

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 3, 2016
1 p.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Rick Boser, Diane Dean, Joe Goodman, Christopher Horvath, Doris Houston, Sheryl Jenkins, Andy Rummel, David Rubin, and Sam Catanzaro (non-voting)

Members not present: None

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

I. Call to order

Chairperson Doris Houston called the meeting to order at 1 p.m.

II. Approval of minutes from the January 19, 2016 meeting

Diane Dean moved, Joe Goodman seconded approval of minutes from the January 19, 2016 meeting as distributed prior to the meeting. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

III. Discussion of ASPT suggestions and requests from Faculty Caucus

Houston referred committee members to the *Status of ASPT Document Changes Dated January 29, 2016* (attached). At Houston's request, Bruce Stoffel oriented committee members to the report format.

A. Confirmation of consent agenda items (approved January 26, 2016)

Houston reported that items in the status report circulated via email for committee approval by consent were approved effective January 26, 2016. [Status report items in the circulation included item numbers 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, and 39.]

B. Item 7

Sheryl Jenkins suggested changing the word "interrupted" to "extended" in the second sentence of the proposed passage so the sentence would read, "This probationary period may be extended by stop-the-clock extensions (see IX.B.3)." Sam Catanzaro clarified that, in suggesting the change to references in the ASPT document regarding length of the probationary period (from seven to six years), he intended that any stop-the-clock period would not count toward the six years and would not extend the length of the probationary period. Dean said, given Catanzaro's clarification, the word "interrupted" in the second sentence might be more appropriate than the word "extended." Dean added that it is important to clarify that a faculty member should not be expected to engage in research during stop-the-clock periods. Also regarding the second sentence of the proposed passage, committee members discussed changing the word "extensions" to "provisions" or "periods." Jenkins suggested that retaining the word "also" in the third sentence of the proposed passage might be misleading ("This period may also be reduced by full-time service as a faculty member at other institutions of higher learning ..."), because the prior sentence refers to an interruption of the probationary period rather than to a reduction of the period.

Dean moved that the passage in Section IX.B.2 of the ASPT document (i.e., in the version recommended by URC to Faculty Caucus in August 2015) that reads, "The probationary period at Illinois State University may not exceed six years. This period may be reduced by full-time service as a faculty member at other institutions of higher learning ..." be revised to read as follows: "The probationary period at Illinois State University may not exceed six years. This probationary period

may be interrupted by stop-the-clock provisions (see IX.B.3). This period may be reduced by full-time service as a faculty member at other institutions of higher learning ...” Christopher Horvath seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

C. Item 5-B

Horvath said the last sentence of IV.C.2 is needlessly complicated and should be revised if it is added to XIII. Dean noted that if the sentence is modified in XIII it should also be modified elsewhere in the document. Catanzaro stated that IV.C.2 is acceptable to him as written. He added that redundancy can be beneficial if it helps faculty members understand their options, so including the passage in XIII would not be problematic for him. He said the passage might best fit with XIII.E or XIII.F or, perhaps, as a new XIII.F or a new XIII.G. Angela Bonnell suggested that the committee may want to consider rewording the passage and/or the article if the passage is added to XIII, to better integrate the content of the passage with the content of the article. Dean noted that the passage currently appears in sections that describe how DFSCs/SFSCs and CFSCs proceed but, perhaps, should not be included in XIII, which is about appeals. Horvath and Goodman agreed.

Dean moved to not accept the suggestion made by Faculty Caucus members that IV.C.2 be added to Article XIII, noting that the committee has already addressed the desire for redundancy by adding IV.C.2 to V.A and further noting that the content of IV.C.2 does not relate to content of XIII. Horvath seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

D. Item 20

Catanzaro explained that permitting a DFSC/SFSC or a CFSC to limit the number of witnesses is meant to allow committee members to use their professional judgement in managing committee meetings. Catanzaro said it would be very rare that a committee would not permit any witnesses. He added that, if asked by a dean or chair, he would advise allowing at least one or two witnesses so the faculty member has a chance to state her or his case.

