

**UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
Illinois State University

Thursday, May 10, 2018  
2 p.m., Hovey 401D

**MINUTES**

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Diane Dean, Kevin Edwards, Joe Goodman, Doris Houston, Rachel Shively, Sarah Smelser

Members not present: Michael Byrns, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Sheryl Jenkins

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 “equity review committee” refers to the Ad Hoc Committee for ASPT Equity Review established by the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate at Illinois State University.

I. Call to order

Chairperson Diane Dean called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. A quorum was present.

Dean thanked committee members for submitting feedback via email regarding URC issues being reviewed and approved by committee members electronically this week. (Note: Those issues include URC minutes, CFSC annual reports to URC, the annual report to URC from the Faculty Review Committee, and revised college ASPT standards submitted by the College of Business and the College of Education. Feedback will continue to be accepted until 5 p.m., Friday, May 11, 2018.)

II. Recommendations from the University Review Committee to the Faculty Caucus regarding the final report from the Ad Hoc Committee for ASPT Equity Review

Dean initiated discussion of equity review recommendations by referring committee members to two versions she prepared of draft URC recommendations to the Caucus regarding the scope of equity review. She explained that in the document labeled “simple edits” (see attached) she incorporated into the final report of the equity review committee suggestions made by URC members at the last URC meeting. She explained that the document labeled “comprehensive edits” (see attached) is her more extensive re-write of the equity review committee final report. She said that, in her re-write, she incorporated suggestions made by URC members, expanded the text for clarity, and made revisions for URC consideration based on her recollections as a member of the equity review committee and based on her research experience.

Dean asked how URC members prefer to proceed with discussion of the documents, whether members prefer to separately approve each of the five study phase descriptions or to approve the five descriptions together and whether members prefer to work from the “simple edits” document or the “comprehensive edits” document. The consensus was to review and approve each of the five study phase descriptions separately. Whether committee members worked from the “simple edits” document or the “comprehensive edits” document changed throughout the meeting. The committee worked primarily from the “simple edits” document when finalizing recommendations for the phase one study (salary) and worked primarily from the “comprehensive edits” document when finalizing recommendations regarding the phase two study (tenure/promotion).

Through the course of the meeting, committee members approved recommendations to the Caucus for the phase one study (salary) and the phase two study (tenure/first promotion). The committee decided to defer discussion of phases three, four, and five until fall 2018 and to defer submission of its recommendations to the Caucus until the committee has approved recommendations for all five studies.

#### Phase one study: salary

Working from the “simple edits” document, committee members made the following changes.

- Add the introductory paragraph headed “Proposed ASPT Equity Review Cycle” from the “comprehensive edits” document
- Change the header “Phase one” to “Phase One: Salary”
- Change the “Controls” section label to “Controls or co-variates may include but are not limited to”
- Change the sentence that begins “Following receipt of the raw and intersectional data by URC ...” to “Following receipt of the raw and intersectional data by URC, URC will need to work with CFSCs to combine the analyses results with assessment of individual faculty performance.”

Doris Houston moved approval of the phase one section of the “simple edits” document with those changes. Rachel Shively seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, with six members voting aye (Bonnell, Edwards, Goodman, Houston, Shively, and Smelser) and one member voting nay (Dean).

The description of Phase One: Salary as recommended by URC to the Caucus is attached.

#### Phase two study: tenure/first promotion

Working from the “comprehensive edits” document, committee members made the following changes.

- Change the passage that reads, “Four analyses will be conducted. These studies are descriptive only, and include:” to “Four analyses will be conducted. These studies are descriptive only, and include, but are not limited to:”
- Replace the paragraph that begins “Overview of the Process:” with the following paragraph:
 

“The Provost’s office and PRPA, and OEOA if necessary, will work together to provide the URC with data related to successful tenure cases and promotions to associate professor, time-to-tenure-and-promotion, non-reappointments, tenure denials, and resignations/retirements prior to tenure-and-promotion.”
- Delete the paragraph that begins “The purpose of the analyses will be to create and review a comprehensive picture ...”
- Delete the paragraph beginning “At the conclusion of the analyses, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus ...” and the two paragraphs that follow with the following paragraph:
 

“At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. If the findings suggest that possible equity concerns may be present, the URC may make recommendations regarding those findings, and/or recommendations for future analyses. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty member’s privacy. Ideally, the completion time for the review will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.”

