UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE Tuesday, December 8, 2015 11 a.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

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

Members not present: Sheryl Jenkins, David Rubin

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

I. Call to order

Chairperson Doris Houston called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

II. Approval of minutes from the December 1, 2015 meeting

Joe Goodman moved, Angela Bonnell seconded approval of minutes from the December 1, 2015 meeting as distributed prior to the meeting. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

III. Action item: Approval of the ASPT calendar for 2016-2017

Rick Boser suggested not including days of the week with dates on the calendar, as adding days provides more opportunities for error. Sam Catanzaro explained that days of the week have been included to clarify that dates do not fall on weekends or other days when the University is closed. Bruce Stoffel noted that content and format of the calendar will need to be revised once the next edition of the ASPT document takes effect and, perhaps, at that time the format of dates can be reconsidered. Boser moved to approve the ASPT calendar for 2016-2017 as distributed prior to the meeting (see attached). Christopher Horvath seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

IV. Continued discussion of ASPT suggestions and requests from Faculty Caucus

URC continued discussion of ASPT suggestions and requests from Faculty Caucus ("Caucus"), following *Status of ASPT Document Changes as of December 2, 2015* (see attached).

Bruce Stoffel informed committee members that he talked briefly with Faculty Caucus Chairperson Susan Kalter on December 4, 2015, regarding URC review of Caucus suggestions and requests. Kalter indicated that it would be acceptable and even preferable to her if URC were to set aside for future discussion substantive issues the committee feels merit in-depth investigation. URC might then consider those items after the new edition of the ASPT document has been approved and before discussion of the 2022 edition begins. Stoffel suggested that Houston contact Kalter to discuss details of such an approach.

Item 9 (re Article XII.B.2)

Houston deferred discussion of this item until spring semester. She intends to invite Claire Lamonica, director of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology, to meet with URC to update the committee regarding best practices in teaching evaluation.

Item 10 (Article XII.B.5)

Horvath said that his initial reaction to the suggestion was that he does not want DFSCs having to annually provide faculty members with suggestions for addressing weaknesses. He explained that, while

doing so would be helpful to faculty members, it would be changing what DFSCs do. The function of DFSCs should be to evaluate faculty members, while some other group should mentor them, he said.

Catanzaro said that his initial reaction to the suggestion was more positive. Documenting suggestions for addressing weaknesses could promote continuity in the evaluation of faculty members, from one DFSC to another, he said. However, he expressed concern about requiring DFSCs to provide suggestions.

Bonnell noted that a concern, perhaps unique to Milner Library, is having the DFSC making suggestions but then not informing the faculty member's administrative coordinator about the suggestions.

Dean said that she sees positives and negatives in the Caucus suggestion. DFSCs are not charged with professional development, she said, yet it would be good for faculty members to have direction. She suggested letting departments and schools decide whether and how to communicate suggestions for addressing weaknesses. Horvath said he would be fine with that approach.

Catanzaro noted that if a civil service or academic/professional employee has a problem, it is best practice to communicate what is expected of the employee. That is not necessarily the case with faculty evaluations. The issue is handled differently by units according to their internal culture.

Goodman said that if the ASPT document were to cite providing suggestions as a best practice, that practice will likely become a standard across the University. He recommended either requiring letters to include suggestions for addressing weaknesses or not mentioning the issue at all. He said he prefers not to codify this.

Horvath asked if a DFSC would be required to provide suggestions for addressing weaknesses for all faculty members including those who are the highest achievers in a department. Horvath said, if that would be the case, he would be more comfortable putting the provision in XII.B.6 (which addresses informing faculty members evaluated as having overall unsatisfactory performance) instead of in XII.B.5.

The discussion concluded with consensus that providing written suggestions is best practice but should not be required of DFSCs/SFSCs. Committee members also agreed that the manner in which ASPT committees have addressed weaknesses has not been a problem. Dean moved to not add a provision to XII.B.5 requiring DFSCs/SFSCs to include in their performance evaluation letter suggestions for addressing weaknesses. Goodman seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Item 12 (re Article XIII)

Horvath expressed concerned about each ASPT decision letter recreating the appeals section of the ASPT document and the impact that might have on the length and clarity of the letters. In addition, a DFSC might error when reciting the appeals passage from the ASPT document. Horvath suggested that the letters might instead just reference sections or pages of the ASPT document regarding appeals. Boser reported that his department does that.

Dean offered that including directions for appeal might be perceived by the faculty member as the DFSC/SFSC urging the faculty member to appeal. She added that the only reason she can think of for mentioning an appeal in a decision letter is legal, such as due process.

Bonnell asked Catanzaro if he still does ASPT training and if he distributes sample decision letters. Catanzaro responded that he does and that most ASPT committees, but not all, use the samples.

