

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Tuesday, February 16, 2016
10 a.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

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

Members not present: Rick Boser and Doris Houston

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

I. Call to order

Vice-Chairperson Diane Dean presided in Chairperson Doris Houston's absence. Dean called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.

II. Approval of minutes from the February 3, 2016 meeting

Bruce Stoffel reported that the minutes were not yet ready for distribution to the committee. Dean deferred approval of minutes to the March 2, 2016 committee meeting.

III. Discussion of ASPT suggestions and requests from Faculty Caucus

Note: ASPT item numbers in these minutes refer to item numbers in the *Status of ASPT Document Changes Dated February 12, 2016* (see attached).

A. Item 22

Christopher Horvath moved to replace the heading of Section XIII.E with the following heading: "Meeting Procedures Prior to Appealing a Negative Tenure or Promotion Recommendation Submitted by a Dean, Chair/Director" (i.e., Option 2 in Item 22 of the ASPT Status Report). Joe Goodman seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

B. Item 23

A revised recommendation for the replacement passage in Section XIII.E.1, written by Sam Catanzaro, was distributed to committee members: "In accordance with IV.C.4 and V.C.4, communications of CFSC and DFSC/SFSC recommendations, as well as Dean and Chair/Director reports, should include a rationale for those recommendations. Thus, the faculty member should be able to address the concerns..." Catanzaro explained that his revised recommendation is more direct and is written in active voice, as requested by Faculty Caucus (hereinafter, "Caucus") members.

Horvath asked for clarification of the options before the committee. Catanzaro explained that he previously drafted the version in Item 22 of the ASPT Status Report and that his revised recommendation just distributed to committee members is intended to better address concerns raised by Caucus members. Horvath asked what follows the ellipsis at the end of the revised recommendation. Catanzaro responded, "in that recommendation and speak to factors or materials that have been ignored or misinterpreted."

Sheryl Jenkins moved approval of the passage as revised by Catanzaro and distributed at this meeting, i.e., "In accordance with IV.C.4 and V.C.4, communications of CFSC and DFSC/SFSC recommendations, as well as Dean and Chair/Director reports, should include a rationale for those

recommendations. Thus, the faculty member should be able to address the concerns....” Horvath seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

C. Item 25

Dean read XIII.E.3. She explained that some Caucus members have suggested granting the DFSC discretion whether newly-submitted information should be considered by the chairperson. Horvath framed the case as involving two issues. The first issue is at whose discretion the additional information shall be considered. Horvath said that, if wording of XIII.E.3 is changed to give the DFSC discretion, it could be interpreted that the DFSC would be telling the chairperson he/she must consider the new information. That may be further interpreted as telling the chairperson to render a particular decision, which would be inappropriate on the part of the DFSC. The second issue is whether information added to the promotion/tenure application by the candidate would be available for viewing by all parties involved in the process. Horvath said that if only the chairperson has access to the new information, there would then effectively be two versions of the promotion/tenure packet, one with the new information and one without it, which could be problematic.

Bonnell recollected the Caucus discussion regarding this matter. She explained that some Caucus members articulated the view that the chairperson, as a voting member of the DFSC, would get a voice in deciding whether the new information should be considered, even if the change to XIII.E.3 suggested by Caucus members is made. Horvath pondered whether some Caucus members may be confusing an appeal to the DFSC with an appeal to the chairperson, which is a separate matter. He opined that it should be the chairperson’s decision what information to consider at this point in the process and the committee’s decision at other points.

Catanzaro offered that it may need to be clarified in the ASPT document that any information submitted by the candidate is added to the tenure/promotion packet for all parties to view, which, he said, should be the case. He asked if there is interest among committee members that such language be added to the document. Goodman asked how often tenure/promotion decisions are so close such that the issue of access to new information and how it is to be used in the decision-making process could arise. Catanzaro said annually there may be a few such instances.

Committee members agreed to ask Catanzaro to review the ASPT document for language regarding access to newly-submitted information. It was the general sense of the committee that, if such language exists, XIII.E.3 should not be changed and, further, that if such language does not exist, the ASPT document should be revised to include that language but that XIII.E.3 should remain unchanged. Catanzaro agreed to research the matter and report back.