Kevin Edwards moved approval of the Phase Two: Tenure/First Promotion section of the “comprehensive edits” document with those changes. Sarah Smelser seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, with four members voting aye (Bonnell, Edwards, Shively, and Smelser), one member voting nay (Goodman), and one member abstaining (Dean). Note: Houston excused herself from the meeting prior to completion of committee discussion regarding the phase two study and, therefore, was not present to vote on the motion.

The description of Phase Two: Tenure/First Promotion as recommended by URC to the Caucus is attached.

III. Other business

There was none.

IV. Adjournment

Joe Goodman moved that the meeting adjourn. Angela Bonnell seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

*Proposed Scope of Equity Review Cycle*, compiled by Dr. Diane Dean, Chairperson, University Review Committee, for review by the committee at its May 10, 2018 meeting. Note: The document is referenced in these minutes as the “simple edits” document.

*Proposed ASPT Equity Review Cycle*, compiled by Dr. Diane Dean, Chairperson, University Review Committee, for review by the committee at its May 10, 2018 meeting. Note: The document is referenced in these minutes as the “comprehensive edits” document.

Introduction and the Phase One: Salary as recommended to the Faculty Caucus by the University Review Committee at its May 10, 2018 meeting.

Phase Two: Tenure/Promotion as recommended to the Faculty Caucus by the University Review Committee at its May 10, 2018 meeting.

**Proposed ~~Scope of each year's equity study~~ Equity Review Cycle**  
**Based on ASPT equity ad hoc committee's discussions**

**Year-Phase one:**

Salary, with each faculty member's monthly salary adjusted into an annual standard for ease of analysis and layperson comprehension, broken out by the following categories related to equal opportunity and access:

1. Gender
2. Race/ethnicity
3. Disability status, if possible
4. U.S. citizenship status versus citizenship status from each continent of origin if not U.S.
5. Military/non-military, if possible
6. Age
7. Intersections of the above as determined by the URC and PRPA, once the raw data is received

Controls:

1. highest earned degree
2. years since appointment on tenure-line at ISU
3. rank
4. years in rank (both with and without this control; as well as intersection of rank by years-in-rank)
5. departmental affiliation by department of rank
6. past administrative appointment or not (chairs/deans/Provost office & deans offices AP roles)

Type:

- ~~a. snapshot in time rather than longitudinal~~
- ~~b. two key sub-models:
  - ~~i. controlled for experience, field and rank~~
  - ~~ii. same without controlling for rank~~~~
- ~~c. total population model (for example, large, high-paid colleges that throw our data off can be excluded in a not-total population model)~~
- ~~d. white-male model with possible sub-models (for example, compared to all-women and compared to all faculty of color) as determined by URC and PRPA~~

Following receipt of the raw and intersectional data by URC, URC will need to work with CFSCs to combine the results ~~of the multiple regression analyses~~ with assessment of individual faculty performance. This is not a URC-level endeavor, but a CFSC-level endeavor, with CFSCs reporting back to the URC regarding findings and corrective steps if identified.

A few studies from other universities that the ad hoc committee examined show the percent distribution of male/female, race/ethnic identity across departments. The Academic Planning Committee and PRPA already currently track this type of data in a different way through Academic Program Profiles and the APC encourages diversification plans; however, seeing concentrations comparatively on one graph may be informative to considerations of how work environment may be affecting outcomes.

At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may

compromise individual faculty member's privacy. Ideally, the completion time for the study will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.

## Year-Phase two

Quantitative analysis of ~~conditions~~ or dynamics from appointment through tenure, university-wide, longitudinal; no controls for departmental affiliation in year two, judgment of URC and the administration whether or not to include department affiliation in years seven and beyond subsequent reviews.

The Provost's office and PRPA, and OEOA if necessary, will work together to provide the URC with data related to successful tenure cases and promotions to associate professor, time-to-tenure-and-promotion, non-reappointments, tenure denials, and resignations/retirements prior to tenure-and-promotion.

Once the raw data regarding how many persons were appointed without tenure over the study period has been collected, it will be broken out by overall percent within the subcategories of each of these categories: gender, race/ethnicity, disability status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. For gender, disability status, military/non-military, and age, these categories and subcategories will be defined here at minimum as "at the time of hire" and "at the time of the study or last year tracked if non-reappointed/tenure denied/resigned/retired."

