

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Friday, November 10, 2017
3 p.m., Hovey 302

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Michael Byrns, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Diane Dean, Kevin Edwards, Doris Houston (via telephone), Sheryl Jenkins, Rachel Shively, Sarah Smelser

Members not present: Joe Goodman

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

Note: In these minutes “URC” refers to the University Review Committee at Illinois State University; “Caucus” refers to the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate at Illinois State University; “ASPT” refers to appointment, salary, promotion, and tenure policies of Illinois State University; “ASPT policies” refers to Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies effective January 1, 2017; “AFEGC” refers to the Faculty Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee at Illinois State University; “DFSC” refers to department faculty status committee; and “SFSC” refers to school faculty status committee. References in the minutes to “DFSC” are intended to refer to both DFSC and SFSC.

I. Call to order

Chairperson Diane Dean called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. A quorum was present.

II. Approval of minutes from the October 20, 2017 meeting

Michael Byrns moved approval of the minutes from the October 20, 2017 URC meeting. Sarah Smelser seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, with seven members voting aye and one member abstaining (Angela Bonnell).

III. Report from the working group on teaching evaluations

Smelser distributed a revised version of “Suggestions for Rewording in Appendix 2, p. 61-62 of ASPT document (green book).” She explained that the revised version includes two changes not included in the version sent to committee members in advance of the meeting. Smelser said the suggestions for rewording are intended to emphasize use of multiple types of evidence when evaluating teaching, taking a holistic approach to evaluating teaching by considering evidence over an extended period of time, and considering potential sources of bias in evaluating teaching. Smelser noted that the working group suggests one change to the sources of evidence listed in the passage, adding “A narrative self-reflection on teaching performance.”

Doris Houston asked if the working group has addressed the issue of weighting types of evidence used to evaluate teaching. Byrns noted that the Caucus had asked URC to consider equal weighting of evidence. Byrns said the working group discussed weighting evaluation methods but has instead suggested allowing each unit flexibility to decide the relative value of each source of evidence it uses. Smelser said the approach suggested by the working group recognizes that every college and school has its own vocabulary with regard to teaching. Sam Catanzaro said he agrees with the working group recommendation that weights not be prescribed in the ASPT policies. He noted that some departments and schools use a numerical system to evaluate teaching while others use qualitative measures. Applying percentages to qualitative methods can be challenging and could have unintended consequences, Catanzaro said.

Houston, Sheryl Jenkins, and Kevin Edwards expressed support for the wording changes suggested by the working group. Houston said she likes the guidance the re-worded passage provides units, and Jenkins said she likes that the re-worded passage de-emphasizes use of student reactions when evaluating teaching performance.

Edwards said a faculty member will be able to question whether his teaching record has been appropriately evaluated.

Jenkins moved to accept “Suggestions for Rewording in Appendix 2” and to recommend the wording changes to the Caucus. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. Dean thanked working group members for their efforts to complete the work started by their predecessors in spring 2016.

IV. Study of ASPT policies regarding service assignments

Dean explained that the Caucus charge to URC regarding service assignments was one of the tasks set aside by URC in 2016-2017 until the committee had completed its work on the disciplinary articles. Dean reviewed a description of the charge (see attached) with committee members. She reported having recently consulted Caucus Chairperson Susan Kalter about the matter. Dean said Kalter confirmed the charge and encouraged URC to consider any other issues related to service. Kalter also indicated that discussion of service assignments is not a high priority for the Caucus this academic year, so URC can take the time it needs to study the matter. URC members then discussed whether and how URC should proceed with its study.

Dean asked if URC should investigate what is happening in units with regard to service assignments or if the committee should approach the issue philosophically. Jenkins said her impression from the charge presented to URC is that the Caucus wants to know what is being done by units with regard to service. Houston agreed, adding that URC could approach this charge as it approached the charge to study performance evaluations (i.e., by investigating unit policies and procedures). Jenkins said she was a member of the spring 2016 URC working group (facilitated by Angela Bonnell) charged with studying performance evaluations, specifically whether ASPT policies should be changed to reduce the reporting burden on faculty members. She said the working group informally surveyed faculty colleagues regarding the scope of performance evaluation in their unit. Bonnell noted that the working group was able to document a wide range of approaches to performance evaluation through the survey. Dean asked if administering the informal survey was manageable. Jenkins replied that it was. Dean said another approach URC might take is to ask each college to investigate how their units approach service assignments and to report their findings to the committee.