Discussion ensued regarding where in the ASPT document the suggested passage should be added. Suggestions included reciting the passage wherever contents of ASPT decision letters are described, including the passage in sections that describe DFSCs/SFSCs and CFSCs, adding the passage toXII.B.5 (regarding annual performance letters), and adding the passage to both XII.B.5 and XII.B.6 (regarding unsatisfactory performance ratings). Not including the passage was also suggested, since information regarding appeals is already in the beige book (on page 4).

Horvath expressed concern that one department might include information regarding the appeals process in its ASPT decision letters but another might not. He described a scenario in which a DFSC or CFSC is predisposed to getting rid of a faculty member and decides not to inform that faculty member about the opportunity to appeal. He said it is important to treat each faculty member fairly.

Bonnell said she has mixed feelings about mandating reference to the appeals process in decision letters. She said she likes having that information in letters but she has seen boiler plate language used incorrectly. Boser said he supports mandating inclusion of a reference to the appeals policy but not the policy itself. Houston said she prefers to include the information in case a faculty member is not aware of the opportunity to appeal.

Dean suggested requiring ASPT decision letters to reference the appeals process only in instances of unsatisfactory decisions, as a way of addressing Bonnell's concerns regarding misuse of boiler plate language. Catanzaro noted that faculty members have the right to appeal even in instances of satisfactory decisions.

Goodman said that if he votes against mandating a reference to the appeals process in decision letters, he will be doing so after extensive discussion of the matter by the committee, to document that several committee members could see advantages and disadvantages of each proposed approach. Houston noted that committee decisions need not be unanimous, that differences of opinion are respected.

Horvath moved that the following sentence be added to the end of Article XII.B.5 to provide consistency regarding provision of information to faculty members regarding opportunities to appeal ASPT decisions: "The letter shall also inform the faculty member of the right to appeal the ASPT decision and shall cite the pertinent article of the ASPT document that describes the appeals process." Bonnell seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, with three ayes, one nay, and one abstention.

Item 13 (re XIII.A)

Dean moved to accept the changes to the first paragraph of Article XIII.A suggested by Caucus members so the paragraph reads as follows: "Illinois State University encourages the fair and equitable resolution of appeals. Informal resolution of issues is encouraged at the DFSC/SFSC and CFSC levels prior to formal meetings and/or appeals. In contrast to formal meetings as defined in XVI.B, informal resolution of issues can be accomplished through communications that address questions and concerns through provision of information or clarification. An informal resolution may also be effected after a formal meeting has been requested."

Other

Catanzaro announced that comments submitted by faculty members regarding changes to the ASPT document proposed by URC have been posted on the Academic Senate website. Catanzaro recommended that URC members review the comments, as they could be helpful in future URC discussions.

V. Adjournment

Horvath moved, Dean seconded that the meeting adjourn. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rick Boser, Secretary Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments: ASPT Calendar 2016-2017 (By Category of Activity and Chronological, All Activities) Status of ASPT Document Changes as of December 2, 2015

posted at http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/faculty/tenure.shtml

CALENDAR FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

This calendar for 2016-2017 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, effective January 1, 2012, and amended by Faculty Caucus on December 7, 2011, January 25, 2012, and March 7, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

Date for 2016-2017	Date per <i>ASPT Policies</i> , Appendix 1	Action per ASPT Policies
Tuesday, November 1, 2016	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 Chairperson/School Director prior to November 1 of the year previously scheduled for the summative review for tenure.
Prior to Thursday, December 15, 2016	Prior to December 15	The 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 each candidate to hold a formal meeting with the committee to discuss the recommendations. If a candidate wants to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, the candidate 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.
Thursday, December 15, 2016	December 15	DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to the candidate and to the CFSC.

ASPT Calendar 2016-2017: By Category of Activity posted at http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/faculty/tenure.shtml

CALENDAR FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE (continued)		
Date for 2016-2017	Date per <i>ASPT Policies</i> , Appendix 1	Action per ASPT Policies
Wednesday, February 1, 2017	February 1	The CFSC must notify candidates of intended recommendations and provide opportunity, if requested, for each candidate to meet with the CFSC to discuss the recommendations. If a candidate wants to request a formal meeting to discuss the CFSC recommendation, 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.
Wednesday, March 1, 2017	March 1	CFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to the Provost, DFSC/SFSC, and candidates.
Wednesday, March 15, 2017	March 15	In the event of a negative recommendation by the DFSC/SFSC or the CFSC, a candidate who wants a university-wide appeal of his/her credentials must file a request for a review by the Faculty Review Committee.
Tuesday, March 21, 2017	March 21	The Provost's recommendation for non-appealed candidates must be reported to the President, CFSC, DFSC/SFSC, and candidates.
Monday, April 17, 2017	April 15	The Faculty Review Committee 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.
Monday, May 1, 2017	April 30	The Provost's decision in appealed cases must be reported to the President, candidate, DFSC/SFSC, and CFSC.
Monday, May 15, 2017	May 15	Notifications of promotion and tenure decisions by the President shall be sent to the candidates, CFSCs, DFSC/SFSCs, and the Provost.

