of the technology used. The University Review Committee does not view use of digital reporting technologies, whether hosted by third party vendors or not, as inherently violating Article I.D. Indeed, the use of digital reporting technologies is encouraged by ASPT Policies and may be required by DFSC/SFSC guidelines consistent with Article VII.D. subject to the stated exception that "items difficult or impossible to document electronically may be submitted directly." With regard to departments or schools using digital reporting technologies, the committee finds nothing in ASPT policies to prohibit a faculty member from entering his or her own faculty performance information rather than having someone else, such as a student worker, enter it on behalf of the faculty member. It would be the faculty members' responsibility to inform the Chair when they want to enter their own data and to do so consistent with ASPT VII.D. that allows departments and schools to mandate the use of technology in preparing the ASPT report. More generally, the faculty may introduce language in the DFSC/SFSC guidelines prescribing procedures aimed at preserving confidentiality of the ASPT process, provided that such language is consistent with ASPT VII.D.

In sum, the concerns raised are interpreted by the URC to be local implementation issues, best handled at the department level, and do not violate (nor necessitate revision of) current ASPT policies.

c: Cynthia James

The following attachment has been redacted from the version of this document posted on the University Review Committee Minutes website.

Email from Susan Kalter to Chairperson Lind, dated February 5, 2013

CALENDAR FOR PROMOTION & TENURE

This calendar for 2013-2014 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, approved May 2011, effective January 1, 2012, and amended on December 19, 2011, and August 14, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies.*

ASPT Policies prescribes that If the University is officially closed on any date for action described in the policies, the action scheduled for that date must be completed on the next working day after the closing. Entries in the "Date for 2013-2014" column of this calendar have been modified to comply with that provision where necessary.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per A*SPT Policies*
Friday, November 1, 2013	November 1	Candidates for promotion and tenure must file application materials. In those situations in which a faculty member chooses to extend a shortened probationary period, notification to add the credited years or a portion of the credited years to the probationary period shall be made to the Department/School Chairperson/Director prior to November 1 of the year previously scheduled for the summative review for tenure.
Prior to Monday, December 16, 2013	Prior to December 15	DFSC/SFSC may notify promotion and tenure candidates and the CFSC, in writing, of recommendations at any time prior to December 15, but must notify candidates of intended recommendations at least 10 working days prior to submitting the final DFSC/SFSC recommendations to the CFSC. The DFSC/SFSC must provide opportunity, if requested, for the candidates to hold a formal meeting with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting of the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) working days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.
Monday, December 16, 2013	December 15	DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to the candidates and to the CFSC.

	CALENDAR FOR PROMOTION & TENURE *(continued)*	
Date for 2013-2014	**Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1**	**Action per *ASPT Policies***
Monday, February 3, 2014	February 1	CFSC must notify candidates of intended recommendations and provide opportunity, if requested, for candidates to meet with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the CFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting with the CFSC within 10 working days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.D.
Monday, March 3, 2014	March 1	CFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to the Provost, DFSC/SFSC, and candidates.
Monday, March 17, 2014	March 15	In the event of a negative recommendation by the DFSC/SFSC or the CFSC, a candidate who wishes a University-wide appeal of his/her credentials must file a request for a review by the Faculty Review Committee (FRC).
Friday, March 21, 2014	March 21	Provost's recommendation for non-appealed candidates must be reported to the President, CFSC, DFSC/SFSC, and candidates.
Tuesday, April 15, 2014	April 15	The FRC must complete its review of promotion and tenure appeals and report to the President, candidate, DFSC/SFSCs, CFSCs, and Provost unless an interim report is appropriate under provisions of Article XIII.F.3.
Wednesday, April 30, 2014	April 30	Provost's decision for appealed cases must be reported to the President, candidates, DFSC/SFSC and CFSC.
Thursday, May 15, 2014	May 15	Notifications of the promotion and tenure decisions by the President shall be sent to the candidates, CFSCs, DFSC/SFSCs, and the Provost.

