

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE  
Thursday, August 27, 2015  
2 p.m., Hovey 302

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Rick Boser, Diane Dean, Joe Goodman (via telephone), Christopher Horvath, Doris Houston, David Rubin, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting)

Members not present: Sheryl Jenkins

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

I. Welcome and introductions

Sam Catanzaro opened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. He explained that he would serve as meeting convener until the committee elects a chairperson. Persons present introduced themselves. Catanzaro welcomed new committee member, Christopher Horvath.

II. Overview of committee responsibilities and committee work for 2015-2016

Catanzaro reviewed URC responsibilities. The primary committee responsibility in 2015-2016 will be to assist the Faculty Caucus with its five-year review of the ASPT document. URC has been reviewing the ASPT document for the past year and a half. This summer Catanzaro compiled recommendations made by URC regarding the document and has forwarded them to the Faculty Caucus. Catanzaro explained that the person elected URC chairperson should plan to attend Faculty Caucus meetings at which the ASPT document is discussed, to answer questions the Faculty Caucus may have regarding the URC recommendations. The Faculty Caucus may refer issues back to URC for further discussion.

Catanzaro updated committee members regarding equity review. Per URC vote at its May 7, 2015 meeting, 2014-2015 URC Chairperson Sheryl Jenkins sent a letter to the Provost asking her to consider creating a task force to study the issue of equity review. In her response, the Provost has asked URC to refine its questions regarding equity review and to meet with Shane McCreery, Director of Equal Opportunity, Ethics, and Access, to discuss the role that office has in equity review. Catanzaro suggested that URC invite McCreery to its next meeting to begin those discussions. Committee members concurred.

Catanzaro stated that URC annually adopts a calendar of ASPT activities for the next academic year and disseminates the calendar to deans, who, in turn disseminate the calendar to chairpersons, directors, and faculty members. Catanzaro said that URC will need to adopt an ASPT calendar for 2016-2017 in October. He also noted that three colleges are scheduled to submit their ASPT standards during the coming year for review by URC: the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business, and Mennonite College of Nursing.

III. Election of officers for 2015-2016

Catanzaro opened nominations for the office of URC chairperson for 2015-2016. Doris Houston self-nominated. Diane Dean seconded the nomination. There being no further

nominations, Catanzaro closed the nominations. Doris Houston was elected URC chairperson for 2015-2016 by unanimous voice vote.

Catanzaro ceded the meeting to new chairperson Houston.

Houston opened nominations for the office of URC vice-chairperson for 2015-2016. Diane Dean self-nominated. David Rubin seconded the nomination. There being no further nominations, Houston closed the nominations. Diane Dean was elected URC vice-chairperson for 2015-2016 by unanimous voice vote.

Houston opened nominations for the office of URC secretary for 2015-2016. Rick Boser self-nominated. Diane Dean seconded the nomination. There being no further nominations, Houston closed the nominations. Rick Boser was elected URC secretary for 2015-2016 by unanimous voice vote.

IV. Meeting schedule for fall 2015

Bruce Stoffel will poll committee members regarding their availability for committee meetings during the fall semester. Houston will then work with Stoffel to establish a fall meeting schedule based on poll results.

V. Approval of minutes from the May 7, 2015 meeting

Boser moved, Dean seconded approval of minutes of the May 7, 2015, committee meeting. The motion was approved on voice vote with one abstention.

VI. Compiled URC recommendations to Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate:  
Five-year review and revision of ASPT policies

Catanzaro reviewed the summary of revisions to the ASPT document proposed by URC and sent by Catanzaro to the Faculty Caucus earlier in August (see attached document). Houston thanked Catanzaro for his work on the summary and for his guidance with the revision process.

Catanzaro noted that the most extensive change recommended by URC is the addition of sections regarding discipline. The sections were drafted by URC working with the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate, as requested by the previous Academic Senate chairperson.

Catanzaro acknowledged contributions by the University Research Council to URC recommendations regarding scholarship. He thanked Rubin for his contributions to the recommendations as a member of both URC and the University Research Council.

Catanzaro informed committee members that he has met with Susan Kalter, Academic Senate chairperson, to discuss her proposed approach to Faculty Caucus review of URC recommendations. Kalter plans to start with high-level review of all changes, followed by section-by-section, in-depth review of the recommendations, beginning with newly-added discipline sections. Kalter plans to defer discussion of editorial issues until all substantive issues have been discussed and decided.

Joe Goodman asked if litigation at the University of Illinois in the Steven Salaita case might affect URC recommendations regarding discipline. Catanzaro responded that the Salaita case

should have no impact on the URC proposal, because the proposal is aligned with recommendations of the American Association of University Professors and with policies of some other universities. Catanzaro clarified that, while AAUP recommendations have been used to guide URC recommendations, AAUP recommendations have been adapted when appropriate to fit the unique circumstances at Illinois State. He added that a major difference between the ASPT system at Illinois State and the system at the University of Illinois is that decisions at Illinois State regarding faculty hires are made by the university president rather than by the governing board.

Houston asked Catanzaro who will initiate equity view if the URC role in equity review changes from initiating equity review to reviewing equity plans compiled by other parties, as URC has recommended. Catanzaro replied that the most likely scenario is for the president to announce an equity review initiative based on recommendations from the Academic Senate or administrative units.

