

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Thursday, February 1, 2018
2 p.m., Hovey 401D

MINUTES

Members present: Michael Byrns, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Diane Dean, Kevin Edwards, Joe Goodman, Doris Houston, Sheryl Jenkins, Rachel Shively

Members not present: Angela Bonnell, Sarah Smelser

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; “CFSC” refers to college faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT policies of Illinois State University; and “AFEGC” refers to the Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee at Illinois State University.

I. Call to order

Chairperson Diane Dean called the meeting to order at 2 p.m. A quorum was present.

Dean welcomed committee member Joe Goodman, who had been on sabbatical in fall 2017. Meeting attendees introduced themselves.

II. Approval of minutes from the December 1, 2017 meeting

Michael Byrns moved approval of the minutes from the December 1, 2017 URC meeting as distributed to committee members prior to the meeting. Rachel Shively seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, with five committee members voting in the affirmative and two committee members abstaining (Goodman and Sheryl Jenkins).

III. Updates

Faculty Caucus discussion of ASPT disciplinary policies

Dean reported. Faculty Caucus Chairperson Susan Kalter has presented a revised version of the proposed ASPT disciplinary articles to the Caucus for discussion this spring. The Caucus began its review of the revised articles at its January 24, 2018 meeting. Dean asked Bruce Stoffel to distribute the revised articles to all URC members.

Dean reported that Kalter has invited URC representatives to attend Caucus meetings this spring to answer questions Caucus members may have as they review the revised articles. Dean said URC was represented at the January 24 Caucus meeting by Dean, Sam Catanzaro, and Nerida Ellerton and Christopher Horvath (former URC members). Byrns asked whether the January 24 discussion occurred at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate or at a meeting of the full Caucus. Dean clarified that the discussion occurred at a full Caucus session.

Dean said the latest version of the proposed disciplinary articles includes both editorial changes and substantive changes. She reported that Kalter hopes to call for votes on the articles this spring without first sending them to URC for its input. Catanzaro noted that the revised articles have not yet been reviewed by general counsel. He

said he is preparing a highlighted version of the articles for general counsel review, preferably before the Caucus votes on them.

Noting that the version of the disciplinary articles recommended by URC in August 2017 resulted from an exhaustive review of the articles, Goodman asked how the revised version now being considered by the Caucus differs from the URC version. Dean cited four changes she deems substantive. Dean first noted that, while URC had tried to closely integrate AFEGC and ASPT processes related to discipline, the latest version of the articles makes clear that the two processes are separate and are not to be closely linked. Next, Dean said a provision has been added to address the possibility that there might not be a sufficient number of CFSC members to make a recommendation in a disciplinary case. She explained that the solution set forth is to ask one or more CFSC members from another college to participate in disciplinary deliberations (i.e., from a college other than the college of the faculty member who is central to the proceedings). Dean reported that some Caucus members expressed concerns regarding the provision, including that faculty members recruited from another college would not have been elected by faculty members in the college of the faculty member central to the disciplinary action. Another expressed concern, Dean said, is whether the same college might repeatedly be asked to provide CFSC members for a disciplinary case. Catanzaro explained that authors of the revisions deemed such a provision necessary because the authors had also added a provision allowing both the faculty member charged in the case and the complainant to each ask that up to two CFSC members be recused without having to explain why. Catanzaro said he has pointed out to Caucus members that current ASPT policies include a recusal provision, adding that if the Caucus deems the existing provision sufficient, the need to seek members from another CFSC to assist with disciplinary proceedings should rarely arise. Third, Dean reported that the party making the final decision in a suspension case has been changed from the Provost to the President. She suggested that the change may not be inappropriate, because the Provost would not likely approve a suspension without first conferring with the President. Fourth, Dean reported a change in the treatment of partial release from or reassignment of faculty duties. She explained that URC had defined suspension as relief of a faculty member from all faculty assignments (teaching, research, and service) and had provided that temporary reassignment from one or more but not all faculty assignments would be considered a sanction. The latest version of the articles provides that relief from any aspect of one's assigned faculty duties would be considered a suspension.

Goodman asked if the new recusal provision includes guidance regarding the type of challenges considered acceptable. Catanzaro responded that the provision does not provide such guidance. Goodman asked if the possibility of an appeal has been eliminated from this latest version of the articles, given the addition of the recusal provision. Catanzaro responded that the right to appeal remains in the document.

Jenkins asked how often the Caucus will meet to discuss the disciplinary articles. Dean responded that the Caucus is scheduled to meet every other week this spring but that the Caucus will not necessarily discuss the disciplinary articles at every meeting. Catanzaro said the Caucus intends to continue its discussion of the disciplinary articles at every meeting this spring unless there are more pressing issues to address. He added that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate decides the Caucus agenda on a meeting-by-meeting basis. Dean reminded URC members that all are welcome to attend Caucus meetings.