D. Item 27

Dean read XIII.K.4. She explained that the question raised by some Caucus members is whether the five-day deadline for a faculty member, who has received a non-reappointment notice from the Provost, to file a complaint with Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee (AFEGC) is too short. Catanzaro noted that the benchmark in the ASPT document for filing appeals or complaints is 10 days in some cases, five days in others. He added that, generally, filing an intent to appeal has a five-day deadline (as opposed to a deadline for filing the actual appeal). Goodman asked if the faculty member need only file an intent to appeal within five days in this case (XIII.K.4). Horvath replied that it is AFEGC policy that the faculty member need only file an intent to appeal within five days, not the actual appeal.

Goodman moved to leave XIII.K.4 as it is (i.e., to retain the five-day deadline for a faculty member receiving a non-reappointment letter from the Provost to file a complaint with AFEGC). Rubin seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

E. Item 29

Stoffel reported that Item 29 has been resolved. Caucus chairperson Susan Kalter has agreed to have Catanzaro draft a flow chart and submit it to Caucus for its review later in the ASPT document review process.

F. Item 35

Dean reviewed Appendix 1.C (February 25 entry), explaining the concern voiced by some Caucus members that a faculty member might not receive acknowledgement of her/his intent to appeal a performance evaluation in time for the faculty member to file the appeal by the March 1 deadline. Catanzaro said a faculty member is unlikely not to submit an appeal by the March 1 deadline if the dean does not confirm receipt of the intent to appeal. Failure of a dean to acknowledge receiving the notice of intent would not likely disrupt the process, he added.

Horvath moved, Goodman seconded that the February 25 entry in Appendix 1.C remain unchanged. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

G. Item 40

Dean explained the request from some Caucus members that the first paragraph of Appendix 2 be revised to explicitly mention the role of CFSCs in ensuring that all units include in their ASPT documents standards of excellence and guidance to faculty members for achieving them.

Horvath noted that the 2012 edition of the ASPT document requires departments and schools to include in their department/school ASPT document a definition for overall satisfactory performance, but departments/school were not asked to define excellence. Horvath said that his department does not have written rules about what qualifies as meritorious performance, that the question is discussed every year by the DFSC. Rubin reported that faculty in his school recently spent two months discussing how to rank faculty performance but were unable to reach a decision. Catanzaro noted that deciding when performance should be rated as excellent rather than satisfactory is a perennial issue in units across the University.

Dean said she is conflicted about the Caucus request. While the evaluation process should be objective, she said, it may not be appropriate for the ASPT document to prescribe a checklist that would apply to all units. Dean suggested not adding the suggested wording at this time but being open to revisiting the request if this continues to be an issue. Sheryl Jenkins agreed, stating that the ASPT document should be kept as simple as possible. Rubin concurred, noting that prescribing such guidelines can limit options of ASPT committee members in such matters.

Horvath moved that the first paragraph of Appendix 2 not be revised to explicitly mention the role of CFSCs in ensuring that all departments/schools include in their ASPT documents standards of excellence and guidance to faculty members for achieving them. Rubin seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

IV. Communication from working groups

Working group on student reactions to teaching performance

Horvath reported that the working group (Horvath and Andy Rummel) continues to make progress and will report at the next URC meeting.

Working group on salary increments

Goodman reported for the working group investigating salary increments (Goodman and Rubin). He distributed copies of two documents (see attached), one with information about salary increments at

comparison and non-comparison institutions and another summarizing salary increment policies at Virginia public universities. Goodman cautioned using the Ball State University figures, because that information was found in secondary sources. Goodman noted that the handout regarding salary increments at Virginia public universities is based on information compiled by a colleague at James Madison University. One of those universities, William and Mary, gives discretion in setting salary increments to its deans.

Goodman reported difficulty finding universities that define salary increments as a percentage of salary. Most universities seem to define salary increments by fixed dollar amounts instead. Dean noted that most increments reported by Goodman's working group are higher than amounts at ISU.