Bruce Stoffel noted that a related issue raised by Houston during URC review of the 2012 ASPT document is how administrative work should be recognized and whether it should be categorized as service. Dean asked if it mattered to the discussion whether the faculty member is paid for administrative work. Houston suggested that URC should include in its investigation administrative work for which a faculty member is paid or receives release time. Jenkins said it was her understanding that faculty members are compensated for their service work through their regular salary. Rachel Shively said the issue is complicated, noting that faculty members in her unit may receive release time or a summer stipend for administrative work. Edwards suggested surveying DFSCs right after the performance evaluation season regarding their approach to service contributions and administrative activities.

Catanzaro noted that a portion of a faculty member’s work is assumed tacitly to be service even though it might not be explicitly assigned as such. He noted that service is part of the shared governance system and that a certain level of service is considered part of faculty members’ duties. Catanzaro added that once the amount of time a faculty member spends on service activities exceeds some threshold, it may be considered worthy of recognition or an explicit time assignment. Catanzaro said it could be a useful contribution to the ASPT system to have URC think through these issues. He suggested consulting AAUP guidelines and other documents to determine how service is recognized by other institutions.

Dean said that how service contributions are weighted in performance evaluations and promotion decisions is also a pressing question. Shively said her department has codified that 20 percent of a faculty member’s work should be spent on service activities. She asked if other units adhere to that standard. Committee members responding said their units do not. Catanzaro pointed out that how service is weighted in a faculty member’s annual assignment and how actual service work is weighted in the faculty member’s performance evaluation may differ. Bonnell raised the question of how the percentages are defined and applied, noting that the official 37.5 hour work week is typically exceeded by faculty members. She noted that answers to that question have

been elusive. Dean said the quality of a faculty member's service contribution is another issue to consider. Jenkins said her unit considers the quality and significance of committee products when evaluating committee contributions. Bonnell said in her unit faculty members are responsible for describing in their performance evaluation papers the contributions they made to the committees on which they served.

Jenkins said it might be helpful for URC to spend additional time discussing service before initiating extensive research into the matter. Dean agreed. She said she will allot time on the agenda of the next URC meeting to continue the discussion.

V. Updates

Ad hoc equity review committee

Houston reported that the equity review committee is working to develop a five-year cycle of equity review in which a different issue is assessed each year of the cycle. An example, she said, would be to examine faculty salary by gender, race/ethnicity, ability status, country of origin, military service, and age in the first year of the cycle. Houston reported that the equity review committee received guidance at its last meeting regarding issues that can legally be examined through the equity review process. She said the committee is fortunate that member Tony Walesby, the new director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access, had experience with equity review when he worked at the University of Michigan. Houston said the equity review committee continues to examine equity review work at that institution as well as at Berkeley (University of California) and Chapel Hill (University of North Carolina).

Dean said she and Houston will bring equity review committee recommendations and a final equity review proposal to URC as they are developed. Dean said the equity review committee is scheduled to meet next week (the week of November 13, 2017) but will not meet thereafter until January 2018.

ASPT disciplinary articles

Dean announced that the Caucus has completed its initial discussion of the disciplinary articles that had been recommended by URC in August 2017. Dean said it is her understanding that the Caucus does not intend to ask URC to further revise the articles, rather any revisions will be made by the Caucus based on its discussions this fall. Key issues to be resolved, Dean added, include how temporary reassignment should be categorized (as a sanction, a suspension, or a separate category of disciplinary action), whether a faculty member should be permitted to appeal a suspension to the President, and the role of AFEGC in disciplinary processes.

Bonnell reported that Caucus Chairperson Kalter sent DFSCs, SFSCs, and CFSCs the August 2017 version of the proposed disciplinary articles and asked the committees to send her any comments they may have regarding the articles by November 1. Bonnell asked if URC will get to review those comments. Dean said she has received comments from Kalter prior to Caucus discussion of them.

Dean suggested sending the Caucus a note thanking the Caucus for involving URC in discussions of the disciplinary articles this fall and inquiring about next steps in their review. Committee members agreed. Dean further asked if URC members who participated in those Caucus discussions should share their discussion notes with the Caucus. She said doing so might help bring closure to the process. Catanzaro said the Caucus may not need notes taken by the URC representatives, because the Caucus maintains a verbatim record of its meetings.

