

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Thursday, November 6, 2014
3 p.m., Hovey 209

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Phil Chidester, Diane Dean, Joe Goodman, Sheryl Jenkins, David Rubin, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting)

Members not present: Rick Boser, Doris Houston, Bill O'Donnell

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

I. Call to order

Chairperson Sheryl Jenkins called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

II. Approval of minutes from the October 23, 2014 meeting

Joe Goodman moved, Diane Dean seconded approval of minutes from the October 23, 2014 meeting. The motion carried.

III. Old business

Review of policies referred by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

Sam Catanzaro reported that he has been working on revisions to Policy 3.3.2 (Faculty Hiring Procedures) and Policy 3.2.19 (Right of Access to Personnel Files). He plans to have a draft of each policy ready for URC review by the end of the fall semester. The drafts will also need to be reviewed by other stakeholders including the Office of Human Resources.

ASPT Policies review

The committee continued its review of the document titled "ASPT Clarifications, Additions, and other Housekeeping," prepared by Catanzaro for discussion at the October 23, 2014, URC meeting (attached). Catanzaro asked if committee members had any thoughts or questions regarding sections of the document discussed at the October 23 meeting.

Referring to XII, pages 41-44 of the ASPT policies, Goodman asked how the University defines "year" for purposes of FMLA administration and compliance. He suggested adopting the calendar year for FMLA, since ASPT evaluations are based on performance during the calendar year. Catanzaro said he would investigate the matter.

Catanzaro discussed potential changes to XIII, pages 45-53. Catanzaro explained that chairpersons/directors voting in the minority in promotion or tenure cases before the DFSC/SFSC and deans voting in the minority in promotion or tenure cases before the CFSC are required to write a separate report indicating reasons for dissenting from the majority recommendation. XIII provides for appeal of such reports by the candidate, beginning with a formal meeting with the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC. However, there are no procedures in ASPT policies to guide establishment of a formal meeting. Catanzaro said that such a situation arose

a couple years ago, when a candidate sought to appeal a minority report by a dean. Catanzaro worked with the URC chairperson and the Academic Senate chairperson at the time to arrive at a procedure for establishing an alternative formal meeting with the dean. It was decided not to include in the meeting those CFSC members who had voted in favor of the candidate's application. Catanzaro said the five-year review of ASPT policies provides an opportunity to formalize the procedure. He said he has drafted such a procedure for URC consideration and will send the draft to committee members for their review. Jenkins said the committee will discuss the draft at its next meeting.

David Rubin asked if it is possible for someone to receive tenure but not promotion. Catanzaro responded that it was more common under prior editions of ASPT policies and is still possible but extremely unlikely.

Catanzaro then referred to his recommendations regarding Appendix 1 (on page three of his document). He noted that if the committee adopts his proposed changes to XIII to guide establishment of formal meetings regarding dean/chair/director reports, the committee will also need to consider modifying formal meeting timelines in Appendix 1. He suggested using the same timelines as those used for requests to meet with DFSC/SFSC and CFSC.

Jenkins asked why a five-day notice is required for requests to meet with a DFSC/SFSC while a ten-day notice is required for requests to meet with a CFSC. Catanzaro responded that the additional time is appropriate for CFSC since CFSC is typically a larger group and may need more time to prepare for a meeting. He added that this policy has worked well.

Catanzaro then discussed his recommendation to clarify notices in the event a candidate decides to appeal to the Faculty Review Committee. Wording of XIII.G.1, on page 48, and Appendix 1.B, on page 58, implies that "intent to file" is different from "request for review." Catanzaro suggested requiring a candidate to inform the FRC chairperson of the candidate's intent to file an appeal within five days of receiving the final recommendation and then requiring the candidate to file the formal appeal with FRC by March 15. Jenkins asked if email is an acceptable medium for filing the appeal. Catanzaro said that it is, since it is written and documented. Jenkins said that the appeals guidelines seem clear. Catanzaro responded that it might be best to clarify the guidelines if there is any chance of confusion, due to the high-stakes nature of promotion and tenure decisions.

Catanzaro then asked for direction from the committee regarding Appendix 2, criteria for evaluating teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service. He asked if any aspect of the appendix needs to be updated. He said that the wording in the appendix seems broad enough to be inclusive yet helpful in guiding faculty and ASPT committees responsible for evaluating faculty performance. He added that he has no specific recommendations for changes. Jenkins said that she found Appendix 2 helpful when she started at the University.

Dean said there has been talk on campus recently about making a distinction between service that is paid and service that is unpaid, with paid service not recognized in performance evaluations.