Dean asked if Goodman and Rubin's working group is prepared to make a recommendation to URC. Goodman responded that he prefers to wait until information has been obtained from all benchmark institutions. He added that the group charge is to investigate whether salary increments should be defined by fixed dollar amount or by percentage. He said the working group does not intend to recommend specific dollar amounts but will let the Academic Senate decide those figures.

Working group on performance evaluation

Bonnell reported for the working group investigating performance evaluation (Bonnell, Boser, and Jenkins). Bonnell distributed copies of a handout (see attached) summarizing working group findings to date.

Bonnell reported having asked Milner Library faculty members for their thoughts about the evaluation process. All respondents described the process as overly burdensome, that preparing annual evaluation documents took too much time. Bonnell posited that if Milner Library faculty members are spending too much time preparing annual papers, it may be because the library has not established guidelines for preparation of annual papers.

Jenkins reported that evaluation documentation in Mennonite College of Nursing is extensive. Mennonite faculty members have reported spending from 10 hours to 40 or more hours preparing annual performance papers. She noted that some faculty members are not aware that items in suggested report outline are optional. Rubin asked if the Mennonite report described by Jenkins is in addition to Digital Measures reporting. Jenkins confirmed that it is. She explained that Mennonite faculty members are asked to update Digital Measures monthly, but most faculty members do not have time to do so.

Horvath reported that his department at one time used Digital Measures but has since discontinued its use. He explained that evaluation papers in his department now consist of three sections, on teaching, research, and service, and a curriculum vita. He explained that annual papers in his department are not extensive, because in his discipline it is the number and nature of publications that distinguishes one faculty member from another. Horvath said he was among the faculty members at the University that used to submit large amounts of documentation annually. He said he has since learned that, in his department, the volume of documentation does not affect the evaluation outcome. Now, he and other faculty members in his department submit as little documentation as needed by the DFSC to make its decisions.

Catanzaro reported that in his home department, the chairperson initiated an external review of the performance evaluation process and the amount of documentation being submitted annually by faculty members. The exercise initiated a culture shift in the department, resulting in less voluminous submissions.

Dean asked Bonnell if the working group on performance evaluation is prepared to make a recommendation to URC or if the group is still collecting information. Bonnell said the working group could spend months and years studying the issue, but, in the end, the matter of burdensome annual evaluation documentation will likely be explained by discretionary decisions at the local (department/school) level. She asked Catanzaro if the working group has access to DFSC/SFSC

documents from units across the University, so the group can test that theory. Catanzaro responded that all college, department, and school ASPT guidelines are posted on the Office of the Provost website. He suggested that a question the working group might ask is how much the documentation described in those guidelines reflects what is actually being submitted by faculty members.

V. Other business

There was none.

VI. Adjournment

Goodman moved, Rubin seconded that the meeting adjourn. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 11:06 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Christopher Horvath, Acting Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:
Status of ASPT Document Changes as of February 12, 2016
Working File, Last Updated (February 16, 2016), from Joe Goodman on behalf of the working group on salary increments
Promotion Pay at Virginia Public Institutions, from Joe Goodman on behalf of the working group on salary increments
URC Performance Evaluations Working Group, Spring 2016 (Bonnell, Boser, Jenkins)

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

February 12, 2016

SECTION 1 OF 3: PENDING BEFORE URC

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 March 2, 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 March 2, 2016 NOTES: Revision drafted by Catanzaro, with changes tracked:</p> <p>1. The faculty member should know <u>be informed of</u> 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.

SECTION 1 OF 3: PENDING BEFORE URC

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 March 2, 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 March 2, 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 March 2, 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 March 2, 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.

SECTION 1 OF 3: PENDING BEFORE URC

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 March 2, 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: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 2, 2016 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: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 2, 2016 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.

SECTION 1 OF 3: PENDING BEFORE URC

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: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 2, 2016 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: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 2, 2016 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: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 2, 2016 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: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 2, 2016 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.

SECTION 1 OF 3: PENDING BEFORE URC

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: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 2, 2016 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.