Horvath said the Faculty Review Committee disallowed witnesses in cases before that committee when he was serving on it. He said there may be circumstances in which a DFSC or CFSC might want to do the same. David Rubin noted that a common point of clarification is the position of authors in a publication. Horvath said such issues can be clarified in writing rather than through witnesses.

Houston asked if there might be a DFSC or SFSC with internal strife that purposely decides to disallow all witnesses in a particular case. Catanzaro said that could happen and, if so, that could be an important aspect of an appeal filed by the faculty member.

Regarding whether a faculty member should be permitted to introduce new information in a formal meeting or hearing, Catanzaro noted that XIII.D.1 already addresses the question by granting the DFSC and CFSC discretion in deciding additional information it will accept from the faculty member. Dean concurred.

Bonnell noted that the Provost raised the question regarding the intent of the word “perspective” in XIII.D.1, perhaps because she has had some experience with its interpretation in that context. Catanzaro said, while he understands that some ASPT committee members seek direction for making sense of complex situations during ASPT deliberations, the word “perspective” was intentionally used in the passage to allow committees flexibility in deciding what additional information to accept and from whom.

Houston offered to work with Catanzaro to redraft XIII.D.2 to addresses issues raised by Caucus members. Boser expressed concern about wordsmithing, asking how much clearer the document can be. Goodman agreed.

Goodman moved to leave XIII.D.2 unchanged (i.e., not making any changes in response to issues raised by Faculty Caucus members). Dean seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, with eight ayes and one nay.

IV. Communication from working groups

Horvath distributed a written report (attached) regarding work of the ad hoc committee on student evaluations. The committee is investigating guidelines and best practices of the American Association of University Professors, policies at benchmark institutions, and research on reliability of student evaluations as measures of faculty performance.

Goodman reported on work of the group investigating salary increments. He said that all universities researched thus far define salary increments using fixed dollar amounts rather than percentages. Houston suggested that Goodman's group consider using the same list of peer institutions as Horvath's group, so URC can be consistent when reporting findings to the Caucus. Horvath noted that the list of peer institutions is available on the university website.

Bonnell and Jenkins reported on work of the group investigating performance evaluations. Bonnell said that the group is also investigating peer institutions and that all but two require annual evaluations. The trickier issue for the group, according to Bonnell, is what constitutes too much time spent by faculty preparing annual evaluation documents. Jenkins reported that Mennonite College of Nursing faculty report spending from two hours to over 40 hours preparing annual performance evaluation documents. She noted that this may be a department issue, since ASPT policies are flexible with regard to the nature of performance evaluation documentation. Boser reported that faculty in his department spend two to four hours on their performance evaluation papers. He said that if the Caucus goal is to encourage a standardized approach to performance evaluation submissions across campus, standardization may not be easy to achieve. Bonnell suggested that the performance evaluation process should be comparable across departments while reflecting the culture of each unit. Houston added that issues to be addressed include the breadth and depth of the review and whether the process should be different for tenured faculty than for probationary faculty.

V. Deferral of college standards submissions, from spring 2016 to fall 2016

Houston referred committee members to the memorandum from Stoffel (attached) regarding scheduled spring 2016 submission of college standards by the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business, and Mennonite College of Nursing. Committee members agreed that the three colleges should be allowed to defer their submission until fall 2016, after they have made any changes necessitated by changes to University ASPT standards approved this spring by the Caucus.

VI. Other business

There was none.

VII. Adjournment

Boser moved, Dean seconded that the meeting adjourn. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 2 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rick Boser, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:
Status of ASPT Document Changes as of January 29, 2016
URC ad hoc Committee on Student Evaluations (report by Chris Horvath and Andy Rummel, undated)
Memorandum from Bruce Stoffel regarding the schedule for college standards submissions, spring 2016

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

STATUS OF ASPT DOCUMENT CHANGES

January 29, 2016

PENDING BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

7	<p>ARTICLE: IX PAGE: 32 SECTION: IX.B.2</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: October 21, 2015; January 15, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider modifying the beginning of this passage as follows:</p> <p>From:</p> <p>The probationary period at Illinois State University may not exceed six years. This period may be reduced by full-time service as a faculty member at other institutions of higher learning ...</p> <p>To:</p> <p>The probationary period at Illinois State University may not exceed six years. This probationary period may be interrupted by stop-the-clock extensions (see IX.B.3). This period may also be reduced by full-time service as a faculty member at other institutions of higher learning ...</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
5-B	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 59</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: October 21, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider inserting the following passage from IV.C.2 in Article XIII: "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."</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 19, 2016 URC ACTION: STATUS: URC deferred further discussion of the item until its February 3 meeting. Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on February 17, 2016 NOTES: See also 5-A</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