The URC will also be provided with the overall percentage of the total appointed who have been tenured/promoted. Within the subset of those tenured/promoted, percentages will be provided according to gender, race/ethnicity, disability status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. Time to tenure-and-promotion will also be provided, both overall and broken out according to gender, etc.

The URC will be provided with the overall percentage of the total appointed who have been non-reappointed. Within non-reappointments, percentages will be provided according to gender, race/ethnicity, disability, status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. Time to non-reappointment will also be provided, both overall and broken out according to gender, etc.

The URC will be provided with the overall percentage of the total appointed who were denied tenure upon applying for it. Within non-reappointments due to tenure denial, percentages will be provided according to gender, race/ethnicity, disability, status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. Time to tenure denial will also be provided, both overall and broken out according to gender, etc.

The URC will be provided finally with the overall percent of the total appointed who resigned/retired prior to tenure/first promotion. Within those resignations/retirements, percentages will be provided according to gender, race/ethnicity, disability, status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. Time to resignation/retirement will also be provided, both overall and broken out according to gender, etc.

At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty member's privacy. Ideally, the completion time for the study will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.

**Commented [DD1]:** Reference to "conditions or dynamics" removed because the type of study proposed does not investigate that type of phenomena.

**Commented [DD2]:** See rationale offered in footnotes for separating out reviews of "tenure" and "promotion"

**Commented [DD3]:** Reference to "controls" removed because these are descriptive studies.

### Year-Phase three

Quantitative analysis of conditions or dynamics from tenure through resignation/retirement

**Commented [DD4]:** See previous comment re: "conditions or dynamics."

The Provost's office and PRPA, and OEOA if necessary, will work together to provide the URC with data related to successful promotions to full professor, time-to-promotion to full professor, resignations/retirements prior to promotion to full professor, and time-to-resignation/retirement prior to promotion to full professor.

UID scope: All persons tenured or hired with tenure between the earliest year reasonably available and the current or previous year during which the data is being collected, whether still at ISU or not. A minimum of one decade of hiring should be represented during the year three study, fifteen years during year eight, and twenty years in subsequent cycle years.

Once the raw data regarding how many persons were tenured or hired with tenure over the study period has been collected, it will be broken out by overall percent within the subcategories of each of these categories: gender, race/ethnicity, disability status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. For gender, disability status, military/non-military, and age, these categories and subcategories will be defined here at minimum as "at the time of tenuring/appointment with tenure" and "at the time of the study or last year tracked if resigned/retired."

The URC will also be provided with the overall percent of the total who have been promoted to full professor and/or appointed at full professor at or after the year of eligibility. Within the subset of those promoted to full professor, percentages will be provided according to gender, race/ethnicity, disability, status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. The time to promotion to full, both overall and broken out according to gender, race/ethnicity, etc will also be provided. For those eligible to be promoted who have not yet been promoted but remain employed at ISU, the overall and broken down percentages will be provided along with the number of years since tenure/appointment with tenure.

In addition, the overall percent of the total who resigned/retired prior to second promotion and the time between tenure/appointment with tenure and resignation will be provided. Within this subset of resignations/retirements prior to promotion to full professor, the percentages according to gender, race/ethnicity, disability, status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age will be provided.

At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty member's privacy. Ideally, the completion time for the study will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.

## **Year-Phase four**

Two simple studies will be performed:

- 1) The Provost's office will provide data on the percentage of faculty members receiving unsatisfactory ratings from DFSCs as compared to the total ASPT faculty, and will further break this data out by gender, race/ethnicity, etc. (according to our year one scope). It will compare this broken-out data to the total ISU tenure-line population to see if there are patterns of disproportionality such as would be analogous to studies in K-12 education that have found that the race/ethnicity and gender of students suspended is disproportionately African American males. If year nine data yields no remarkable results, this study might not need to be repeated in year fourteen, year nineteen, etc. The intention of this study will be to examine the success/failure of our system of rewards, including merit-based salary increments, formative feedback, and other factors intended to encourage successful faculty productivity outcomes.
  