CALENDAR FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REVIEW

This calendar for 2013-2014 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, approved May 2011, effective January 1, 2012, and amended on December 19, 2011, and August 14, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

ASPT Policies prescribes that If the University is officially closed on any date for action described in the policies, the action scheduled for that date must be completed on the next working day after the closing. Entries in the "Date for 2013-2014" column of this calendar have been modified to comply with that provision where necessary.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per *ASPT Policies*
Monday, January 6, 2014	January 5	All faculty members eligible for performance-evaluation salary increment must submit files in support of their request for performance-evaluation adjustments.
Monday, February 3, 2014	February 1	DFSC/SFSC recommendations for performance evaluation must be reported to the faculty member by February 1 in each year that the faculty member is performance-evaluation eligible. DFSC/SFSC must notify faculty members of intended recommendations to CFSC at least 10 working days before submitting these recommendations to CFSC and provide opportunity, if requested, for the faculty members to meet with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the faculty member wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, then the faculty member must request a meeting with the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) working days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.B.
Monday, February 17, 2014	February 15	DFSC/SFSC must transmit final recommendation for performance-evaluation review to the faculty member and to the CFSC.
Monday, March 3, 2014	March 1	Faculty members must file with the CFSC* any appeal of the DFSC/SFSC performance-evaluation recommendation. (* FRC in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC)
Monday, March 31, 2014	March 31	All appeals to the CFSC* of performance-evaluation recommendations must be completed and CFSC* decisions reported to the Provost and to the faculty member. Appeals will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.H. (* FRC in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC)

CALENDAR FOR CUMULATIVE POST-TENURE REVIEW

This calendar for 2013-2014 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, approved May 2011, effective January 1, 2012, and amended on December 19, 2011, and August 14, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

ASPT Policies prescribes that If the University is officially closed on any date for action described in the policies, the action scheduled for that date must be completed on the next working day after the closing. Entries in the "Date for 2013-2014" column of this calendar have been modified to comply with that provision where necessary.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per *ASPT Policies*
Monday, January 6, 2014	January 5	All faculty members scheduled for cumulative post-tenure review must submit their materials.
Monday, February 17, 2014	February 15	The DFSC/SFSC must inform the faculty member of cumulative post-tenure review evaluation and, if applicable, a plan for remediation.
Tuesday, February 25, 2014	February 25	Faculty member's last day to request meeting with DFSC/SFSC to consider DFSC/SFSC response and/or remediation plan.
Monday, March 10, 2014	March 8	DFSC/SFSC gives final outcome of review and/or remediation plan to faculty member.
Monday, March 24, 2014	March 22	A faculty member must file, to the CFSC chairperson, a written appeal to the cumulative post-tenure review. The CFSC chairperson shall acknowledge receipt of the appeal to the appellant and the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) working days. Appeals will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.I.
Tuesday, April 15, 2014	April 15	Each CFSC shall submit to each appellant faculty member and to the appropriate DFSC/SFSC a written report that describes the disposition of the cumulative post-tenure review appeal.

CALENDAR FOR REAPPOINTMENT

This calendar for 2013-2014 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, approved May 2011, effective January 1, 2012, and amended on December 19, 2011, and August 14, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

ASPT Policies prescribes that If the University is officially closed on any date for action described in the policies, the action scheduled for that date must be completed on the next working day after the closing. Entries in the "Date for 2013-2014" column of this calendar have been modified to comply with that provision where necessary.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per A*SPT Policies*
Monday, February 3, 2014	February 1	Provost issues notification of non-reappointment by February 1 to faculty member in the second academic year of service, notifying candidate that the last employment date is May 15 or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
Monday, March 3, 2014	March 1	Provost's notification of non-reappointment must be given by March 1 to candidate in the first year of service, notifying candidate that last employment date is May 15 or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.
Thursday, May 15, 2014	At least 12 months before the termination of an appointment after two (2) or more years of service	Provost notifies third and subsequent year faculty members who will not be reappointed, 12 months before the termination of the appointment, that the candidate's last employment date is May 15 of the following year. If the appointment is at least 12 months and terminates during an academic year, notification must take place at least 12 months in advance of the end of the appointment period.