PENDING BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

20	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 61 SECTION: XIII.D.2</p> <p>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: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
22	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 61 SECTION: XIII.E</p> <p>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: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p> <p>NOTES: Two options are proposed.</p> <p>Option 1: E. Procedures for Meetings with Dean or Chair/Director Preliminary to an Appeal of a Dean or Chair/Director Report Making <u>which made</u> a Negative Tenure or Promotion Recommendation</p> <p>Option 2: E. Meeting Procedures Prior to Appealing a Negative Tenure or Promotion Recommendation Submitted by a Dean, Chair/Director</p>
23	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 61-62 SECTION: XIII.E.1</p> <p>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: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on February 17, 2016 NOTES: Revision drafted by Catanzaro, with changes tracked:</p> <p>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).</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

PENDING BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

25	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 62 SECTION: Reference: XIII.E.3</p> <p>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: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
27	<p>Article: XIII Page: 70 Section: XIII.K.4</p> <p>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: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
29	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 73 SECTION: Appendix 1 (beginning on p. 73)</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Add a flow chart to this appendix to graphically illustrate the timelines. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on February 17, 2016 NOTES: This change was suggested by URC Chairperson Doris Houston and supported by numerous Faculty Caucus members who commented.</p>
35	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 76 SECTION: Appendix 1.C, “February 25”</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Discuss the appropriateness of the CFSC chairperson acknowledging a written notice of intent to appeal a performance evaluation within five business days of its receipt. The concern raised by multiple Caucus members was the possibility, given this timing, that a faculty member could receive acknowledgement after the March 1 deadline for filing the appeal with the CFSC. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

PENDING BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

40	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 79 SECTION: Appendix 2, University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation, first paragraph</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Add to this paragraph mention of the role CFSCs have in ensuring that all departments/schools include in their DFSC/SFSC documents both standards of excellence and guidance to faculty members for achieving excellence (e.g., including examples). A concern was raised by one Caucus member that the DFSC in his/her department does not have such standards. Other Caucus members expressed concern about the situation and supported the Caucus member's request that such an addition to the paragraph be considered. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
42	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 83 SECTION: Appendix 2, Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider including the second clause of item five in the Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Service Activities on page 85: Refereeing or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: NOTES: This suggestion was submitted in response to the request sent to members of the university community for comments regarding the August 2015 draft ASPT document. Senator Kalter suggests that URC consider consulting with the University Research Council regarding this suggestion.</p>
43	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 83 SECTION: Appendix 2, Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider adding a statement to the text preceding the list clarifying that the order of the list is not meant to imply the relative value of each factor. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: NOTES: If such a statement is added to page 83, should a similar statement be added to the text preceding the list of teaching factors and the list of service factors, also in Appendix 2?</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

44	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 84 SECTION: Appendix 2, Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider adding the following to the list on pages 83-84: 16. Other activities as determined by the department/school. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: NOTES: If this is added to the list on pages 83-84, should the same be added to the list of teaching factors and the list of service factors, also in Appendix 2?</p>
45	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 83 SECTION: Appendix 2, Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider reversing the order of items 9 and 10 in the list of factors on page 83, placing “submitting grant proposals” before “obtaining grants.” DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: NOTES:</p>
46	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 84 SECTION: Appendix 2, Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Considering inserting the word “substantive” to item 15 on page 84, so the item reads: “Demonstrating <i>substantive</i> leadership of teams conducting scholarly or creative work, especially where that leadership contributes to the success of other faculty, students, or staff.” DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: NOTES:</p>
47	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 4 PAGE: 87 SECTION: Note below the flow chart</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider adding to the list in parentheses in the notation at the bottom of the page reference to chairs/directors and deans, since they may write minority reports that become part of the promotion and tenure file. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: NOTES:</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