SECTION 1 OF 3: PENDING BEFORE URC

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 Charge to be determined</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.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE 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 17, 2016</p> <p>NOTES: Caucus discussed the URC recommendation on January 20, 2016, when it considered a motion to approve revised Article V. Caucus tabled the motion due to concerns about this passage. Chairperson Kalter said she would redraft the passage for consideration by Caucus at a future Caucus meeting. Caucus considered a redraft of this passage, prepared by Susan Kalter, at its February 3, 2016, meeting. After extensive discussion, Caucus agreed it was not ready to vote on the motion. Susan Kalter offered to revise the passage again and bring it back to Caucus for consideration. The re-revised passage is scheduled for consideration by Caucus on February 17, 2016, in connection with an action item to approve Article V.</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.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE 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>
----------	--

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: February 3, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to recommend replacing the first two sentences of Section IX.B.2 (of the ASPT document as recommended by URC to Faculty Caucus in August 2015) 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 provisions (see IX.B.3). This period may be reduced by full-time service as a faculty member at other institutions of higher learning ...</p> <p>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.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

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 March 2, 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>
-----------	---

5-B	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 59</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: October 21, 2015</p> <p>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; February 3, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to NOT add the passage from IV.C.2 to Article XIII</p> <p>STATUS: URC deferred further discussion of the item until its February 3 meeting. Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 2, 2016.</p> <p>NOTES: In approving the URC motion, URC members indicated that they like the idea of repeating the passage in the ASPT document and noted that the passage appears in Section IV.C.2 and Section V.A. URC members noted that the passage would not fit well with Article XIII because the subject of the passage differs from the subject of Article XIII (appeals).</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.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

15 **ARTICLE:** XIII
PAGE: 59
SECTION: XIII.A

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 March 2, 2016

16 **ARTICLE:** XIII
PAGE: 59
SECTION: XIII.A

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 March 2, 2016

17 **ARTICLE:** XIII
PAGE: 60
SECTION: XIII.B.3

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 March 2, 2016

18 **ARTICLE:** XIII
PAGE: 60
SECTION: XIII.B.3.c

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 March 2, 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.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE 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."</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: November 17, 2015</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 2, 2016</p>
-----------	--

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."</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: February 3, 2015</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to NOT modify XIII.D.2 i.e., NOT to clarify whether bodies can disallow all witnesses, NOT to clarify whether new information may be brought forth or if the hearing is restricted to discussing evidence that may have been ignored or misinterpreted, and NOT to clarify the word "perspective."</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 2, 2016</p> <p>NOTES: The rationale for URC not modifying XIII.D.2 is to allow ASPT committees flexibility in determining, on a case-by-case basis, the nature and proceedings of formal meetings and appeal hearings.</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".</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 2, 2016</p> <p>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>
-----------	---

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.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

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 March 2, 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 March 2, 2016</p>
-----------	---

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 March 2, 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, January 26, 2016. STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 2, 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.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

31 **ARTICLE:** Appendix 1
PAGE: 74-75
SECTION: Appendix 1.B, "March 10"

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, January 26, 2016.
STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 2, 2016

32 **ARTICLE:** Appendix 1
PAGE: 74
SECTION: Appendix 1.B, "Prior to December 15" (p. 74) and elsewhere throughout the document

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, January 26, 2016.
STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 2, 2016

33 **ARTICLE:** Appendix 1
PAGE: 76
SECTION: Appendix 1.C, "February 25"

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 March 2, 2016

34 **ARTICLE:** Appendix 1
PAGE: 76
SECTION: Appendix 1.C, "February 25"

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, January 26, 2016.
STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 2, 2016

36 **ARTICLE:** Appendix 1
PAGE: 77
SECTION: Appendix 1.E, "April 15"

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, January 26, 2016.
STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 2, 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.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

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, January 26, 2016. STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 2, 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, January 26, 2016. STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 2, 2016</p>
-----------	---

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, January 26, 2016. STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 2, 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.

SECTION 3 OF 3: 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 January 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.

SECTION 3 OF 3: 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.