CALENDAR FOR REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

This calendar for 2013-2014 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, approved May 2011, effective January 1, 2012, and amended on December 19, 2011, and August 14, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

ASPT Policies prescribes that If the University is officially closed on any date for action described in the policies, the action scheduled for that date must be completed on the next working day after the closing. Entries in the "Date for 2013-2014" column of this calendar have been modified to comply with that provision where necessary.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per A*SPT Policies*
Thursday, May 1, 2014	May 1	Each CFSC shall submit an annual report (Promotion and Tenure) to its College Council and the URC (Article IV.D.). Also, each CFSC shall submit an annual written report to the URC and the Provost that enumerates all cumulative post-tenure review appeals and describes their disposition (see XIII.I.9).
Thursday, May 1, 2014	May 1	The fifth-year review of College Standards or, in the interim, proposed revisions to College Standards must be submitted to the URC.
Thursday, May 1, 2014	May 1	The FRC shall submit to the URC a final report summarizing the number of appeals by Department/School and College, the type of appeals, and the disposition of these appeals (see Article III.F).

CALENDAR FOR ASPT ELECTIONS
(for 2014-2015 Academic Year)

This calendar for 2013-2014 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, approved May 2011, effective January 1, 2012, and amended on December 19, 2011, and August 14, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

ASPT Policies prescribes that If the University is officially closed on any date for action described in the policies, the action scheduled for that date must be completed on the next working day after the closing. Entries in the "Date for 2013-2014" column of this calendar have been modified to comply with that provision where necessary.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per A*SPT Policies*
Tuesday, April 15, 2014	April 15	Members of the University Review Committee, Faculty Review Committee, and College Faculty Status Committee must have been elected.
Thursday, May 1, 2014	May 1	Members of the Department/School Faculty Status Committee must have been elected.

This calendar for 2013-2014 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, approved May 2011, effective January 1, 2012, and amended on December 19, 2011, and August 14, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