Houston asked how recommendations made by URC will be decided. Catanzaro responded that final approval of the new ASPT document will be made by the Faculty Caucus. Houston asked if there is a deadline for approving the new document. Catanzaro responded that the document needs to be approved in calendar 2016 if it is to take effect January 1, 2017 as planned. Catanzaro said that college and department standards will also need to be revised to align with the new ASPT document before the new university document and new unit documents can take effect. Additionally, revised college standards will need to be reviewed and approved by URC. Catanzaro said he hopes Faculty Caucus will approve a new document by the end of spring semester 2016, to allow colleges and departments time in fall 2016 to review and, if necessary, revise their standards and to allow time for URC to approve college standards. However, if all documents have not been approved by the end of calendar 2016, the ASPT system will not shut down. Rather, the current document will remain in effect.

Angela Bonnell asked if the new ASPT document will be made available in print as well as online. Catanzaro responded that the new document will be printed and made available to all faculty members. The current document was recently reprinted so copies of it will be available to members of the campus community if it would be helpful in following discussions regarding changes to the document.

## VII. Other business

Houston asked committee members to send her recommendations for new committee discussion topics for the coming year.

## VIII. Adjournment

Boser moved, Dean seconded that the meeting adjourn. Houston adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
 Rick Boser, Secretary  
 Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachment:

*ASPT Revisions, to be Effective January 1, 2017, Proposed by University Review Committee Pending Review and Approval by Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate, July 2015*

ASPT Revisions, to be Effective January 1, 2017  
Proposed by University Review Committee  
Pending Review and Approval by Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate  
July 2015

Major Substantive Revisions Proposed by URC

1. **Overview:** All references to the rank of “Instructor,” including criteria for promotion to Assistant Professor (Article VIII in the Beige Book), have been removed. This rank has not been used for more than a decade, and can create confusion with the title “Instructional Assistant Professor” used for non-tenure track faculty.
2. **Section I.E:** A new statement making explicit a commitment to the quality of evidence used in ASPT processes.
3. **Section II.D:** Revised role for University Review Committee in equity distribution plans: reviewing them for consistency with policy rather than actually developing and conducting them.
4. **Section V.B:** New requirement that DFSC/SFSC guidelines be reviewed on a regular basis: Suggested by University Research Council, recommended by University Review Committee.
5. **Disciplinary Actions:** A new major section, consisting of new **Articles XI through XIV**, covering general policies, sanctions, suspensions, and dismissals. These policies have been developed over the last two academic years with ongoing consultation with the Faculty Affairs Committee. **Appendices 5 through 7** provide overviews of the processes for sanctions, suspensions, and dismissals, respectively.
6. **Section XIV:** A new section providing for an optional meeting between a faculty member and a dean/chair/director who has written a negative promotion and/or tenure recommendation voting in the minority of the relevant committee. Such a meeting would be in lieu of a formal meeting with the entire committee. The proposed section is based on procedures developed a few years ago in collaboration with the Chairs of Senate and URC at the time, when such a situation arose.
7. **Appendix 2:** Updated language suggested by the University Research Council and recommended by the University Review committee to more fully recognize the wide variety of research and creative activity on campus, especially grant submission.
8. **Appendix 8:** A new appendix was needed to summarize the timelines for appeals of non-reappointment recommendations on procedural grounds (**XIII.J** in Beige Book, **XVI.K** in the proposed revision.)

ASPT Revisions, to be Effective January 1, 2017  
Proposed by University Review Committee  
Pending Review and Approval by Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate  
July 2015

Major Editorial Revisions Proposed by URC

1. **Throughout:** “Shall” is used to refer to what a committee or administrator is required to do by policy. “Must” is used to refer to what a faculty member is required to do.
2. **Throughout:** Used “Article” to refer to entire major policies bearing Roman numerals (e.g., Article XII, Sanctions); used Section to refer to any more specific portion of an Article (e.g., Section XII.A).
3. **Articles XV, XVI, and XVII** (Performance Evaluation and Salary Incrementation, Appeals, and Right of Access to Personnel Documents, respectively; Articles XII through XIV in Beige Book): Re-numbered to reflect the addition of new articles XI through XIV on Disciplinary Actions.
4. **Section II.E:** Clarifies that reports are submitted by the Provost to Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate.
5. **Sections IV.B and V.B:** Aligned language on CFSC responsibility to review/approve DFSC/SFSC policies on performance evaluation and salary incrementation.
6. **Sections IX.B.2 and IX.B.3:** clarified definition of the probationary period and how a “stop-the-clock” period is interpreted.
7. **Section X.B:** Clarified the timeline for Cumulative Post-Tenure Reviews that are mandatory due to unsatisfactory annual performance evaluations.
8. **Section XVI.A** (XIII.A in Beige Book): Clarified that policies and procedures for appeals of disciplinary actions are included in the articles governing those actions (XII through XIV).
9. **Article XVI** (XIII in Beige Book) and **Appendix 1:** Clarified two steps of initiating an appeal of promotion, tenure, or annual performance evaluation: Notifying the relevant committee chair of intention to appeal, and submission of written material in support of the appeal.