Ad hoc equity review committee

Doris Houston reported. Houston first explained the genesis of the committee and its charge. Houston then described progress made by the committee. She said the committee continues to plan a five-year cycle of equity review, most recently discussing what topics should be researched in each of the five years. The current thought, she said, is to research salary in year one; promotion in year two; retention and reasons faculty members leave their positions in year three; performance evaluations, including the percent of faculty members receiving unsatisfactory and meritorious ratings, in year four; and disciplinary actions (sanctions, suspensions, and dismissals) in year five. For each review, Houston said, data will be analyzed by gender, race, age, ability status, and military status. Other parameters may be added by the committee, she said. Dean clarified that the equity review plan devised by the committee will be presented to URC for its consideration, feedback, and recommendations, since URC has been charged by ASPT policies to oversee equity review. Houston said the recommendations to URC will likely be made by the equity review committee in fall 2018.

[Catanzaro left the meeting at 2:30 p.m.]

Houston reported that Catanzaro has agreed to help the committee develop a plan for the series of equity review studies and has also offered to provide information to committee members regarding statistical testing. She added that Tony Walesby, Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access, is also available to advise the committee.

Goodman asked if the study of performance evaluations will involve study of post-tenure reviews, pre-tenure reviews, or both. Houston said the equity review committee has not yet discussed details of the performance evaluations study. She said she will raise Goodman's question with the committee. Goodman suggested that the committee also consider incorporating qualitative analyses in its cycle of equity review. He cited review of wording in performance evaluation letters using currently-available software as an example of the qualitative analyses that might be conducted. Byrns cautioned that URC might not be permitted to access performance evaluation letters to conduct such an analysis due to policies regarding confidentiality of personnel documents. Houston said one option might be to ask colleges to perform the analyses and then report summaries of their findings to URC.

Jenkins asked Houston if the committee has also considered studying compression. Houston said the committee initially thought about incorporating analysis of compression in the five-year equity review cycle but is now considering recommending that compression be studied separately. Jenkins asked if compression would be evaluated based on factors such as age and race. Houston responded that the committee has discussed doing so. Byrns offered that if compression is occurring, it is likely the result of inequities in performance evaluations. Houston noted that compression may also be caused by market factors and by the lack of raises for faculty in some years. Shively asked Houston if the committee has considered the nature of the job position as a variable. She cited as one example a faculty member who has been assigned administrative duties and, consequently, may not have sufficient time to conduct the research needed to qualify for tenure. Houston responded that the committee has not yet discussed job positions and has not yet discussed administrative roles. Houston said she will raise the issues with the committee. Byrns also suggested that the committee consider studying hiring practices. Dean noted that disciplinary policies merge with equity review in the fifth year of the proposed equity review cycle. Houston said it should be interesting to study the history of disciplinary actions at that time, since the University will have had a few years of experience implementing the disciplinary policies by then.

Kevin Edwards suggested that the equity review committee consider having someone external to URC conduct the equity analyses. He noted that external contractors are expensive, but the cost may be justified given the importance of this issue. Goodman agreed, citing concerns regarding confidentiality. Houston said she personally thinks the equity review committee will recommend that the colleges report to URC regarding equity, much as the colleges report other data to URC. Jenkins said requiring colleges to do so might be considered an unfunded mandate. Houston said she agrees but feels it is important to have these analyses conducted. Houston thanked URC members for their suggestions and urged members to send her any additional thoughts or insights.

IV. Continued discussion of service assignments; establishment of service assignments working group

To allow sufficient time at this meeting to organize review of CFSC standards, Dean deferred discussion of service assignments to the next URC meeting (March 1, 2018). To help facilitate committee discussion at that meeting, Dean asked Stoffel to send committee members the list of questions raised by Caucus members in 2016 regarding the issue. Stoffel said he will also send minutes of fall 2017 URC meetings at which service assignments were discussed.

V. Organizing for review of CFSC standards

Stoffel reported having requested current ASPT standards from each college. He reported having received standards from the College of Education, the College of Fine Arts, and Milner Library. Stoffel said the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Applied Science and Technology have informed him that they are revising their standards and will submit them to URC later this spring term. Stoffel said he has not yet received responses from the College of Business or Mennonite College of Nursing.

URC members agreed to form working groups to review standards submitted by Education, Fine Arts, and Milner Library and to report findings at the next URC meeting. Members organized into the following groups:

College of Education: Shively and Byrns
College of Fine Arts: Goodman and Jenkins
Milner Library: Dean and Edwards

Shively asked if there is a summary of changes made to the ASPT document (that was effective January 1, 2012 and that has subsequently been superseded by the ASPT document effective January 1, 2017), that working groups can use when reviewing the college standards. Stoffel responded that Catanzaro had compiled such a summary. Stoffel said he will send the summary to URC members.

VI. Other

There was no other business for consideration by the committee.

VII. Adjournment

Goodman moved, Edwards seconded that the meeting adjourn. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sheryl Jenkins, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:
None