Dean asked about evaluation of administrators, if there is a point when faculty members performing administrative duties are no longer evaluated through the ASPT system. Catanzaro responded that, in most cases, faculty members who transfer into an academic/professional position are not evaluated through ASPT. The exception involves chairperson, directors, or deans who are candidates for promotion or tenure. In those instances the employee's dossier is

reviewed by DFSC/SFSC. Catanzaro noted that situations may differ across campus units. Angela Bonnell noted that at Milner Library the dean and associate deans are evaluated by the DFSC. Catanzaro noted that annual evaluations of faculty work by administrators are advisory to the administrators' supervisors (e.g., the dean in the case of an associate dean), who have responsibility for the official performance evaluation.

Phil Chidester suggested that faculty members might be evaluated against their faculty assignment rather than against general guidelines for evaluation. Catanzaro noted that VII.A of the ASPT policies sets forth that idea in principle. Chidester suggested referring to VII.A in Appendix 2, perhaps by adding a statement that "individuals are evaluated separately based on their faculty assignment." Dean agreed that such a statement would be helpful. Chidester will draft such a passage for review by the committee.

Dean asked if there issues related to online teaching that need to be addressed in Appendix 2. Chidester said that online courses should absolutely be addressed. He reported that teacher evaluation response rates for online courses in his unit are low. Low response rates may affect promotion and tenure decisions.

Bonnell suggested that college research coordinators should be asked for input regarding the scholarly and creative productivity section of Appendix 2. She noted that college research coordinators have talked about some of the criteria, such as writing research proposals. Perhaps John Baur should be asked for input as well, she added. Catanzaro said that he would do so.

Catanzaro suggested that it would be premature for ASPT policies to require faculty members to submit grant applications, but ASPT policies can address how grant activities are valued. That is best done locally, he said. Each DFSC/SFSC has to determine the value it places on submitting research grant applications, having an application disapproved or approved, and producing outcomes from a grant-funded project. There may be a concern in some units that grant application preparation may consumer time better spent by faculty on research, he added. Rubin noted that the manner in which research proposals are factored into faculty evaluations vary by discipline. In biological sciences it is important for external funding proposals to be approved, he said. Goodman agreed that it would be helpful for departments and schools to address this issue.

Catanzaro said he will circulate the draft he has prepared regarding formal meetings and will compile notes from this discussion. He reminded committee members that their review of ASPT policies is not limited to suggestions he or Academic Senate chairperson Susan Kalter has made. He urged committee members to offer issues for discussion. He asked if there are ways committee members might seek suggestions from their faculty colleagues. Dean reported that she has asked chairpersons in her college for input. Jenkins said she has done the same in her college, and Rubin said he asked for input from faculty in his unit last year but has not yet received any. Catanzaro said he will again ask deans, chairpersons, and directors for input.

Catanzaro said he hopes to compile a document by May setting forth ASPT policy revisions recommended by URC. The Faculty Caucus would then begin its review of the recommendations in August 2015. In 2015-2016 the URC will need to be prepared to field feedback from the Faculty Caucus regarding the committee recommendations. Bonnell noted that when ASPT policies were last reviewed by Faculty Caucus, the process lasted more than a year.

Bonnell said she was a member of Faculty Caucus when it last conducted a five-year review and update of ASPT policies. It would have been helpful to have had URC minutes at that time to better understand the intent of URC recommendations to the Faculty Caucus. She asked if there might be a way for URC to share its minutes with the Faculty Caucus during this five-year review. Catanzaro said he will investigate options for doing so.

IV. Other business

There was none.

V. Adjournment

Dean moved, Rubin seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 4:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Dean, Secretary

Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachment: ASPT Clarifications, Additions, and other Housekeeping, Prepared by Sam Catanzaro for Discussion by University Review Committee, October 23, 2014

ASPT Clarifications, Revisions, Additions, and other Housekeeping
Prepared by Sam Catanzaro
For Discussion by University Review Committee
October 23, 2014

II. E, p. 9-10 (URC reporting)—More precise language needed

“This summary shall also be made available to **the Faculty Caucus** of the Academic Senate in Executive Session.”

And further on...

“Final reports prepared for the Board of Trustees shall be available for review by members of the Academic Senate at least forty-eight hours prior to the **Faculty Caucus meeting** in Executive Session.”

Note that the reports to the BOT are of Promotion, Tenure, and Sabbaticals, and do not include information on annual performance evaluation. The Provost’s Office does provide a separate memo summarizing the annual evaluation results, in addition overall numbers regarding promotion and tenure decisions, to the Senate and the President.

IV. B.1, p. 12—CFSC Review of D/SFSC Policies—inconsistent language

Make clear that CFSC “authority to ensure conformity” means “approval” per V.B.1 PP 18-19 and XII.B.1 P. 43

“The CFSC Shall review **and approve...**”

IV.B.2, p 13—CFSC Review of D/SFSC Policies—inconsistent language

Add “approve” per V.B.2, p19

“... but the CFSC Shall review **and approve** them for...”

V.B. 1&2, p. 18-19—DFSC development of Policies—possible inconsistency

Compare language -

1: “approve....for their conformity to....”