ASPT Policies prescribes that If the University is officially closed on any date for action described in the policies, the action scheduled for that date must be completed on the next working day after the closing. Entries in the "Date for 2013-2014" column of this calendar have been modified to comply with that provision where necessary.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per *ASPT Policies*
Friday, November 1, 2013	November 1	**Promotion & Tenure**: Candidates for promotion and tenure must file application materials. In those situations in which a faculty member chooses to extend a shortened probationary period, notification to add the credited years or a portion of the credited years to the probationary period shall be made to the Department/School Chairperson/Director prior to November 1 of the year previously scheduled for the summative review for tenure.
Prior to Monday, December 16, 2013	Prior to December 15	**Promotion & Tenure:** DFSC/SFSC may notify promotion and tenure candidates and the CFSC, in writing, of recommendations at any time prior to December 15, but must notify candidates of intended recommendations at least 10 working days prior to submitting the final DFSC/SFSC recommendations to the CFSC. The DFSC/SFSC must provide opportunity, if requested, for the candidates to hold a formal meeting with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting of the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) working days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.
Monday, December 16, 2013	December 15	**Promotion & Tenure:** DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to the candidates and to the CFSC.
Monday, January 6, 2014	January 5	**Performance Evaluation Review**: All faculty members eligible for performance-evaluation salary increment must submit files in support of their request for performance-evaluation adjustments.
Monday, January 6, 2014	January 5	**Cumulative Post-Tenure Review:** All faculty members scheduled for cumulative post-tenure review must submit their materials.
Monday, February 3, 2014	February 1	**Promotion & Tenure:** CFSC must notify candidates of intended recommendations and provide opportunity, if requested, for candidates to meet with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the CFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting with the CFSC within 10 working days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per *ASPT Policies*
		provisions of Article XIII.D.
Monday, February 3, 2014	February 1	**Reappointment:** Provost issues notification of non-reappointment by February 1 to faculty member in the second academic year of service, notifying candidate that the last employment date is May 15 or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
Monday, February 3, 2014	February 1	**Performance Evaluation Review**: DFSC/SFSC recommendations for performance evaluation must be reported to the faculty member by February 1 in each year that the faculty member is performance-evaluation eligible. DFSC/SFSC must notify faculty members of intended recommendations to CFSC at least 10 working days before submitting these recommendations to CFSC and provide opportunity, if requested, for the faculty members to meet with the committee to discuss these recommendations. If the faculty member wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, then the faculty member must request a meeting with the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) working days of receiving the recommendation. Formal meetings will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.B.
Monday, February 17, 2014	February 15	**Performance Evaluation Review**: DFSC/SFSC must transmit final recommendation for performance-evaluation review to the faculty member and to the CFSC.
Monday, February 17, 2014	February 15	**Cumulative Post-Tenure Review:** The DFSC/SFSC must inform the faculty member of cumulative post-tenure review evaluation and, if applicable, a plan for remediation.
Tuesday, February 25, 2014	February 25	**Cumulative Post-Tenure Review:** Faculty member's last day to request meeting with DFSC/SFSC to consider DFSC/SFSC response and/or remediation plan.
Monday, March 3, 2014	March 1	**Promotion & Tenure**: CFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to the Provost, DFSC/SFSC, and candidates.
Monday, March 3, 2014	March 1	**Reappointment:** Provost's notification of non-reappointment must be given by March 1 to candidate in the first year of service, notifying candidate that last employment date is May 15 or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per *ASPT Policies*
Monday, March 3, 2014	March 1	**Performance Evaluation Review**: Faculty members must file with the CFSC* any appeal of the DFSC/SFSC performance-evaluation recommendation. (* FRC in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC)
Monday, March 10, 2014	March 8	**Cumulative Post-Tenure Review:** DFSC/SFSC gives final outcome of review and/or remediation plan to faculty member.
Monday, March 17, 2014	March 15	**Promotion & Tenure:** In the event of a negative recommendation by the DFSC/SFSC or the CFSC, a candidate who wishes a University-wide appeal of his/her credentials must file a request for a review by the Faculty Review Committee (FRC).
Friday, March 21, 2014	March 21	**Promotion & Tenure:** Provost's recommendation for non-appealed candidates must be reported to the President, CFSC, DFSC/SFSC, and candidates.
Monday, March 24, 2014	March 22	**Cumulative Post-Tenure Review:** A faculty member must file, to the CFSC chairperson, a written appeal to the cumulative post-tenure review. The CFSC chairperson shall acknowledge receipt of the appeal to the appellant and the DFSC/SFSC within five (5) working days. Appeals will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.I.
Monday, March 31, 2014	March 31	**Performance Evaluation Review**: All appeals to the CFSC* of performance-evaluation recommendations must be completed and CFSC* decisions reported to the Provost and to the faculty member. Appeals will be held under the provisions of Article XIII.H. (* FRC in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC)
Tuesday, April 15, 2014	April 15	**Promotion & Tenure:** The FRC must complete its review of promotion and tenure appeals and report to the President, candidates, DFSC/SFSCs, CFSCs, and Provost unless an interim report is appropriate under provisions of Article XIII.F.3.
Tuesday, April 15, 2014	April 15	**Cumulative Post-Tenure Review:** Each CFSC shall submit to each appellant faculty member and to the appropriate DFSC/SFSC a written report that describes the disposition of the cumulative post-tenure review appeal.
Tuesday, April 15, 2014	April 15	**ASPT Elections:** Members of the University Review Committee, Faculty Review Committee, and College Faculty Status Committee must have been elected.
Wednesday April 30, 2014	April 30	**Promotion & Tenure:** Provost's decision for appealed cases must be reported to the President, candidates, DFSC/SFSC and CFSC.

17

Date for 2013-2014	Date per *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 1	Action per *ASPT Policies*
Thursday, May 1, 2014	May 1	**Reporting Requirements (CFSC):** Each CFSC shall submit an annual report (Promotion and Tenure) to its College Council and the URC (Article IV.D.). Also, each CFSC shall submit an annual written report to the URC and the Provost that enumerates all cumulative post-tenure review appeals and describes their disposition (see Article XIII.I.9).
Thursday, May 1, 2014	May 1	**Reporting Requirements (CFSC):** The fifth-year review of College Standards or, in the interim, proposed revisions to College Standards must be submitted to the URC.
Thursday, May 1, 2014	May 1	**ASPT Elections:** Members of the Department/School Faculty Status Committee must have been elected.
Thursday, May 1, 2014	May 1	**Reporting Requirements (FRC):** The FRC shall submit to the URC a final report summarizing the number of appeals by Department/School and College, the type of appeals, and the disposition of these appeals (see Article III.F).
Thursday, May 15, 2014	May 15	**Promotion & Tenure:** Notifications of the promotion and tenure decisions by the President shall be sent to the candidates, CFSCs, DFSC/SFSCs, and the Provost.
Thursday, May 15, 2014	At least 12 months before the termination of an appointment after two (2) or more years of service	**Reappointment:** Provost notifies third and subsequent year faculty members who will not be reappointed, 12 months before the termination of the appointment, that the candidate's last employment date is May 15 of the following year. If the appointment is at least 12 months and terminates during an academic year, notification must take place at least 12 months in advance of the end of the appointment period.