Promotion increments

Catanzaro reported that President Larry Dietz announced the previous Monday (November 6, 2017) retroactive increases to faculty promotion increments, whereby all faculty at the associate professor rank who were promoted at the University will receive an additional \$2,000 increment and all faculty at the professor rank who were promoted at the University will receive an additional \$3,000 increment. Catanzaro said URC might consider recommending that the Caucus revise promotion increments set forth in ASPT policies (Section XII.A.5) accordingly (increasing the increment associated with promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor from \$3,000 per year minimum to \$5,000 per year minimum and increasing the increment associated

with promotion from Associate Professor to Professor from \$5,000 per year minimum to \$8,000 per year minimum). Catanzaro said he has consulted Alan Lacy, Associate Vice President for Academic Fiscal Management, about so revising ASPT policies, and Lacy has indicated he can support such a change. Smelser asked Catanzaro how the University can afford retroactive promotion increment increases at this time. Catanzaro said the University has been cautious with its expenditures for many years and now has sufficient resources in the fund from which faculty salaries are paid to afford the additional increments. Committee members unanimously agreed to immediately recommend to the Caucus that Section XII.A.5 of ASPT policies be so revised. Dean noted that URC has not yet submitted its 2016 report regarding salary increments to the Caucus, the report in which URC recommended reconsideration of the salary increments set forth in ASPT policies. Catanzaro said he can attach that URC report to the memorandum he sends to the Caucus recommending the ASPT policies change.

Dean thanked Catanzaro for raising this matter with URC at this time and for advocating for increased salary increments on behalf of faculty. She noted that URC, through its review of ASPT policies and study of salary increments, has contributed to this development. She thanked URC members for their efforts.

VI. Review of University Policy 3.2.4: Salary Adjustments

Because time allotted for this URC meeting had nearly expired, Dean deferred discussion of this agenda item to a future URC meeting.

VII. URC review of college (ASPT) standards

Because the time allotted for this URC meeting had nearly expired, Dean deferred discussion of this agenda item to a future URC meeting.

VIII. Adjournment

Shively moved that the meeting adjourn. Byrns seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sheryl Jenkins, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

“Suggestions for rewording in Appendix 2, p. 61-62 of ASPT document (green book),” distributed to the University Review Committee at its November 10, 2017 meeting by committee member Sarah Smelser

“Attachment D: URC Working Group, Service Assignments,” undated

SUGGESTIONS FOR REWORDING IN APPENDIX 2, p. 61 - 62 of ASPT document
(green book)

Factors Used for Evaluation of Teaching

Guidelines and criteria for the evaluation of teaching are based on common teaching activities such as those listed above. Those who evaluate teaching should take into consideration multiple types of evidence over an extended period of time and weigh the various sources of data in ways appropriate to particular faculty members and their situations. One such source of data must be student reactions to teaching performance. When evaluating ~~student reactions to~~ teaching, reviewers should consider factors that can influence the data collected, including course load, instructional method, course content, discipline, potential sources of bias, etc. ~~In addition to student reactions, other s~~ Sources of evidence that may be used to identify meritorious teaching include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. A record of solidly favorable student reactions to teaching performance;
2. Favorable teaching ratings by peers through review of instructional materials;
3. Favorable teaching ratings by peers through classroom observation;
4. Favorable teaching reactions by alumni;
5. A narrative self-reflection on teaching performance;
6. Evidence that the faculty member's students experience cognitive or affective gain as a result of their instruction;
7. Syllabi from various courses that feature clarity of instructional objectives, clear organization of material, and equitable and understandable criteria for the evaluation of student work;
8. Breadth of teaching ability as this is illustrated by effective teaching in different classroom settings, effective teaching of different types of students, preparation of new courses, or significant modification of established courses;
9. Evidence of meritorious supervision of students in independent studies, internships, clinical experiences, laboratories, and field work;
10. Credible advising and mentoring of students in their preparation of research projects, theses, and dissertations;
11. Significant involvement in sponsoring student organizations and co-curricular activities;
12. Development or review of teaching materials (textbooks, workbooks, reading packets, computer programs, curriculum guides, etc.);
13. Development of new teaching techniques (videotapes, independent study modules, computer activities, instructional technologies, etc.);
14. Service as a master teacher to others (conducting teaching workshops, supervising beginning teachers, coaching performances, etc.);
15. Recognition of meritorious teaching by winning teaching awards;
16. Submitting successful competitive grant proposals related to teaching.

ATTACHMENT D

URC WORKING GROUP SERVICE ASSIGNMENTS

Background

During its discussions on January 27, 2016 regarding proposed ASPT policies, the Faculty Caucus raised questions regarding the appropriate treatment of service assignments in the policies. The questions and issues raised more specifically related to Article VII: Faculty Assignments and Faculty Evaluation, but similar questions were raised during subsequent consideration by the Caucus of Appendix 2 (University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation). Among the questions/issues raised ...