posted at http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/faculty/tenure.shtml

CALENDAR FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

This calendar for 2016-2017 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, effective January 1, 2012, and amended by Faculty Caucus on December 7, 2011, January 25, 2012, and March 7, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

Date for 2016-2017	Date per <i>ASPT Policies</i> , Appendix 1	Action per ASPT Policies
Thursday, January 5, 2017	January 5	All faculty members eligible for performance-evaluation salary increment must submit files in support of their request for performance-evaluation adjustments.
Wednesday, February 1, 2017	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. The DFSC/SFSC must notify faculty members of intended recommendations to the CFSC at least 10 working days before submitting the recommendations to the CFSC and provide opportunity, if requested, for the faculty member to meet with the committee to discuss the recommendations. If a faculty member wants to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, 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.
Wednesday, February 15, 2017	February 15	The DFSC/SFSC must transmit its final recommendation for performance-evaluation review to the faculty member and to the CFSC.

ASPT Calendar 2016-2017: By Category of Activity posted at http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/faculty/tenure.shtml

CALENDAR FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (continued)		
Date for 2016-2017	Date per <i>ASPT Polici</i> es, Appendix 1	Action per ASPT Policies
Wednesday, March 1, 2017	March 1	A faculty member who wants to appeal the DFSC/SFSC performance-evaluation recommendation must file an appeal with the CFSC (or Faculty Review Committee in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC).
Friday, March 31, 2017	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. (* or Faculty Review Committee in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC)

posted at http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/faculty/tenure.shtml

CALENDAR FOR CUMULATIVE POST-TENURE REVIEW

This calendar for 2016-2017 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, effective January 1, 2012, and amended by Faculty Caucus on December 7, 2011, January 25, 2012, and March 7, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

Date for 2016-2017	Date per <i>ASPT Policies</i> , Appendix 1	Action per ASPT Policies
Thursday, January 5, 2017	January 5	All faculty members scheduled for cumulative post- tenure review must submit their materials.
Wednesday, February 15, 2017	February 15	The DFSC/SFSC must inform the faculty member of its cumulative post-tenure review evaluation and, if applicable, a plan for remediation.
Monday, February 27, 2017	February 25	A faculty member who wants to discuss the DFSC/SFSC response and/or remediation plan must request a meeting with the DFSC/SFSC.
Wednesday, March 8, 2017	March 8	The DFSC/SFSC notifies the faculty member regarding the final outcome of the DFSC/SFSC cumulative post-tenure review.
Wednesday, March 22, 2017	March 22	A faculty member who wants to appeal the DFSC/SFSC cumulative post-tenure review outcome must file a written appeal with the CFSC chairperson. 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, April 17, 2017	April 15	The CFSC shall submit to each appellant faculty member and to the appropriate DFSC/SFSC a report that describes the disposition of the cumulative post- tenure review appeal.

posted at http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/faculty/tenure.shtml

CALENDAR FOR REAPPOINTMENT

This calendar for 2016-2017 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, effective January 1, 2012, and amended by Faculty Caucus on December 7, 2011, January 25, 2012, and March 7, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

Date for 2016-2017	Date per <i>ASPT Policies</i> , Appendix 1	Action per ASPT Policies
Wednesday, February 1, 2017	February 1	The Provost issues notification of non-reappointment by February 1 to a faculty member in the second academic year of service, notifying the faculty member 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.
Wednesday, March 1, 2017	March 1	The Provost issues notification of non-reappointment by March 1 to a faculty member in the first year of service, notifying the faculty member that the 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.
Monday, May 15, 2017	At least 12 months before the termination of an appointment after two (2) or more years of service	The Provost notifies a third- or subsequent-year faculty member who will not be reappointed, 12 months before the termination of the appointment, that the faculty member'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.

posted at http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/faculty/tenure.shtml

CALENDAR FOR REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

This calendar for 2016-2017 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, effective January 1, 2012, and amended by Faculty Caucus on December 7, 2011, January 25, 2012, and March 7, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

Date for 2016-2017	Date per <i>ASPT Policies,</i> Appendix 1	Action per ASPT Policies
Monday, May 1, 2017	May 1	Each CFSC shall submit an annual report (Promotion and Tenure) to its College Council and to the University Review Committee (Article IV.D.). Each CFSC shall submit an annual report to the University Review Committee and to the Provost that enumerates all cumulative post-tenure review appeals and describes their disposition (see XIII.I.9).
Monday, May 1, 2017	May 1	The fifth-year review of College Standards or, in the interim, proposed revisions to College Standards must be submitted to the University Review Committee (by the CFSC).
Monday, May 1, 2017	May 1	The Faculty Review Committee shall submit to the University Review Committee a final report summarizing the number of appeals by Department/School and College, the types of appeals, and the disposition of the appeals (see Article III.F).

posted at http://provost.illinoisstate.edu/faculty/tenure.shtml

CALENDAR FOR ASPT ELECTIONS (for the 2017-2018 Academic Year)

This calendar for 2016-2017 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, effective January 1, 2012, and amended by Faculty Caucus on December 7, 2011, January 25, 2012, and March 7, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

Date for 2016-2017	Date per <i>ASPT Policies</i> , Appendix 1	Action per ASPT Policies
Monday, April 17, 2017	April 15	Members of the University Review Committee, Faculty Review Committee, and College Faculty Status Committees must have been elected.
Monday, May 1, 2017	May 1	Members of the Department/School Faculty Status Committees must have been elected.