2: “approve them for their clarity, fairness and conformity to...” make consistent OR assume that V.B.1 applies to policies more directly shaped by CFSC and Unit ASPT, whereas V.B.2 refers to the local salary policies and procedures.

IX.B.2 and 3, p 31—Probationary period maximum and effect of “stop the clock”

IX.B.2 defines maximum probationary period as 7 years. This reflects the old limit of only one “stop-the-clock” year while assuming that year counted as part of the probationary period. Now that there is no policy-mandated limit on stop-the-clock years, consider the following revisions:

IX.B.2: “The probationary period at Illinois State may not exceed ~~seven~~ **six** years.”

IX.B.3: “A stop-the-clock period will not count toward tenure **or against the length of the probationary period.**”

X., pp. 34-38—Post-tenure Reviews

Consider adding **new language** as X.B. (and re-number subsequent subsections as necessary):
Cumulative post-tenure reviews which are required as a result of receiving unsatisfactory performance ratings for any two years of a three-year period of annual ASPT evaluations will occur in the annual evaluation review cycle immediately following the unsatisfactory annual evaluation that precipitates the required cumulative post-tenure review.

XII, pp. 41-44: Performance (Annual) Evaluation and Salary Incrementation

There has been confusion and inconsistent practice regarding annual evaluation of faculty on leaves other than sabbaticals. This is due in part to the different reasons faculty could be on leave. FMLA leaves are “protected” by law. When a faculty member (or any employee) is on an FMLA leave, they *cannot* be evaluated. Faculty who take unpaid leaves for personal reasons or to visit other universities *may* be evaluated. Sometimes, they are--if they submit materials.

Faculty members who are not evaluated are not eligible for any salary increase. Because any employee on an FMLA leave cannot be disadvantaged upon their return, we need a provision for evaluation at some point after their return to document contributions and determine eligibility for salary increases. I am checking with Legal and HR to find out the statutory requirements regarding the timing of such an evaluation.

Because ASPT XII.B.3.b (p. 43) allows for recognition of “long-term contributions,” there is flexibility for incorporating evaluation of accomplishments while on leave in later evaluations. As I get more information on the legal requirements, I will share with the committee and develop draft language for the ASPT policies. In the meantime, I am including this item to familiarize the committee with the relevant issues.

Note that ASPT VII, Faculty Assignments and Faculty Evaluation, also includes policies about the evaluation process (see pp. 24-26). As the draft language for XII develops, we will want to cross-reference and make sure no updates are needed in VII.

XIII, pp. 45-53: Appeals

Consider guidelines for Formal Meetings that occur as a preliminary step for appeals of Dean/Chair’s report. Dean/Chair report, by definition, reflects the contrary position to the majority of the CFSC/DFSC/SFSC, and may be appealed. An appeal *requires* a Formal Meeting as a preliminary step (XIII.B.1, p. 45). It may be unnecessary to convene the entire FSC for a Formal Meeting (and indeed, may be to the candidate’s disadvantage under some circumstances, given that the vote is by split). This situation arose once in the past three years, and I worked out a procedure with the Chairs of URC and Senate at the time. Formalizing this procedure would require a brief addition to section XIII.B and a new section XIII.E.

See attached draft based on the procedure used previously.

Appendix 1: Calendar

P & T – Appendix 1.B, p. 58: Timeline for Formal Meeting and Appeal

Formal Meeting Timelines—possible additions

Deadlines for requests for formal meetings is OK (5 working days for DFSC/SFSC and 10 working days for CFSC). If proposed XIII.E for meetings with Dean/Chair/Director is adopted, we would need to add provision for these. I recommend the same timelines (5 days for Chair/Director, 10 days for Dean)

Appeal Timelines—possible clarifications

XIII.G.1 (p. 48): Requirement to inform Chair of FRC of *intent* to file within 5 working days of receipt of final recommendation. This would ordinarily fall sometime in the first week of March, as CFSC final recommendations are due March 1.

-Chair of FRC acknowledges within 5 working days

Appendix 1.B (p. 58): Requires that candidate must *file a request for review by FRC* by March 15. Implication is that the “intent to file” is different from the “request for review,” which is the actual written statement and supporting materials that comprise the substance of the appeal.

Consider the following revisions:

Prior to March 15: In the event of a negative recommendation by the DFSC/SFSC, the CFSC, or a Dean/Chair/Director, a candidate who wishes a University-wide appeal of his/her credentials must inform the chair of the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) of his/her intent to file an appeal within five (5) business days of receipt of the final CFSC recommendation. The Chair of FRC shall respond to the candidate within five (5) business days of receipt of the written intent to request additional review.

March 15: A candidate who wishes a University-wide appeal of his/her credentials must submit a written statement and relevant supporting materials to the Chair of the FRC.

Appendix 2 – Criteria for evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service

Do any of these need to be updated?

On-line courses?

Administrative assignments?

Community/civic engagement?