

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 *NSL*
Chad M. Kahl, University Review Committee Vice-Chairperson *CMK*

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