48	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 4 PAGE: 87 SECTION: Box with the text, "Option to review by FRC a negative recommendation"</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Add a notation indicating recommendations that can be appealed to FRC, perhaps by adding language in Comment SC53 to the box or perhaps by use of an asterisk in the box and a note at the bottom of the page or perhaps by adding to the box the appropriate section numbers from the text (as has been done with flow charts in proposed new appendices). DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: NOTES:</p>
10	<p>WORKING GROUP Joe Goodman (CH) and David Rubin</p> <p>ARTICLE: XII PAGE: 56 SECTION: XII.A.5</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider defining salary increments by percentages rather than by dollar amounts. Or consider increasing the dollar amounts of the raises since they have not likely been changed in many years. URC ACTION: URC has formed a working group to investigate this issue. STATUS: The working group is scheduled to report to the full URC on April 27, 2016 NOTES: This item may be considered by Caucus off-cycle.</p>
11	<p>WORKING GROUP Christopher Horvath (CH) and Andy Rummel</p> <p>ARTICLE: XII PAGE: 57 SECTION: XII.B.2 and others throughout the document</p> <p>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. URC ACTION: URC has formed a working group to investigate this issue. STATUS: The working group is scheduled to report to the full URC on April 27, 2016 NOTES: This item may be considered by Caucus off-cycle.</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

PENDING BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

41	<p>WORKING GROUP Angela Bonnell (CH), Rick Boser, and Sheryl Jenkins</p> <p>ARTICLE: Articles V, VII, and related articles PAGE: 20, 26, and others SECTION: V.C, VII, and related sections</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Discuss how often performance evaluations must be conducted by a DFSC/SFSC and the content and extent of materials submitted by faculty members with their performance evaluation documents. Several caucus members expressed concern that the current performance evaluation system is overly burdensome for faculty members, that too much time is being spent by faculty members preparing their performance evaluation documents. One suggestion was to conduct performance evaluations every other year rather than every year. Another suggestion was to conduct performance evaluations annually for probationary faculty but every other year for tenured faculty. Diane Dean pointed out that performance evaluations inform annual salary increment decisions, so not having an annual evaluation may be problematic in distributing salary increments. Another option suggested was to continue to conduct performance evaluations every year but to reduce the extent of documentation being submitted by faculty members. It seemed to be the consensus of those Caucus members commenting during the meeting (there were several) that it might be timely for URC to revisit how performance evaluations are conducted, since the current system has been in place for several years without discussion or change. URC ACTION: URC has formed a working group to investigate this issue. STATUS: The working group is scheduled to report to the full URC on April 27, 2016 NOTES: This item may be considered by Caucus off-cycle.</p>
-----------	---

49	<p>WORKING GROUP</p> <p>ARTICLE: PAGE: SECTION:</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: SUGGESTION/REQUEST: DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: NOTES:</p>
-----------	---

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

DECIDED BY UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE / PENDING BEFORE FACULTY CAUCUS

4	<p>ARTICLE: V PAGE: 19 SECTION: V.B.1</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Revised V.B.1 (with track changes)</p> <p>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.</u> and approved by the majority vote of the eligible Department/School faculty. Copies of 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</u></p> <p><u>DFSC/SFSC shall report annually to the CFSC whether they reviewed their Department/School policies (See V.D.3)</u></p> <p>New V.D.3</p> <p><u>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).</u></p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration on February 3, 2016 NOTES: Caucus discussed the URC recommendation on January 20, 2016, when it considered a motion to approve revised Article V. Caucus tabled the motion to approve revised Article V due to concerns about this passage. Chairperson Kalter said she would redraft the passage for consideration by Caucus at a future Caucus meeting.</p>
----------	---