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Friday, March 1, 2013
12 p.m., Hovey 401D

MINUTES

Members present: Cyndee Brown, Sam Catanzaro (ex officio), Phil Chidester, Domingo Joaquin, Chad Kahl, David Rubin

Members not attending: Nancy Lind, Ron Meier

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

Vice Chairperson Chad Kahl called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

I.   Approval of minutes from the February 8, 2013 meeting

         Cyndee Brown moved approval of minutes from the February 8, 2013 meeting. David Rubin
         seconded the motion. The motion carried.

II.   Digital storage of confidential ASPT data and use of vendors: Request for URC Guidance

         Committee members reviewed the discussion that occurred at the February 8 committee
         meeting regarding use of Digital Measures and other digital reporting technologies,
         specifically the issues raised by Susan Kalter on behalf of her colleagues in the Department of
         English.

         Brown asked what the committee charge is related to this issue and what Kalter was hoping for
         from URC after the February 8 meeting.

         Sam Catanzaro suggested that URC send Kalter a memorandum to address questions and
         concerns she raised at the February 8 meeting. The memorandum could clarify points made in
         the January 28, 2013 memorandum from Chairperson Lind to Academic Senate Chairperson
         Dan Holland and Kalter regarding this matter. A second memorandum could elaborate on
         points made in the first one or alter its content. Whatever the committee decides, the intent of
         the second memorandum should be clearly stated, Catanzaro suggested. One by-product of this
         discussion, he said, might be clarification that faculty productivity data is important and may
         be used by a department for reporting in the aggregate.

         Kahl said that Kalter was asking about three issues. First, she suggested that the department
         chairperson should be responsible for notifying faculty members when someone is entering
         confidential data on their behalf rather than placing responsibility on the faculty member to
         notify the department chairperson when they want to enter their own data. Second, she asked if
         URC can protect faculty members not wanting to use Digital Measures. Third, she asked if
         faculty members could submit two ASPT-related reports to their DFSC, one with confidential
         information and one with non-confidential information.

         David Rubin asked whether URC should be addressing this issue since faculty members in
         only one department have expressed concern about it. Phil Chidester said that this seems to be
         an issue of implementation in one department. That department should not have given

confidential data to students and asked them to enter it into Digital Measures. Chidester suggested revising the passage in the January 28 memorandum regarding data entry to read, "It is incumbent on department chairs to ensure confidentiality when that is a concern, including in reports, such as use of graduate students to enter data." Catanzaro said that it is not known if other faculty members in other departments/schools share these concerns, as no votes have been taken to his knowledge. Catanzaro suggested that URC focus on broader issues rather than concern itself with the specific instance of this one department.

Committee members discussed Kalter's suggestion that faculty information be reported to DFSCs in two documents, one with confidential information and one with non-confidential information. Chidester noted that information entered into Digital Measures is substantially different from data submitted in DFSC documents. Data entered into Digital Measures is for faculty productivity reports and is public information.

Rubin noted that only public information is extracted from Digital Measures by the University for reporting purposes and then only in aggregate form. At the heart of this matter is the lack of understanding among some faculty members regarding how faculty productivity reports are used. In the absence of this information, some faculty members have expressed the desire for more input regarding what goes into the system, he said.