- It has been reported that not all units assign service to faculty members (i.e., that service is not officially part of their load). Is this the case? If so, is it appropriate?
- Similarly, it has been reported that some units make teaching and scholarship assignments totaling 100 percent but then expect faculty members to be involved in service activities above and beyond the 100 percent. Is this the case? If so, is it appropriate?
- Do units make specific service assignments or do they permit faculty to choose their own service activities (much like faculty members set their own research agenda)? Is either or both acceptable?
- What activities should count as service (versus teaching and research)?
- How much credit should service be given in promotion and tenure decisions?
- In a related matter, how should administrative-type activities be counted (teaching, service, or research)?

An excerpt from the minutes of the January 27, 2016 Faculty Caucus meeting, documenting this discussion, is attached.

The Caucus asked URC to consider these and any other related issues and report its findings and recommendations.

URC planned to establish a working group to study this matter. Due to other priorities, URC has not yet done so.

Next steps

Establish a URC working group to study the issues raised by the Faculty Caucus regarding service assignments and report findings and recommendations to the full committee.

Faculty Caucus Minutes
Wednesday, January 27, 2016
(Approved)

Note: The recording of this meeting was lost prior to being transmitted to the Senate office, so the minutes are a re-creation based on notes taken by URC Recorder Bruce Stoffel. Even where seemingly verbatim, they should not be assumed to be so.

Call to Order

Senator Kalter called the meeting to order.

Election of Library Committee Representatives (Term Spring 2016):

Carlyn Morenus, CFA

Clinton Warren, CAST

The Caucus unanimously elected these two nominees to the open seats on the newly expanded Library Committee.

ASPT Discussion:

Action items session on existing Articles VI-VIII, X, XII (and related appendices)

Article VI

Senator Kalter called for a motion to approve the changes proposed to existing ASPT Article VI.

Motion: By Senator Daddario, seconded by Senator Huxford, to approve proposed revisions to Article VI.

Senator Kalter reviewed the recommended changes. She noted that the word “Dismissal” would not be added to the title at this time.

A Senator [name not recorded] made a motion amend VI.G. to “in this case” retain the “must” rather than changing it to “shall.” There was no second.

Senator Kalter recommended against any motion to amend of this nature, explaining that the Caucus had already decided to reject all changes proposed by URC to the must/shall, will/shall, etc., areas as well as deferring all changes related to the proposed new disciplinary articles, which will not be approved until at least 2016-17. She recommended against any motion to amend so that the other changes to the proposed version before the Caucus could be made without engaging in extended debate on the must/shall question. She explained that VI.G would indeed retain the “must” in any event under this previous agreement so that the motion to amend was not necessary.

After asking for debate and seeing none, Senator Kalter called for a vote.

The motion to approve the proposed changes to Article VI was unanimously approved.

Article VII

Senator Kalter called for a motion to approve the changes proposed to existing ASPT Article VII.

Motion: By Senator Huxford, seconded by Senator Hoelscher, to approve proposed revisions to Article VII.

Senator Kalter reviewed the recommended changes. She noted that the section reference in VII.F would not change as a result of the vote but may change later. She noted again that the must/shall changes would also be disregarded.

Senator Krejci, referring to the recommended change to VII.A, noted that service is an area that is not often assigned to a faculty member.

Senator Kalter: Some departments include it (service) in their assignments, some don't.

Senator Krejci: No, I am referring to faculty usually volunteering for service rather than having service assigned to them. Some volunteer, some don't.

Senator Kalter: There is an interesting middle ground. In my college we are assigned to some (service work) and some we volunteer for.

Senator Krejci: The question I sometimes get is "I wasn't assigned service."

Senator Kalter: Let's refer that to URC for a longer discussion. How do we make sure this (wording) reflects that well?

Senator Krejci: So, I appreciate the changes made (to VII.A). So if we are to say we are to support service, we aren't doing that necessarily.

Professor Dean, URC Vice Chair: So, in your reading (of the passage), the switch to a positive word may imply an expectation?

Senator Krejci: It implies all faculty get assigned to teaching, research, and service. This almost gets interesting. We don't assign such activity (service). But (this passage) may not be interpreted that way. I just want to raise it (the issue). (The passage, as revised,) may not be (interpreted) that we are assigning these things (service), but it could be.

Senator Troxel: I should delay comments before fully forming them. My question is the definition of assignment relative to contributions being evaluated. Maybe add language like including voluntary (service) but maybe this needs more thought.

Senator Krejci: It says assignments are in all three areas. We don't assign in all three areas. If there is a way to change that (language in the passage).

Senator Clark: Instead of saying "teaching" maybe "the teaching assignment shall support ..."