This calendar for 2016-2017 is based on actions and deadlines described in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies*, effective January 1, 2012, and amended by Faculty Caucus on December 7, 2011, January 25, 2012, and March 7, 2012. Article and section references in this document are to the *ASPT Policies*.

Date for 2016-2017	Date per <i>ASPT Policies</i> , Appendix 1	Action per ASPT Policies
Tuesday, November 1, 2016	November 1	Promotion and 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 Chairperson/School Director prior to November 1 of the year previously scheduled for the summative review for tenure.
Prior to Thursday, December 15, 2016	Prior to December 15	Promotion and Tenure: The 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 each candidate to hold a formal meeting with the committee to discuss the recommendations. If the candidate wants to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, the candidate 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.
Thursday, December 15, 2016	December 15	<u>Promotion and Tenure</u>: DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to the candidate and to the CFSC.
Thursday, January 5, 2017	January 5	Performance Evaluation : All faculty members eligible for performance-evaluation salary increment must submit files in support of their request for performance-evaluation adjustments.

Date for 2016-2017	Date per ASPT Policies, Appendix 1	Action per ASPT Policies
Thursday, January 5, 2017	January 5	<u>Cumulative Post-Tenure Review</u> : All faculty members scheduled for cumulative post-tenure review must submit their materials.
Wednesday, February 1, 2017	February 1	Promotion and Tenure: The CFSC must notify candidates of intended recommendations and provide opportunity, if requested, for each candidate to meet with the CFSC to discuss the recommendations. If the candidate wants 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.
Wednesday, February 1, 2017	February 1	<u>Reappointment</u> : The Provost issues notification of non- reappointment by February 1 to a faculty member in the second academic year of service, notifying the faculty member 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.
Wednesday, February 1, 2017	February 1	Performance Evaluation : 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. The DFSC/SFSC must notify faculty members of intended recommendations to CFSC at least 10 working days before submitting the recommendations to the CFSC and provide opportunity, if requested, for the faculty member to meet with the committee to discuss the recommendations. If the faculty member wants to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, 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.
Wednesday, February 15, 2017	February 15	Performance Evaluation : The DFSC/SFSC must transmit its final recommendation for performance-evaluation review to the faculty member and to the CFSC.
Wednesday, February 15, 2017	February 15	<u>Cumulative Post-Tenure Review</u>: The DFSC/SFSC must inform the faculty member of its cumulative post-tenure review evaluation and, if applicable, a plan for remediation.

Date for 2016-2017	Date per <i>ASPT Polici</i> es, Appendix 1	Action per ASPT Policies
Monday, February 27, 2017	February 25	<u>Cumulative Post-Tenure Review</u> : A faculty member who wants to discuss the DFSC/SFSC response and/or remediation plan must request a meeting with the DFSC/SFSC.
Wednesday, March 1, 2017	March 1	<u>Promotion and Tenure</u> : CFSC recommendations for promotion and tenure must be reported to the Provost, DFSC/SFSC, and candidates.
Wednesday, March 1, 2017	March 1	<u>Reappointment</u> : The Provost issues notification of non- reappointment by March 1 to a faculty member in the first year of service, notifying the faculty member that the 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.
Wednesday, March 1, 2017	March 1	Performance Evaluation: A faculty member who wants to appeal the DFSC/SFSC performance-evaluation recommendation must file an appeal with the CFSC (or Faculty Review Committee in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC).
Wednesday, March 8, 2017	March 8	<u>Cumulative Post-Tenure Review</u>: The DFSC/SFSC notifies the faculty member regarding the final outcome of the DFSC/SFSC cumulative post-tenure review.
Wednesday, March 15, 2017	March 15	Promotion and Tenure: In the event of a negative recommendation by the DFSC/SFSC or the CFSC, a candidate who wants a university-wide appeal of his/her credentials must file a request for a review by the Faculty Review Committee.
Tuesday, March 21, 2017	March 21	Promotion and Tenure: The Provost's recommendation for non-appealed candidates must be reported to the President, CFSC, DFSC/SFSC, and candidates.
Wednesday, March 22, 2017	March 22	<u>Cumulative Post-Tenure Review</u> : A faculty member who wants to appeal the DFSC/SFSC cumulative post-tenure review outcome must file a written appeal with the CFSC chairperson.
		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.