Brown asked if Digital Measures is designed to accept only non-confidential data. Catanzaro responded that Digital Measures is intended to be used to collect only non-confidential data but that the system could be configured to accept information that is confidential. Joaquin said that a department chairperson has latitude when implementing a matter related to DFSC policies and procedures if the DFSC document is not specific enough on the matter. But faculty members may vote to put language in their DFSC document to address any concerns they have.

Because faculty productivity reporting is related to ASPT, each department may address these issues through its own ASPT processes, Brown said. Chidester agreed, proposing that URC communicate that, "Because Digital Measures is not set up to accept confidential information and because performance review information is submitted separately, use of Digital Measures does not violate ASPT policies. Each department can determine how annual ASPT documents are to be submitted." Kahl suggested adding to language suggested by Chidester so it reads, "It is incumbent on department chairs to ensure confidentiality when that is a concern, including in reports, such as use of graduate students to enter data. DFSC guidelines can be written to ensure that the chairperson does so. In the case of Digital Measures, attention should be given to data that is confidential and data that can be shared."

Committee members asked Kahl to work with Catanzaro on a draft memorandum based on discussion at this meeting and then share the draft with committee members to get their input prior to sending anything to Holland and Kalter.

III.   Other business

Catanzaro announced that Dean Greg Simpson of the College of Arts and Sciences has submitted revisions of CAS College Standards for review by URC. Catanzaro will be in contact with Chairperson Lind about scheduling committee review of the revisions.

IV.   Adjournment

Chidester moved to adjourn the meeting. Joaquin seconded the motion. The motion carried.
The meeting adjourned at 12:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joaquin Domingo, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

NEXT MEETING: 12 p.m., Friday, May 3

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Friday, May 3, 2013
12 p.m., Hovey 209

MINUTES

Members present: Sam Catanzaro (ex officio), Phil Chidester, Domingo Joaquin, Nancy Lind, Ron Meier, David Rubin

Members not attending: Cyndee Brown, Chad Kahl

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

Chairperson Nancy Lind called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. in Hovey 209. The meeting had been relocated from its planned location (Hovey 302) due to a room conflict.

I.   Approval of minutes from the March 1, 2013 meeting

        Ron Meier moved approval of minutes from the March 1, 2013 meeting. Phil Chidester
        seconded the motion. The motion carried.

II.   Updates

        Digital storage of confidential ASPT data and use of vendors

        Lind announced that she and Vice Chairperson Chad Kahl sent a memorandum (see attached
        memorandum dated March 21, 2013) to Academic Senate Chairperson Dan Holland and
        Academic Senator Susan Kalter regarding discussion by URC of issues raised by Senator
        Kalter about digital storage of confidential ASPT data and use of digital reporting software.
        Sam Catanzaro said that no response has been received from Chairperson Holland or Senator
        Kalter regarding the memorandum. Lind said that the matter has presumably been resolved for
        the year.

        Lind announced that the URC approved changes to ASPT College Standards proposed by the
        College of Arts and Sciences via email vote (see the attached memorandum from Lind to Dean
        Greg Simpson).

III.   Action item: CFSC annual reports

        Committee members reviewed 2012-2013 CFSC annual reports submitted by each college (see
        attached). Catanzaro explained that a new reporting form was used this year, more closely
        aligned with reporting requirements in the latest ASPT document. Meier remarked that the
        form is longer than in past years, requiring more paper. Catanzaro said that changes will
        continue to be made based on comments received from the colleges and from URC and that an
        online format may be developed in coming years.

        Committee members reviewed each report, noting possible minor errors in reports submitted
        by the College of Education, the College of Fine Arts, and Milner Library. Catanzaro indicated
        that he would contact the respective deans to verify the data that has been provided. Meier
        moved to approve the seven CFSC annual reports subject to data verification by Catanzaro.

David Rubin seconded the motion. The motion carried. Catanzaro indicated that he would email committee members once he has verified the data.

IV.   Other business

Catanzaro noted that URC terms of Chairperson Lind, Vice Chairperson Chad Kahl, and member Cyndee Brown expire at the end of the spring semester. Consequently, this is their last meeting while members of committee. Catanzaro thanked the three outgoing members for their service, including service by Lind as committee chairperson.