- 2) Starting in FY19, the Provost's office will ask chairs/directors to provide data regarding all persons who leave a faculty role for positions outside of the University, with or without a request for a counteroffer, and regarding the percentage of any counteroffer in relation to current salary for all faculty who received a counteroffer, coded by whether they stayed at ISU or were not retained. This data will be collected and in year four will be provided to the URC. It will be broken down by department and by gender, race/ethnicity, etc. (according to our year one scope). These two break downs need not be intersected if to do so would reveal confidential personnel information. Records of institutions to whom we have lost faculty may also be of interest in formulating optimum retention strategies for ISU. The intention of this study will be to examine the success/failure of our efforts to retain faculty and the ability of ISU to offer competitive salaries.

At the conclusion of each analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty member's privacy. Ideally, the completion time for both studies will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.



## Year five

Study of sanctions/suspension/dismissal outcomes

The Provost's office will provide the overall percentage of faculty members sanctioned/suspended/dismissed (in the aggregate, with dismissals not separated from suspensions, suspensions not separated from sanctions) as compared to the total ASPT faculty.

It will also provide data regarding how the persons discipline break down by gender, race/ethnicity, etc., according to our year one scope.

Intersections here (e.g. white male, black female, disabled older-than-peers faculty member) will be provided.

These statistics will be reported confidentially to the URC in the aggregate, not broken down by college or department, in order to protect the identities of disciplined faculty. According to proposed Article XII.A.7, confidential reports of disciplinary actions will also be submitted annually by the Provost to the URC.

However, such annual reports may or may not include data related to equal opportunity and access considerations, so may not related directly to these year-five studies.

[At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty member's privacy. Ideally, the completion time for the study will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.](#)

## Proposed ASPT Equity Review Cycle

The proposed ASPT Equity Review Cycle examines processes affecting tenure-track faculty, and encompasses five phases of study that include:

- Phase one: Salary
- Phase two: Tenure / First Promotion
- Phase three: Full Professor / Second Promotion
- Phase four: Performance Reviews & Salary Counteroffers
- Phase five: Disciplinary Actions

These studies are described in the following pages.

### Phase One: Salary

The first phase of the ASPT Equity Review Cycle will focus on salary. The review will include quantitative and qualitative analyses. The population for the study will be all currently employed tenure-track faculty.

The dependent variable will be current year salary, with each faculty member's monthly salary adjusted into an annual standard for ease of analysis and layperson comprehension.

Independent variables of interest include the following categories related to equal opportunity and access:<sup>1</sup>

1. Gender
2. Race/ethnicity
3. Disability status, if possible
4. U.S. citizenship status versus citizenship status from each continent of origin if not U.S.
5. Military veteran/non-military veteran, if possible
6. Age (40 or over)
7. Intersections of the above as determined by the University Review Committee (URC) and the office of Planning, Research & Policy Analysis (PRPA).

Controls or covariates include:

1. Highest earned degree
2. Years since appointment on tenure-line at ISU
3. Rank
4. Years in rank (both with and without this control; as well as intersection of rank by years-in-rank)
5. Past administrative appointment or not (chairs/deans/Provost office & deans' offices AP roles)

Overview of Process: The office of Planning, Research, & Policy Analysis (PRPA) will prepare raw data. Following preparation of the data, URC will then work with PRPA or other offices as needed to conduct appropriate quantitative analyses to determine a) whether or not there are salary disparities (higher/lower) that appear to be attributable to one or more of the independent variables, and b) the size of the disparity.

<sup>1</sup> Variables of interest will be defined here as "at the time of the study." To preserve faculty confidentiality and to best fulfill the purposes of the study, age will be identified as "40 or older during salary year under analysis" yes/no, in accordance with the Age Discrimination Act.

**Commented [DD1]:** Edit reflects language used by ISU's equal opportunity / affirmative action policy.

**Commented [DD2]:** Edit reflects Age Discrimination Act, which provides protection for age 40 or over.

**Commented [DD3]:** Eliminated "departmental affiliation" from controls. Ad Hoc Committee's proposal recommends that data be given to individual CFSC's for further review of any problematic results in their departments / schools. Yet we won't be able to find any problematic results for unit levels if they are "controlled" out of the study.

**Commented [DD4]:** In case the types of analyses needed exceed PRPA expertise, we discussed the potential for needing to contract assistance.

Initial analyses of all data will be conducted centrally at the university level to ensure uniformity and consistency of analytic procedures. Specific analytic procedures will be determined by URC in consultation with PRPA and other offices as needed, but will include a university-wide analysis, college-wide analyses, and departmental/school analyses. The analyses will be conducted by PRPA, or other offices as needed, with URC providing direction and oversight.