Date for 2016-2017	Date per <i>ASPT Policies</i> , Appendix 1	Action per ASPT Policies
Friday, March 31, 2017	March 31	Performance Evaluation : 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. (* or Faculty Review Committee in the absence of a DFSC/SFSC)
Monday, April 17, 2017	April 15	Promotion and Tenure: The Faculty Review Committee 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.
Monday, April 17, 2017	April 15	<u>Cumulative Post-Tenure Review</u> : The CFSC shall submit to each appellant faculty member and to the appropriate DFSC/SFSC a report that describes the disposition of the cumulative post-tenure review appeal.
Monday, April 17, 2017	April 15	ASPT Elections: Members of the University Review Committee, Faculty Review Committee, and College Faculty Status Committees must have been elected.
Monday, May 1, 2017	April 30	Promotion and Tenure: The Provost's decision in appealed cases must be reported to the President, candidates, DFSC/SFSC, and CFSC.
Monday, May 1, 2017	May 1	Reporting Requirements (CFSC): Each CFSC shall submit an annual report (Promotion and Tenure) to its College Council and to the University Review Committee (Article IV.D.).
		Each CFSC shall submit an annual report to the University Review Committee and to the Provost that enumerates all cumulative post-tenure review appeals and describes their disposition (see Article XIII.I.9).
Monday, May 1, 2017	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 University Review Committee.
Monday, May 1, 2017	May 1	ASPT Elections: Members of the Department/School Faculty Status Committees must have been elected.

Date for 2016-2017	Date per <i>ASPT Polici</i> es, Appendix 1	Action per ASPT Policies
Monday, May 1, 2017	May 1	Reporting Requirements (FRC): The Faculty Review Committee shall submit to the University Review Committee a final report summarizing the number of appeals by Department/School and College, the type of appeals, and the disposition of the appeals (see Article III.F).
Monday, May 15, 2017	May 15	Promotion and Tenure : Notifications of promotion and tenure decisions by the President shall be sent to the candidates, CFSCs, DFSC/SFSCs, and the Provost.
Monday, May 15, 2017	At least 12 months before the termination of an appointment after two (2) or more years of service	<u>Reappointment</u> : The Provost notifies a third- or subsequent- year faculty member who will not be reappointed, 12 months before the termination of the appointment, that the faculty member'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.

STATUS OF ASPT DOCUMENT CHANGES

As of December 2, 2015

SUGGESTIONS AND REQUESTS BY FACULTY CAUCUS

Green denotes a substantive item

Gray denotes an item that has been decided by URC

Page numbers in the Reference field of entries in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee to the Faculty Caucus in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document (effective January 1, 2012). Article numbers in the Reference field of entries in this report refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document (effective January 1, 2012) rather than to article numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee to the Faculty Caucus in August 2015.

Reference: Overview, Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty (p. 5)
Date of suggestion/request: October 7, 2015
Suggestion/request: Revise to reflect current practice
Date(s) of URC review: October 20, 2015; November 3, 2015; November 17, 2015

URC action: Initially URC decided to refer the issue to Mennonite College of Nursing for a recommendation back to URC; at its November 3, 2015 meeting, URC decided to invite members of the Mennonite DFSC and CFSC to the December 1, 2015 URC meeting to discuss this matter; following the November 3, 2015 URC meeting, URC members beryl Jenkins (the Mennonite representative on URC) met with Mennonite tenure track faculty members to discuss this issue and to invite them to a URC meeting so they could provide feedback directly to URC; Mennonite tenure track faculty members decided instead to submit their suggestions to URC via Sheryl; Sheryl drafted proposed ASPT document changes related to this matter and disseminated them to Mennonite tenure track faculty members for comment prior to the November 17, 2015 URC meeting; based on comments received from Mennonite tenure track faculty members and on discussion of this issue by URC members, URC approved the following motions at its November 17, 2015 meeting:

1) To strike the passage titled "Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty" from page 5 2) To remove IV.A.3 from page 13

3) To add the following sentence at the end of V.A.1 on page 18: "For MCN, the dean's designee (who must be tenured) will serve as chair of the DFSC."

Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

Notes: The two sections suggested for deletion (motions 1 and 2 above) had been placed in the current ASPT document to address issues that arose because Mennonite did not have a sufficient number of tenure track faculty members to meet its ASPT committee obligations. Because that is no longer the situation at Mennonite and is not likely to be the situation at Mennonite in the foreseeable future, URC members concur with Mennonite tenure track faculty members that the passages should be deleted. With deletion of those passages, the composition of the Mennonite CFSC and DFSC would be governed by the same ASPT document provisions that govern the composition of the CFSC and DFSC/SFSC in other units. The suggested addition to V.A.1 is intended to address Mennonite not having a department chair who would otherwise serve as chair of the DFSC.