SECTION 3 OF 3: 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>

Working File

Last updated (February 16, 2016)

Table 1: IBHE Comparison Institutions used in Non-Salary Studies

	Comparison Institutions	Enrollment	Assistant to Associate	Associate to Full
1.	Ball State University	21,196	\$4000	\$6000
2.	Bowling Green State University	16,912	\$5500	\$9000
3.	Central Michigan University	27,069	\$6250	\$7250
4.	Miami University (Ohio)	18,456	\$6000	\$9000
5.	Old Dominion University	24,932	\$4000	\$8000
6.	Portland State University	28,241		
7.	UNC-Charlotte	26,571		
8.	UNC-Greensboro	18,502		
9.	Western Michigan University	23,914		
10	Wichita State University	14,495		

Table 2: Non-comparison Institutions with Percentage Based Advancement Raises

	Comparison Institutions	Enrollment	Assistant to Associate	Associate to Full
1.	UT-Chattanooga	10,781	10% of Current Salary	10% of Current Salary
2.	Virginia Military Institute	1,700	5% or \$3000	5% or \$3000
3.				

Institution	Promotion Pay at Virginia Public Institutions		Notes
	Assistant to Associate	Associate to Professor	
Christopher Newport University	minimum salary \$60,000	minimum salary \$78,000	CNU uses salary minimums rather than pay increases for promotions. Assistant Professor minimum salary is \$47,000. These are only general amounts. W & M does not follow any across-the-board guidelines for faculty promotion salary increases. The increases are at the dean's discretion.
College of William and Mary	about \$2,500	about \$3,000	For P&T - its \$1,500 for one action (promotion or tenure); \$2,000 for both actions. If they receive genuine excellence in all categories (Provost decision), whatever action amount is doubled (\$1,500 will be 3,000; 2,000 will be 4,000).
George Mason University	\$3,500	\$5,000	
James Madison University	\$2,000	\$3,000	
Longwood University	\$1,500	\$2,500	\$1,500 for approved for tenure
Norfolk State	\$4,000	\$6,000	
Old Dominion University	\$3,500	\$5,000	
Radford University	\$2,000	\$3,000	
University of Mary Washington			UMW also provides a \$2,000 raise when a lecturer is promoted to senior lecturer. These are determined by each school. Typically, the school decides how much they want to award as a base promotion increase, then they adjust for additional merit, if warranted.
University of Virginia	\$1,500	\$2,000	
University of Virginia-Wise	\$1,500	\$2,500	
Virginia Commonwealth University	5% or \$3,000 (whichever is greater)	5% or \$3,000 (whichever is greater)	Instructor to Assistant Professor - \$1,000
Virginia Military Institute	\$3,000	\$4,500	
Virginia State University	\$3,000 (with tenure)	\$4,000 (with tenure)	
Virginia Tech	\$3,000 (with tenure)	\$4,000 (with tenure)	

URC Performance Evaluations Working Group, Spring 2016
(Bonnell, Boser, Jenkins)

Benchmark Institutions for ISU

http://prpa.illinoisstate.edu/data_center/peer_groups/

1. **Ball State University** Annual evaluations used for salary increment, page 98
<http://cms.bsu.edu/-/media/WWW/DepartmentalContent/FacProfHandbook/201516/201516C2.pdf>

2. **Bowling Green State University** Annual review with rolling three-year review to determine merit increases

"The annual merit review will be based upon the accomplishments over the most recent three-year period on a rolling basis, ie., each year new information is added to the file for the most recent year, and information from the oldest year is eliminated from the file. This will help to reduce inequities that can result both from differences in the merit funds available each year and from fluctuations in performance that may occur from year to year.

<http://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/philosophy/graduate-program/graduate-student-handbook/philosophy-department/department-policies-and-procedures/iv-annual-faculty-evaluation-and-determination-of-merit.html>

3. **Clemson University** Annual performance evaluations via Faculty Activity System (FAS), Appendices E, F

"An individual's recommended merit increase is based upon the performance evaluation by the chair or director although there may be no precise correlation between the annual faculty evaluation and the amount of salary increase." page IV-10

"Post Tenure Review Merit salary increments are based on these annual performance reviews." page IV-8

<http://www.clemson.edu/administration/provost/documents/facultymanual.pdf>, page IV-4

4. **Miami University (Ohio)** Annual evaluations used in determining salary recommendations

"Each tenured and probationary member of the instructional staff shall receive at a minimum a written annual evaluation based at least in part on data supplied by the person in his or her Annual Report of Professional Activities. Evaluations shall serve two functions: (1) to guide the professional development of the person and (2) to record part of the evidence upon which personnel decisions and salary recommendations shall be based."