V.   Adjournment

Lind adjourned the meeting at 12:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joaquin Domingo, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

Memorandum dated March 21, 2013, from Nancy S. Lind and Chad M. Kahl to Dan Holland and Susan Kalter re confidentiality and digital reporting technologies

Memorandum dated April 17, 2013, from Nancy Lind to Greg Simpson re review college standards

CFSC Annual Reports (with post-meeting revisions):
College of Applied Science and Technology
College of Arts and Sciences
College of Business
College of Education
College of Fine Arts
Mennonite College of Nursing
University Libraries

THIS IS THE LAST MEETING OF THE 2012-2013 ACADEMIC YEAR

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

MEMORANDUM

March 21, 2013

TO: Dan Holland, Academic Senate Chairperson
Susan Kalter, Academic Senator

FROM: Nancy S. Lind, University Review Committee Chairperson
Chad M. Kahl, University Review Committee Vice-Chairperson

RE: Confidentiality and digital reporting technologies

The University Review Committee met on March 1, 2013 to address the issues raised by Senator Kalter in her visit to the Committee on February 8, 2013.

To reiterate, as noted in the January 28, 2013 memorandum, "The University Review Committee does not view use of digital reporting technologies, whether hosted by third party vendors or not, as inherently violating Article I.D." Concerns raised by Dr. Kalter focused on both the content of and manner in which Faculty Performance Report data were entered into *Digital Measures*, a digital reporting technology provided by a third-party vendor. With the use of digital reporting technologies, it is incumbent upon the department chairs/school directors to implement departmental policies in a manner that guarantees confidentiality. Department chairs/school directors should notify faculty members of their right to enter their own faculty performance information into a digital reporting technology. In cases where data entry is performed by individuals other than the faculty member, DFSC/SFSC guidelines may provide direction on how to ensure confidentiality when information from Faculty Performance Reports is entered into a digital interface by individuals other than the faculty member. Although digital reporting technologies offer different data entry and retrieval possibilities, university, college, and department/school administrators have gathered and reported non-confidential information in aggregate form use prior to the use of these technologies.

brs

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

MEMORANDUM

April 17, 2013

TO: Greg Simpson, Dean
           College of Arts and Sciences

FROM: Nancy Lind, Chair
           University Review Committee

RE: Review of College Standards

Greetings, Dean Simpson.

The University Review Committee (URC) has reviewed the recently revised College of Arts and Sciences Standards (Effective January 2014). The URC agrees that the revised standards adhere to policies set forth in the Faculty Appointment Salary Promotion and Tenure Policies (ASPT). URC approved the revised standards on April 10, 2013.

Your new college standards, including a notation of URC approval, are attached. I have also asked Bruce Stoffel, URC recorder, to send you this document as an email attachment.

Please post these revised standards on your college website.

brs

attachment

FACULTY APPOINTMENT, SALARY, PROMOTION, AND TENURE (ASPT) STANDARDS

College of Arts and Sciences

January 2014

The College of Arts and Sciences is committed to a system of faculty evaluation and compensation that promotes the highest quality professional work by faculty. The College standards are meant to encourage departments/schools to set high expectations for faculty performance and to offer appropriate rewards to faculty based upon their accomplishments in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service that genuinely advance the mission of the department/school and the University.

The most important principle of effective faculty evaluation is peer review. The strongest evidence of performance in the area of scholarship and creative activity comes from one's peers within the discipline. Generally, the best judges of the quality of such work are those who have similar academic interests and whose judgments influence dissemination in appropriate scholarly or creative venues. The best evaluators of the quality of a faculty member's teaching and service are peers within the academic department.

POLICIES

CFSC members may participate in, be present at, and vote in ASPT deliberations (including appeals) involving individuals from their own departments/schools. However, requests to have a CFSC member recused (regardless of departmental/school affiliation of the member) can be made by the applicant or by the Chair/Director/DFSC/SFSC of the department/school. Persons making such a request must provide the Dean a brief written explanation. These requests will be considered by the Dean and the CFSC on a case-by-case basis. A CFSC member may recuse herself/himself at any time without explanation.

Individuals may not serve on CFSC the year they are being considered for Tenure, Promotion, Distinguished or University Professor.

