

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Thursday, April 3, 2014

3 p.m., Hovey 302

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Phil Chidester, Doris Houston, Sheryl Jenkins, Domingo Joaquin, Bill O'Donnell, David Rubin, James Wolf, Sam Catanzaro (ex officio non-voting)

Members not attending: Diane Dean

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

I. Call to order

Chairperson David Rubin called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

II. Approval of minutes from the March 21, 2014, meeting

Sheryl Jenkins moved, Doris Houston seconded approval of minutes from the March 21, 2014, meeting. Chairperson Rubin declared the minutes approved.

III. Old business: Suspension/dismissal policy (status update)

Sam Catanzaro reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate continues to discuss the draft policy and will likely conclude its discussions next academic year. However, the schedule for Academic Senate review of the policy may be impacted in part by priorities of the person named to replace Provost Everts (who has been named chancellor of Appalachian State University and will be leaving Illinois State University as the end of this fiscal year). Catanzaro said that he wants to move the policy forward through the review and approval process, but whether and when that occurs are decisions to be made by others.

IV. Discussion items: ASPT Policies

A. Changes discussed at the March 21, 2014, meeting

Catanzaro reported that he has been working on drafts of ASPT Policies changes recommended by the committee at its March 21 meeting. He is reviewing some passages with legal counsel before completing his drafts.

Catanzaro noted a related issue that he discovered while drafting the new passages. Initiation of a non-reappointment recommendation appeal, as described in XIII.J, does not have a provision for a formal meeting. Catanzaro asked committee members to ponder this and recommend whether such a provision should be added.

B. Alignment of sections related to performance evaluation

Section V.C - DFSC/SFSC Responsibility for Review of Department/School Faculty

Rubin asked what happens when DFSC/SFSC standards change during a faculty member's probationary period. When the DFSC/SFSC considers a faculty member's application for tenure and promotion, does the committee apply standards in place at the time the faculty member is hired or the standards in place at the time the faculty member applies for tenure and promotion? Catanzaro responded that standards applicable at the time the faculty member was hired are not used. If they were, multiple sets of standards would be at play. If faculty is concerned about the impact of changes in ASPT standards on probationary faculty members, faculty should consider those concerns when deciding whether to amend the standards. Domingo Joaquin noted that a grandfather clause could be included in DFSC standards when they are revised, as has happened in his unit. Catanzaro stated that this can be done, citing an example related to external reviews.

Related to V.C.II.D., Rubin asked how committees can limit use of innuendo in the performance review process. Catanzaro said that the only anonymous input allowed in the performance evaluation process is anonymous input provided in state-mandated student evaluations of courses.

Phil Chidester noted that V.C.II.C, regarding post-tenure review, does not include a timeline for when and how post-tenure reviews should be conducted. Catanzaro said that post-tenure review is required by law. ASPT Policies are silent as to a timeline for post-tenure reviews to allow units to adopt their own post-tenure review policies to best meet their needs. ASPT Policies provide guidance regarding a timeline for post-tenure review in only one instance, mandating post-tenure review if a faculty member receives an overall unsatisfactory rating two out of three years.

Section VII – Faculty Assignments and Faculty Evaluation

Rubin noted that passages related to faculty assignments do not address equity. He explained that some types of activities in his unit are counted as meeting service assignments while others are not. Policies seem to change by the year, he said. For example, involvement with a community group may count toward service one year but not another, he said. Catanzaro suggested that conversations regarding such matters need to happen on the unit level. ASPT Policies are appropriately vague regarding assignments to provide units flexibility in designing systems and processes that best meet their needs.

Bill O'Donnell suggested changing wording in VII.A from "... faculty assignments shall be designed not to inhibit faculty members from contributing in all three areas ..." to wording that is more positive, such as "... faculty assignments shall be designed to support faculty members' contributions in all three areas ..." Other committee members agreed.

Section XII – Performance Evaluation Policies and Salary Incrementation Procedures

Regarding XII.A.2.c, O'Donnell asked if the process for allocating salary increments among faculty members can be standardized across all units. Catanzaro explained that the

salary increment allocation process varies by unit. Some units have adopted a ranking system, and some use a point system, he said.

Rubin asked if the provision in XII.A.2.a, precluding a faculty member with an overall unsatisfactory performance rating from receiving an incremental raise, refers to both a cost-of-living adjustment and a merit raise. Catanzaro clarified that it does. Rubin asked how often this happens. Catanzaro responded that it is rare, perhaps five instances per year.

Rubin asked if there is any way the policies can be revised to prevent salary compression. Catanzaro responded that salary compression will likely be an ongoing issue. It is an issue that cannot likely be prevented but can be managed. Salary increases associated with promotions are intended to help address compression. Units are allowed to set aside a portion of incremental salary funds for equity increases, however units must provide for this practice in DFSC/SFSC standards approved by faculty vote. Joaquin noted that equity increases tend to be so small as to be insignificant in addressing compression. Catanzaro agreed, noting that a common strategy in dealing with compression is to address a specific occurrence over several years, a little each year.

Committee members discussed passages of XII and Appendix 2 related to evaluation of teaching performance. It was noted that Appendix 2, in the section headed “Factors Used for Evaluation of Teaching,” requires units to use two or more types of factors to evaluate teaching performance, one of which must be student reactions to teaching performance. However, XII does not include the same requirement. Doris Houston recommended that requirements for evaluation of teaching performance be consistent across all sections related to performance evaluation.

XIII.H – Initiation of a Performance-Evaluation Appeal

James Wolf said that repeated references to DFSC/SFSC and to Chairperson/Director throughout this section and throughout the document are distracting. He asked if other wording might be adopted to save space. Catanzaro said that he would investigate options.

C. Other sections identified by committee members for discussion

There were none.

V. Other business

There was none.

VI. Adjournment

Wolf moved to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Angela Bonnell, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

No attachments