Senator Kalter: We are assigned research but we aren't told what to research. I may be assigned three courses and one unit of release time (from teaching) for research. That is your assignment. On top of that we add 10 percent service.

Senator Kalter suggested keeping the wording in VII.A as it was, keeping the status quo (rather than accepting the URC's proposed change).

Senator Huxford: Maybe we should think about this more deeply. 100 percent is teaching and research. No time is assigned to service. But you're judged on it (by DFSC/SFSC). It is part of the job but we aren't given time to do it.

Senator Daddario: Service is unpopular.

Senator Troxel: When I was interim chair completing the faculty report, I was told that service kind of counts in teaching. This needs more discussion. Is the assignment for you to do teaching, research, and service? Not that it is balanced out.

Senator McHale: As I read this, for me at least, (the change) modifies (the word) “contributions” rather than (the word) “assignments.” Whatever the assignment is shall not inhibit teaching, research, and service.

Senator Alcorn: I think that is correct, if you parse it. Would it be beneficial to be very clear?

Senator Kalter: We could (decide) to leave (the passage) as is and ask URC to work it out. Or we could table (the matter). I recommend not changing VII.A and approving the rest of the article. Senator Huxford has brought up a long-standing issue.

Senator Hoelscher: Should we vote (the motion) down?

Senator Kalter: I recommend a friendly amendment to keep VII.A as is.

Senator Clark: Or we could vote the motion down.

Senator Rich: Let me add one more note. I am comfortable with (the word) “support.” The expectation has not changed. There is an expectation depending on the department. Then they are in conflict in the faculty activity report. There are three ways we look at this. In the time and effort report, implicitly, and in the faculty activity report. This is conflict in the time and effort report. I think the language (recommended by URC) is laudable. The time and effort report is the issue.

Professor Dean: [To Senator Kalter] We (URC) can accept that as a friendly amendment.

Senator Rich: I am pretty indifferent.

Senator McHale: I would make a motion to keep the language “not to inhibit”.

Senator Rich: I’m happy either way. I don’t think that the change changes much.

Senator McHale: Senator Kalter suggested we would change the language for future consideration [??].

Senator Kalter: The first option is to keep VII.A as it is but refer these questions to URC. The third option is to change it to “support” and still refer them to URC. The second option is to table it all.

Assistant Vice President Catanzaro: You could vote it down.

Senator Kalter: But I don’t want to dump VII.F.

Senator Clark: But we have a motion.

Senator Kalter: I suggest an amendment.

Motion: By Senator Rich, seconded by Senator McHale, as follows:

Senator Rich: I move to move it back to “not to inhibit” with the understanding that URC will take this up.

Senator McHale: Second.

Debate followed on the motion to amend the language in VII.A (Rich/McHale) so that it remains unrevised as in the 2012 ASPT document.

Senator Krejci: I wish I hadn't mentioned it [laughter]. I didn't want anyone to believe that faculty could be assigned specific things in all three areas. But I've heard you are not interpreting it that way. I am concerned that someone might do this.

Senator Daddario: There are two different definitions of "assignment". [???

Senator Crowley: Looking at this, the fourth line (of VII.A) is too long.

Senator Kalter: We are not wordsmithing.

Senator Crowley: Break (the sentence) into two pieces.

Senator Kalter: I am still going to rule it out of order as it doesn't relate to the motion. Is there further debate?

Senator Daddario: Call the question.

Seeing no objection to calling the question, Senator Kalter asked for a vote on the motion to amend.

The motion to amend (Rich/McHale) was approved. The effect of the vote is to leave VII.A as it is in the current version of the ASPT document and to refer the matter of assignments to URC for discussion.

Senator Kalter: Is there further debate on the article as a whole?

There being none, Senator Kalter called for a vote, explaining that VII.A is to read "not to inhibit".

The motion to approve the proposed changes to Article VII as amended was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: What we will do with Senator Crowley's suggestion is to ask URC to consider the length of the sentence.

Senator McHale: Long introductory phrases can muddy the water. But I am wordsmithing.

Article VIII

Senator Kalter called for a motion to approve the changes proposed to existing ASPT Article VIII.

Motion: By Senator Rich, seconded by Senator Dyck, to approve proposed revisions to Article VIII.

Senator Kalter reviewed the recommended changes. She noted the need to re-letter sections since a new "C" has been added. She explained that Senator Bushell had requested this (new section "C"). It pulls language from another article, from Article IV.

Senator Kalter: Any debate?

Senator McHale: Move to approve.

Senator Kalter: We already have a motion.

There was a pause in the proceedings for Dr. Catanzaro to review his copy of Article VIII.