PROMOTION AND TENURE

Evaluation of the professional performance of faculty cannot be reduced to simple numeric standards. D/SFSCs and the CFSC must make judgments about the overall quality of a candidate's performance in accordance with the unit's "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" standards as these committees make recommendations on promotion and tenure. Given these assumptions, the following standards should apply in considering all applications for promotion and tenure within the College:

To qualify for promotion or tenure, a faculty member must exhibit sustained and consistent high quality performance in all faculty roles.

1. Each candidate for promotion or tenure must present evidence of high quality achievements in teaching, validated by careful peer review by tenure line faculty within the department. Each candidate for promotion or tenure will prepare a teaching portfolio, including a summary of student teaching evaluation results placed in the context of departmental norms, a summary of the results of a second departmentally determined method of evaluating teaching and examples of course material. The portfolio also may include a reflective statement of teaching philosophy and evidence of student learning based upon the candidate's work. It is the responsibility of the D/SFSC to provide a written evaluation of this portfolio.

2. Each candidate for promotion or tenure must present high-quality scholarly or creative works. These works may have appeared in any medium, but the scholarly or creative works will have been subject to external peer review appropriate to the venue. Successful scholarly or creative records normally also include additional evidence of scholarly productivity demonstrated by activities such as conference papers, performances, or invited addresses or funded external grants.

3. Each candidate for promotion or tenure must present evidence of consequential service activities.

4. The scholarship of each candidate for promotion or tenure will be evaluated by at least three and no more than six scholars from his or her discipline and external to Illinois State University. Guidelines for conducting the review will be developed by each department and added to the department's ASPT standards document.

5. The College regards the customary six-year probationary period in rank as an opportunity to observe a candidate's sustained performance in teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service before awarding promotion and tenure. For this reason, an early record of extraordinary scholarship is not in itself sufficient to warrant promotion to the rank of associate professor before the awarding of tenure. Early promotion is unusual in the College and shall occur only when the candidate has exhibited an extraordinary scholarly record, an exceptional record of teaching performance, and appropriate service.

6. Each candidate for promotion or tenure will undergo a mid-probationary tenure review conducted by the D/SFSC in the candidate's third or fourth year in order to assess the candidate's progress toward tenure.

Written departmental assignments for faculty may emphasize one of the faculty roles over others for purposes of evaluation. However, all candidates for promotion or tenure must have a record that includes peer-reviewed scholarly or creative works, and strong teaching.

To ensure uniformity in the presentation of information on candidates for promotion or tenure, all D/SFSCs shall utilize the College format for documentation of promotion and tenure cases.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Departmental/school guidelines for the annual performance review of faculty should reflect the strategic directions and values of the department/school. These guidelines should be designed to recognize faculty contributions in both short-term and long-term performance.

Faculty's overall annual performance will be evaluated in accordance with "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" standards developed by each department/school's Faculty Status Committee (D/SFSC). Departments/schools may choose to provide separate assessments of faculty performance in each evaluation category (teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service) as either "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory," but must provide an overall assessment as well (VII.E., p. 25-26).

Annual performance review of faculty should be consistent with the annual assignment letters provided to each faculty member by the department chair/director. Assignment letters should include information on the faculty member's teaching load for the year, the amount of time assigned to scholarly and creative activities, and any other assignments expected to utilize significant portions of a faculty member's time.

SALARY REVIEW

Annual salary review should be directed toward ensuring that faculty salaries are consistent with performance and contributions to the department, in both the short term and the long term.

The department chair/director serves as chair of the D/SFSC, is usually the member of the D/SFSC with the longest continuous tenure, and is not personally affected by the outcome of the departmental salary process. Therefore, the chair/director shall be responsible with presenting to the D/SFSC a set of recommendations regarding the distribution of increment funds. The D/SFSC is responsible for input and final approval of salary recommendations.

The College Standards were approved by the CFSC, February 18, 2013.

The College Standards were approved by the University Review Committee, April 10, 2013.

The following attachments have been redacted from the version of this document posted on the University Review Committee Minutes website.

CFSC Annual Reports (with post-meeting revisions):
College of Applied Science and Technology
College of Arts and Sciences
College of Business
College of Education
College of Fine Arts
Mennonite College of Nursing
University Libraries