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

DECIDED BY UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE / PENDING BEFORE FACULTY CAUCUS

6	<p>ARTICLE: IX PAGE: 32 SECTION: IX.B.2</p> <p>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-the-clock 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: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
14	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 59 SECTION: XIII and others throughout the document</p> <p>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: December 8, 2015 URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to add the following sentence to the end of XII.B.5: “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.” The motion passed with three ayes, one nay, and one abstention. STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016 NOTES: The rationale articulated by the URC member making the motion was to provide consistency regarding provision of information to faculty members regarding opportunities to appeal ASPT decisions. Reasons expressed by URC members for not supporting the suggested change: concern about the length and clarity of decision letters and concern that the ASPT committee writing the letter might error in reciting the appropriate appeals passage or in its reference to the appropriate appeals passage. URC discussed where in the ASPT document the suggested passage should be added. The URC member making the motion selected XII.B.5, the passage regarding DFSC/SFSC notification regarding performance evaluation and recommended change in rank and/or tenure status.</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

DECIDED BY UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE / PENDING BEFORE FACULTY CAUCUS

15	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 59 SECTION: XIII.A</p> <p>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: December 8, 2015 URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to revise the first paragraph of XIII.A to read 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.” STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
16	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 59 SECTION: XIII.A</p> <p>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: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
17	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 60 SECTION: XIII.B.3</p> <p>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: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
18	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 60 SECTION: XIII.B.3.c</p> <p>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: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

DECIDED BY UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE / PENDING BEFORE FACULTY CAUCUS

19	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 60 SECTION: XIII.B.3.d</p> <p>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: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
21	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 61-62 SECTION: XIII.E</p> <p>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: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016 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.</p>
24	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 61-63 SECTION: XIII.E.1 through XIII.E.6</p> <p>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: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016 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.</p>
26	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 62 SECTION: XIII.E.4</p> <p>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: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

DECIDED BY UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE / PENDING BEFORE FACULTY CAUCUS

28	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 70 SECTION: XIII.K.5</p> <p>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: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
30	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 74 SECTION: Appendix 1.B., “Prior to December 15”</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change the reference to “Section XV.D” at the end of the entry to “Section XVI.D” but only if the article numbering is changed throughout the document to accommodate new sections. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26, 2016 URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
31	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 74-75 SECTION: Appendix 1.B, “March 10”</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change the reference to “DFSC” (third line from the top on p. 75) to “DFSC/SFSC”. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26, 2016 URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
32	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 74 SECTION: Appendix 1.B, “Prior to December 15” (p. 74) and elsewhere throughout the document</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Check for consistent use of “article” versus “section”. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26, 2016 URC ACTION: URC agreed with the suggestion via consent agenda STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
33	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 76 SECTION: Appendix 1.C, “February 25”</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change the reference on the last line, from “five” to “5” for consistency. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 26, 2016 URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

DECIDED BY UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE / PENDING BEFORE FACULTY CAUCUS

34	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 76 SECTION: Appendix 1.C, "February 25"</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change the reference on line four from "The Chair" to "The chair". DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 26, 2016 URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
36	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 77 SECTION: Appendix 1.E, "April 15"</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change this entry from passive to active voice. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26, 2016 URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
37	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 77 SECTION: Appendix 1.E, "May 1", "The fifth-year review of College Standards ..."</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change this entry from passive to active voice. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26, 2016 URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
38	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 77 SECTION: Appendix 1.E, "May 1", "Each CFSC shall submit an annual report to its College Council and the URC ..."</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Reinsert the reference to "Promotion and Tenure" to clarify what is to be reported. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26, 2016 URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

DECIDED BY UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE / PENDING BEFORE FACULTY CAUCUS

39	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 79 SECTION: Appendix 2, University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation, first paragraph</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Remove the word “specific” from the last sentence of the paragraph. There was confusion among some Caucus members as to its meaning in this context. It was consensus of those Caucus members commenting that it would be easier to remove the word rather than try to agree on an alternative. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26-2016 URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on February 17, 2016</p>
-----------	--

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

DECIDED BY FACULTY CAUCUS

1	<p>ARTICLE: Overview PAGE: 5 SECTION: Overview, Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty</p> <p>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 member Sheryl 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 on November 17, 2015.</p> <p>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."</p> <p>STATUS: Caucus incorporated the URC recommendation in the revised Overview, approved by Caucus January 20, 2016.</p>
2	<p>ARTICLE: I PAGE: 8 SECTION: I.E</p> <p>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: Caucus incorporated the URC recommendation in revised Article, approved by Caucus 20, 2016.</p>
3	<p>ARTICLE: I PAGE: 8 SECTION: I.E.</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: October 7, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider replacing "possible" with "reasonable" DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 19, 2016 URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change. STATUS: Caucus incorporated the URC recommendation in revised Article I, approved by Caucus January 20, 2016.</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