Status of ASPT Document Changes As of November 19, 2015 Page 1 of 8 2 Reference: I.E (p. 8)

Date of suggestion/request: October 7, 2015 Suggestion/request: Consider replacing "obtain" with "consider" Date(s) of URC review: October 20, 2015 URC action: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change. Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus Notes: The revised passage reads "All committees and officials within the faculty status system process will make every possible effort to consider the most reliable evidence available for use in their deliberations."

3 Reference: V.B.1 (p. 19)

Date of suggestion/request: October 7, 2015

Suggestion/request: Consider requiring department/school review of department/school ASPT documents at least every five years rather than at least every three years.

Date(s) of URC review: October 20, 2015; November 3, 2015; December 1, 2015

URC action: At its December 1, 2015 meeting, URC approved a motion to make the following changes to the passage initially recommended to Faculty Caucus in August 2015.

Revised V.B.1 (with track changes)

V.B.1

Following appropriate faculty input, each DFSC/SFSC shall develop Department/School policies and procedures for appointment, reappointment, performance evaluation, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews. These policies and procedures shall be approved by the majority vote of the eligible Department/School faculty prior to January 1 of the year in which the policies and procedures take effect. Department/School ASPT policies and procedures shall be reviewed at least every three years. <u>Any changes resulting from such reviews will be subject to vote of the eligible Department/School faculty, with approval requiring a majority of those voting. If no changes are made, no vote is necessary. and approved by the majority vote of the eligible Department/School faculty member. These policies and procedures shall be distributed to each Department/School faculty member. These policies and procedures are left to the discretion of each Department/School but they shall be submitted to the appropriate CFSC, which will approve them for conformity to College standards and University policies and procedures (see IV.B.1). <u>The DFSC/SFSC shall report annually to the CFSC whether they reviewed their Department/School policies (See V.D.3)</u></u>

New V.D.3

The DFSC/SFSC shall report annually to the CFSC whether they reviewed their Department/School policies. Any changes must be approved by the CFSC (see IV.B.1 and V.B.1).

Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

Notes: After lengthy discussion, URC has decided to retain its recommendation to Faculty Caucus for review of department/school policies and procedures at least every three years. Committee members feel that planning a review midway between the five-year reviews necessitated by changes to the university-wide ASPT document would not create an undue burden on departments/schools. URC notes that numerous departments/schools already discuss their ASPT policies and procedures annually. Committee members note that, while this ASPT document change would require DFSCs and SFSCs to review their policies and procedures at least every three years, faculty in those units may reasonably decide that no changes are necessary and, therefore, no vote of faculty would be needed.

Status of ASPT Document Changes As of November 19, 2015 Page 2 of 8 4 Reference: VIII (p. 28)

Date of suggestion/request: October 21, 2015

Suggestion/request: Consider inserting a new Article VIII.C based on IV.C.2: "In all situations involving a positive DFSC/SFSC recommendation for promotion, the CFSC shall review the promotion application of the individual involved and either endorse the DFSC/SFSC's recommendation or reach an alternate recommendation. A faculty member may withdraw an application for promotion at any time during the review process prior to review by the President. Negative DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion shall not be forwarded beyond the Department/School to the CFSC unless the faculty member requests, in writing, to the Department/School Chairperson/Director, additional review." See also new Article XVI (current Article XIII) for possible addition of the same passage as new B.1.B or D.1.B.

Date(s) of URC review: November 3, 2015

URC action: URC approved a motion to add the following as new Article VIII.C (with existing Article VIII.C renumbered Article VIII.D, existing Article VIII.D renumbered Article VIII.E, and so on):

"In all situations involving a positive DFSC/SFSC recommendation for promotion, the CFSC shall review the promotion application of the individual involved and either endorse the DFSC/SFSC's recommendation or reach an alternate recommendation. A faculty member may withdraw an application for promotion at any time during the review process prior to review by the President. Negative DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion shall not be forwarded beyond the Department/School to the CFSC unless the faculty member requests, in writing, to the Department/School Chairperson/Director, additional review. See also Article IV.C.2."

Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus Notes:

5 Reference: IX.B.2 (p. 32)

Date of suggestion/request: October 21, 2015

Suggestion/request: Consider adding the following passage from Article IX.B.3 to Article IX.B.2: "A stop-theclock period will not count toward tenure or against the length of the probationary period." **Date(s) of URC review:** November 3, 2015

URC action: URC approved a motion not to add said sentence from Article IX.B.3 to Article IX.B.2, because those two articles address different issues.

Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

Notes:

6 **Reference:** X.D (p. 40)

Date of suggestion/request: October 21, 2015

Suggestion/request: Reconsider the parenthetical passage. Consider removing it. Consider keeping it. Consider keeping it but adding qualifying language to the effect that a department might not be able to provide resources, that resources are available to other faculty members (e.g., faculty members who have not been deemed deficient), and that other types of support are potentially available to assist the faculty member (i.e., types of support not already listed in the parentheses)

Date(s) of URC review: November 17, 2015

URC action: URC approved a motion to retain X.D as URC had recommended it to Faculty Caucus, i.e., to not remove the parenthetical clause.

Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

Notes: Including examples of resources that might be made available by a unit is beneficial to both the faculty member and to the unit. For the faculty member, having such a list helps the faculty member understand the types of resources that could be made available to her/him and the types of resources the faculty might request from the unit. For the unit, having such a list helps the unit understand the types of resources is should be offering to the faculty member and might help the unit project the cost of remediating a deficiency.

Status of ASPT Document Changes As of November 19, 2015 Page 3 of 8 Reference: XII.A.4 (p. 56)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Change "the Academic Senate" to "the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate."
Date(s) of URC review: November 17, 2015
URC action: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.
Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus
Notes:

8 Reference: XII.A.5 (p. 56)

Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015

Suggestion/request: Consider defining salary increments by percentages rather than by dollar amounts. Date(s) of URC review: December 1, 2015

URC action: URC approved a motion to refer the question whether Article XII.A.5 should be modified to define raises by percentages rather than by dollar amounts back to Faculty Caucus for discussion and analysis.

Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

Notes: URC discussed this matter at length at its December 1, 2015 meeting. The sense of the committee is that more time is needed to adequately discuss and analysis the suggestion than is available to URC at this time. Among the concerns/suggestions of individual URC members expressed during the committee discussion: 1)the suggestion merits discussion by multiple groups rather than just by URC, 2) Faculty Caucus should consider requesting assistance from administration in analyzing the financial implications of the suggested change and the status quo, 3) as an alternative to the suggestion, consideration should be given to increasing the dollar amounts of the raises since they have not likely been changed in many years, and 4) Faculty Caucus might consider asking URC to address this issue as a possible mid-five-year-cycle ASPT revision, when more time is available for adequate discussion of the matter.

9 Reference: XII.B.2 (p. 57) and throughout the document

Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015

Suggestion/request: Should the term "student reactions" still be used, or should the phrase be replaced with "student evaluations" or some other term? Consider AAUP guidance. Look to recent research regarding use of student evaluations in evaluating a faculty member's teaching. Consider adding a requirement that multiple methods of teaching evaluation be weighed equally.

Date(s) of URC review: December 1, 2015

URC action:

Status: Under review by URC

Notes: At its December 1, 2015 meeting, committee members agreed to pursue a modest amount of additional information-gathering regarding the issue before making a recommendation to Faculty Caucus. Additional information-gathering may include requesting a presentation by the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology regarding best practices in teaching evaluation, consulting AAUP publications regarding the matter, studying policies and practices at other institutions, and reviewing recent research regarding the evaluation of teaching performance. The concern articulated by multiple URC members is that more time may be needed for URC to adequately discuss the questions raised by Faculty Caucus members than is available to URC at this time.

10	Reference: XII.B.5 (p. 58) Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015 Suggestion/request: Consider including in the written notification to the faculty member recommended (but not required) suggestions for addressing weaknesses. "This letter shall provide an assessment of the faculty member's strengths and suggestions toward addressing weaknesses and" Date(s) of URC review: URC action: Status: Notes:
11	Reference: XII.B (p. 58) Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015 Suggestion/request: Remove extraneous period after XII.B.9. Date(s) of URC review: November 17, 2015 URC action: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change. Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus Notes:
12	Reference: XIII (p. 59) and throughout the document Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015 Suggestion/request: Should we stipulate in our policies that letters of decision by an ASPT body must include directions to the faculty member for appeal, or do we not add that to our policies (but continue to recommend that bodies do so as best practice). Date(s) of URC review: URC action: Status: Notes:
13	Reference: XIII.A (p. 59) Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015 Suggestion/request: Consider wording and sentence order of the first paragraph. Maybe change "An informal resolution may be effected" to "An informal resolution may also be effected" Maybe move the sentence beginning "An information resolution" to the end of the paragraph. Maybe both. Date(s) of URC review: URC action: Status: Notes:
14	Reference: XIII.A (p. 59) Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015 Suggestion/request: Replace "except as noted" with reference to Appendices 1 and 8. Date(s) of URC review: November 17, 2015 URC action: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change. Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus Notes:

Status of ASPT Document Changes As of November 19, 2015 Page 5 of 8 Reference: XIII.B.3 (p. 60)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Consider flipping c and d (so the deadlines set forth in a-d are in chronological order).
Date(s) of URC review: November 17, 2015
URC action: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.
Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus
Notes:

Reference: XIII.B.3.c (p. 60)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Add a comma after "and/or plan" and the word "to" before "communicate." "Formal meetings to discuss cumulative post-tenure reviews and/or remediation plans with the DFSC/SFSC must be scheduled to allow the DFSC/SFSC sufficient time to finalize its review and/or plan, and to communicate it to the faculty member and the appropriate Dean by the March 8 deadline."
Date(s) of URC review: November 17, 2015
URC action: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.
Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus Notes:

Reference: XIII.B.3.d (p. 60)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Change "CFSC/SFSC" to "CFSC."
Date(s) of URC review: November 17, 2015
URC action: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.
Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus
Notes:

Reference: XIII.D.2 (p. 61)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Clarify whether bodies can disallow all witnesses (i.e., allow no witnesses). Clarify whether new information may be brought forth or if the hearing is restricted to discussing evidence that may have been ignored or misinterpreted. Clarify the word "perspective."
Date(s) of URC review:
URC action:
Status:
Notes:

Reference: XIII.E (pp. 61-62)
Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015
Suggestion/request: Change "CFSC/DFSC/SFSC" to "CFSC or DFSC/SFSC."
Date(s) of URC review: November 17, 2015
URC action: URC approved a motion to replace references to "CFSC/DFSC/SFSC" in XIII.E and throughout the ASPT document with references to "DFSC/SFSC or CFSC".
Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus
Notes: URC suggests that committees within the reference be ordered by administrative level, from lower to higher, and that the syntax be applied consistently throughout the ASPT document.

Status of ASPT Document Changes As of November 19, 2015 Page 6 of 8 20 Reference: XIII.E (p. 61)

Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015

Suggestion/request: Rewrite the heading to "make it more accessible." Change "making" to "which made." Reword the clause "to an appeal of a dean or chair/director report …"

Date(s) of URC review: URC action:

Status:

Motor: T

Notes: Two options are proposed.

Option 1:

E. Procedures for Meetings with Dean or Chair/Director Preliminary to an Appeal of a Dean or Chair/Director Report Making which made a Negative Tenure or Promotion Recommendation

Option 2:

E. Meeting Procedures Prior to Appealing a Negative Tenure or Promotion Recommendation Submitted by a Dean, Chair/Director

21 Reference: XIII.E.1 (pp. 61-62)

Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015

Suggestion/request: Rewrite this passage to clarify that the rationale for the negative recommendation is to be given to the faculty member (e.g., "The faculty member should be informed ..."). Add the word "may" before "have been ignored or misinterpreted." Use active voice. For example, "The official who issues the report should deliver the recommendation so the faculty member is made aware of the rationale ..." Date(s) of URC review:

URC action:

Status:

Notes: Revision drafted by Catanzaro, with track changes.

1. The faculty member should know <u>be informed</u> of the rationale for the negative recommendation to be able to address the concerns raised in that recommendation and speak to factors or materials that have been ignored or misinterpreted. (See IV.C.4 and V.C.4).

22 Article/Section/Passage/Page: XIII.E.1 through XIII.E.6 (pp. 61-63)

Date of Faculty Caucus suggestion/request: November 4, 2015

Faculty Caucus suggestion/request: Consider rearranging the items in XIII.E to help faculty members understand their options and to help them be strategic. Consider flipping XIII.E.2 and XIII.E.3. **Date(s) of additional URC review:** November 17, 2015

URC action: URC approved a motion not to accept the suggestion from Faculty Caucus members. **Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

Notes: URC members feel that referring first to a meeting with the full DFSC/SFSC or CFSC (XIII.E.2) is preferable because that action is more likely to result in a complete and favorable hearing from the perspective of the faculty member than would meeting one-on-one with the Chair/Director or Dean. URC members feel that the order of these two items is important, as it may suggest that the first approach listed (meeting with the full DFSC/SFSC or CFSC) is the preferred approach from the perspective of the faculty member. URC members point out that, regardless of the order of XIII.E.2 and XIII.E.3, faculty members have a choice between the two approaches.

Status of ASPT Document Changes As of November 19, 2015 Page 7 of 8

23	Reference: XIII.E.3 (p. 62) Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015 Suggestion/request: Should the phrase "at the discretion of the dean/chair/director" be changed to "at the discretion of the committee"? Date(s) of URC review: URC action: Status: Notes:
24	Reference: XIII.E.4 (p. 62) Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015 Suggestion/request: Add "to be" before the word "available" on line 2. Date(s) of URC review: November 17, 2015 URC action: URC approved a motion to accept the suggested change. Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus Notes:
25	Reference: XIII.K.4 (p. 70) Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015 Suggestion/request: Rethink the five-day deadline for a faculty member to file a complaint with AFEGC. Is that time too short from the perspective of the faculty member? If URC decides to recommend a longer period, the period should not be too long so as to needlessly lengthen the entire process. Date(s) of URC review: URC action: Status: Notes:
26	Reference: XIII.K.5 (p. 70) Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015 Suggestion/request: Remove the word "its" on the last line. Date(s) of URC review: November 17, 2015 URC action: URC approved a motion to accept the suggested change. Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

ASPT DOCUMENT CHANGES APPROVED BY FACULTY CAUCUS

None

Status of ASPT Document Changes As of November 19, 2015 Page 8 of 8