While these analyses are underway, the URC will ask all CFSCs to examine and verify to the URC whether:

1. All of its Department/School ASPT policies are current, defined (in accordance with ISU ASPT policy V.B.1) as having been formally reviewed and voted upon by Department/School faculty within the past five years, annually reviewed by the DFSC/SFSC by the most recent March 31, and reviewed and approved by the CFSC for conformity to College and University standards <sup>2,3,4</sup>
2. All of its Department/School policies and procedures for performance-evaluated salary increments and salary equity adjustments are current, defined (in accordance with ISU ASPT policy V.B.2) as having been formally reviewed and voted upon by Department/School faculty within the past five years, reviewed and approved by the CFSC for conformity to College and University standards, and distributed to each Department/School faculty member: <sup>5,6,7</sup>

CFSCs will be asked to ensure remedy of any policies or procedures found to be outdated, not endorsed by Department/School faculty, or not reviewed and approved by the CFSC.

Based on the results of the aforementioned salary analyses, URC will identify units in need of further review for possible equity concerns and convey findings to relative CFSCs. URC will entrust the CFSCs with conducting a qualitative review of the results of the salary analysis in combination with past assessments of individual faculty performance (e.g. annual performance reviews), and with consideration of unit-level salary increment and salary adjustment policies and practices. The purpose of the analysis will be to determine whether salary differences are attributable to performance, or whether an underlying equity concern is indicated. This is not a URC-level endeavor, but a CFSC-level endeavor, with CFSCs reporting back to the URC regarding findings. If equity concerns are indicated, then the CFSC's report will also include

<sup>2</sup> ISU ASPT policy V.B.1.a: Each DFSC/SFSC in the College reviewed their Department/School policies and procedures by the most recent March 31 in order to identify whether or not any areas may need updating based on that academic year's work and any informal faculty input.

<sup>3</sup> ISU ASPT policy V.B.1.b: Each DFSC/SFSC in the College has, within the past five years, formally invited input from Department/School faculty at a Department/School meeting regarding recommended revisions or updates to Department/School ASPT policies, presented to the faculty any proposed revisions that it endorses, and held a faculty vote upon any proposed revisions

<sup>4</sup> ISU ASPT policy V.B.1.c: The current ASPT policies and procedures in use within each Department/School have been reviewed and approved by the CFSC for conformity to College and University standards. In accordance with the above, at a minimum this review should have occurred within the past five years.

<sup>5</sup> ISU ASPT policy V.B.2: Each DFSC/SFSC in the College has policies and procedures for the allocation of monies devoted to performance-evaluated salary increments and salary equity adjustments, and that these policies and procedures have been approved by a majority vote of the faculty and that copies of these policies and procedures have been distributed to each Department/School faculty member

<sup>6</sup> ISU ASPT policy V.B.2: Each DFSC/SFSC in the College has, within the past five years, formally invited input from faculty regarding the policies and procedures for allocation of performance-evaluated salary increments and salary equity adjustments, and presented to the faculty any proposed revisions that it endorses, and held a faculty vote upon any proposed revisions

<sup>7</sup> ISU ASPT policy V.B.2.b: The current performance-evaluated salary increment and salary equity adjustment policies and procedures in use within each Department/School have been reviewed and approved by the CFSC for clarity, fairness and internal consistency. In accordance with the above, at a minimum this review should have occurred within the past five years.

**Commented [DD5]:** Note: URC needs to be mindful that this "kicks the can." Next year URC will need to review, consider and select form among potential appropriate analyses, looking at how other colleges/universities have studied salaries and how salaries are studied in other sectors. This work might be delegated to an office (e.g. PRPA) or to a URC subcommittee.

**Commented [DD6]:** Due to differences in department/school salary policies and procedures, and given that URC has been asked to selectively forward unit-level data for CFSC reviews, unit-level analyses are needed.

**Commented [DD7]:** I added this while working on revisions, but URC can decide whether or not to omit it.

During the past year, URC has discussed that although we review College standards, we have no mechanism for ensuring that CFSCs are providing required oversight of Department/School policies and procedures. This new ASPT Equity Review Cycle is an appropriate time to introduce that. It seems that an inherent part of this equity review should be to ensure that the Department/Schools have current, faculty endorsed, CFSC-reviewed policies and procedures for ASPT and salaries.

identification of steps or changes needed to prevent future inequities in performance-evaluated salary increments.