DECIDED BY FACULTY CAUCUS

5-A	<p>ARTICLE: VIII PAGE: 28</p> <p>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.” DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: November 3, 2015 URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to make the change and to renumber existing Article VIII.C as Article VIII.D, existing Article VIII.D as Article VIII.E, and so on. STATUS: Caucus incorporated URC recommendation in revised Article VIII, approved by Caucus January 27, 2016 NOTES: See also 5B</p>
8	<p>ARTICLE: X PAGE: 40 SECTION: X.D</p> <p>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: Caucus incorporated URC recommendation in revised Article X, approved by Caucus January 27, 2016</p>
9	<p>ARTICLE: XII PAGE: 56 SECTION: XII.A.4</p> <p>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: Caucus incorporated URC recommendation in revised Article XII, approved by Caucus January 27, 2016</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

DECIDED BY FACULTY CAUCUS

12	<p>ARTICLE: XII PAGE: 58 SECTION: XII.B.5</p> <p>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: December 8, 2015 URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to not modify XII.B.5 to require written notifications to faculty members regarding ASPT decisions to include recommended (but not required) suggestions for addressing weaknesses. STATUS: Caucus incorporated URC recommendation in revised Article XII, approved by Caucus January 27, 2016 NOTES: It was consensus of URC members voting on the motion at the December 8, 2015 URC meeting that providing written suggestions is best practice but should not be required, that the manner in which ASPT committees have addressed weaknesses has not been a problem.</p>
13	<p>ARTICLE: XII PAGE: 58 SECTION: XII.B</p> <p>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: Caucus incorporated URC recommendation in revised Article XII, approved by Caucus January 27, 2016</p>

URC ad hoc Committee on Student Evaluations:

Chris Horvath (CAS/Philosophy)

Andy Rummel (CFA/Music)

1. AAUP guidelines and best practices:

2. Benchmark Institutions:

Are student course evaluations administered?

How: On-line/In course

By whom: Students/Faculty/Administration

Methodology

Are the student course evaluations part of the faculty evaluation process?

Tenure/Promotion

Annual performance evaluation

Are other forms of teaching evaluation required for faculty evaluation?

What other forms?

Weighting

Mandatory or optional?

3. Research on reliability of student evaluations as measure of faculty performance/learning outcomes assessment:

With special attention to

Female Faculty

Faculty of Color

LGBTQ Faculty

EASL Faculty



**ILLINOIS STATE
UNIVERSITY**
Illinois' first public university

Vice President
Provost of the University
410 Hovey Hall
Campus Box 4000
Normal, IL 61790-4000
Phone: (309) 438-7018
Facsimile: (309) 438-5602

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bruce R. Stoffel, Recorder, University Review Committee

FROM: University Review Committee

DATE: January 29, 2016

RE: Deferral of college standards submissions, from spring 2016 to fall 2016

Several years ago the University Review Committee adopted a schedule for review of college standards at five-year intervals, as mandated by the ASPT document (Section II.C). Per the schedule adopted by URC, the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business, and Mennonite College of Nursing are expected to submit their college standards this spring, by May 1, 2016, for review by URC either this spring or this coming fall.

However, these three colleges as well as the other four will be asked to revise their college standards this coming fall to align with the new university ASPT document and to then submit their revised standards to URC for URC review and approval prior to December 31, 2016.

Rather than ask the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business, and Mennonite College of Nursing to submit their college standards to URC twice this calendar year (this spring and again this fall), URC could choose to waive the spring 2016 submission given the unique circumstance this year of having a new university ASPT document adopted.

QUESTION:

Does URC support waiving the scheduled spring 2016 submission of college standards by the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business, and Mennonite College of Nursing, with the understanding that all seven colleges will be asked to submit revised college standards to URC in fall 2016?