<https://blogs.miamioh.edu/miamipolicies/?p=163>

5. and 6. **University of California-Riverside** and **University of California-Santa Cruz** A system of rigorous performance review is linked directly to compensation on salary scales.

"Faculty are reviewed on average every two to three years by faculty peers and administrators."

"Faculty continue to be reviewed regularly after tenure is conferred. Senior faculty who reach the highest "step" at the professorial level (Professor, Step IX) may receive a special review and be placed "above scale," where they still undergo regular review but the salary

exceeds the maximum salary designated for the title series. On many UC campuses, these "above scale" faculty are awarded the title of "Distinguished Professor."

<http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/uc-faculty-comp-summary-jun-2014.pdf>

Academic Salary Scales

<http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/compensation/2015-16-academic-salary-scales.html>

- 7. University North Carolina-Greensboro** Annual reviews contribute toward merit increases "Annual reviews should provide a means of recognizing, encouraging, and rewarding faculty performance by means of merit pay increases, when funds are available for this purpose."

<http://provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/posttenurereview.pdf>

8. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

"The Departmental Executive Committee shall provide for the periodic review of the performance of every faculty member. These reviews include those for determining annual merit salary increases, contract renewal, tenure and promotion and tenured faculty review." page 30

<http://www4.uwm.edu/secu/policies/faculty/upload/May2015P-P.pdf>

Questions asked of Milner tenure-line faculty (2 weeks to comment, responses due 2/12/16)

1. Do you agree that the performance evaluation system is overly burdensome?
Assistant: 1 yes
Associate: 4 yes
Full: 2 yes

2. Do you agree that too much time is being spent by faculty members preparing their performance evaluation documents?
Assistant: 1 yes
Associate: 4 yes
Full: 2 yes

3. How much time do you spend preparing materials?
Assistant: 10-12 hours
Associate: range from 8 to 40 hours
Full: range from days to a week

4. For tenured faculty members, do you spend less time preparing materials post-tenure than when pre-tenure, and if so, could you estimate the difference?
Assistant: NA
Associate: 4 yes (less time is spent but still too much)
Full: yes; about the same

Milner Library Department Faculty Status Committee document III.B.1 (pages 11–12)

III. B. Annual Evaluation

1. General Procedures

No later than January 5th of each year, or the next working day if the University is officially closed on January 5th, faculty must submit materials to the DFSC for an annual performance evaluation of their activities and accomplishments of the preceding year.

Faculty members shall submit the following:

- an activities report;
- a copy of their current job description;
- a list of their goals for the year being evaluated;
- a list of goals for the coming year;
- faculty assignments prepared in consultation with the Department Chair or his/her designee for the period under review; and
- additional supporting materials.
- Pre-tenured faculty members shall also submit all prior DFSC annual performance evaluations.

The activities report, from one to seven pages in length (one side of a page = one page), should focus on the prior year's most significant achievements in relation to the job description and faculty assignments. The list of goals for the year being evaluated should include an indication of whether each goal was met. It is appropriate to refer to specific sections of the activities report and to include bulleted lists or brief statements of explanation. Supporting materials the individual wishes to submit may be included in appendices. Individuals are asked to emphasize quality rather than quantity of work in these reports, although numerical evidence may be cited in support of arguments for quality.

Administrative coordinators shall write evaluations and discuss them with faculty members. After an evaluation is completed and signed, administrative coordinators are responsible for submitting it to the DFSC by the same date identified by the ASPT Calendars for faculty to submit their files for performance evaluations (typically January 5). Faculty members may, if they wish, append a written response to their evaluations.

In addition to submitting paper copies, faculty members are encouraged—but not required—to submit electronic copies of their activities report, job description, and annual goals to the DFSC Chair to be made available via network facilities to DFSC members only. The DFSC Chair will delete the electronic files upon completion of the annual evaluation and/or promotion and tenure timeline each year.