Any resultant salary equity concerns shall be addressed through an equity redistribution plan (to be developed by URC, and approved by Faculty Caucus and the President).<sup>8</sup>

The URC will make periodic reports to Faculty Caucus during phase one. The first report will be at the conclusion of the URC's quantitative analyses; and the second report will be at the conclusion of URC's review of CFSCs' resultant reports (if any are needed). To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty members' privacy. The URC will ask ISU legal counsel for a review of reports prior to their release.

Ideally, the timeline for phase one will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of phase one, URC will evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future salary reviews.

As this is a new initiative that has not been pilot tested, the URC may need to modify variables or analyses. Any modifications made will be explained in URC reports.

**Commented [DD8]:** Edits reflect Ad Hoc committee's intentions. The phrase "corrective steps" refers to self-identified steps a college/ school/department would need to take to prevent further inequities. The unit is asked to report on how it will correct that situation (e.g. what it will change in the way that it does things) so that inequity isn't perpetuated. This local investigation, reflection and response is a critical facet of organizational learning.

In contrast, URC is responsible for developing an overall equity redistribution plan.

**Commented [DD9]:** We really need to do this, so let's state it in the proposal to remind future URCs.

---

<sup>8</sup> The Faculty Caucus recommended that the development of an equity re-distribution plan be the responsibility of the URC, to be reviewed and approved by the Faculty Caucus and the President.

## Phase Two: Tenure / First Promotion

The second phase of the ASPT Equity Review Cycle will focus on faculty progression from appointment through tenure and first promotion. The population for the study will include all tenure-track faculty who were appointed without tenure since 2010 and the current year, whether still employed at ISU or not.<sup>9</sup>

**Commented [DD10]:** Reference to “conditions or dynamics” removed because the type of study proposed does not investigate that type of phenomena.

Four analyses will be conducted. These studies are descriptive only, and include:

**Commented [DD11]:** See rationale offered in footnotes for separating out reviews of “tenure” and “promotion”

- Study #1 – A review of “voluntary departure prior to tenure” (yes/no)
  - Study #1 will include the full study population, as described above. “Yes” will be defined as faculty who voluntarily departed from ISU prior to tenure (e.g. resignation, retirement). “No” will be defined as faculty who did not voluntarily depart prior to tenure, whether still employed at ISU or not (e.g. this includes faculty who departed due to non-reappointment or tenure denial, faculty who were tenured, and faculty who have not yet undergone tenure review).
  - Time between appointment and voluntary departure also will be examined.
  - After the conclusion of study #1, tenure-track faculty who departed ISU voluntarily prior to tenure will be removed from the study population. For the remainder:
- Study #2 – A review of “non-reappointment prior to tenure” (yes/no)
  - “Yes” will be defined as tenure-track faculty who were not reappointed prior to tenure. “No” will be defined as all tenure-track faculty who have not yet applied for tenure and faculty who progressed through to applying for tenure (whether approved or denied).
  - Time between appointment and non-reappointment also will be examined.
  - After the conclusion of study #2, tenure-track faculty who were not reappointed prior to tenure will be removed from the study population.
  - Tenure-track faculty who are not yet eligible to apply for tenure also will be removed from the study population. For the remainder:
- Study #3 – A review of “award of tenure” (yes/no)<sup>10</sup>
  - “Yes” will be defined as tenure-track faculty who applied for and were awarded tenure, and “no” will be defined as faculty who applied for but were denied tenure.
  - Time between appointment and tenure also will be examined.
  - After the conclusion of study #3, tenure-track faculty who applied for but were denied tenure will be removed from the study. For the remainder:
- Study #4 – A review of “rank at time of tenure” (associate professor or higher: yes/no)<sup>11</sup>
  - “Yes” will be defined as attainment of associate professor rank (or higher) at time of tenure, including faculty who were appointed at the associate professor rank, those were promoted prior to tenure (if any), and those who were promoted concurrently with tenure. “No” will

<sup>9</sup> A minimum of one decade of data should be represented during the initial undertaking of this analysis. In future cycles, 15 years of data should be represented in the second cycle, and 20 years of data in subsequent cycle years. If one decade of data are not available for the initial Equity Review Cycle, then the earliest year reasonably available should be used; subsequent cycles should be adjusted accordingly until the 20 years threshold is reached.

<sup>10</sup> ISU ASPT policies establish that promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor is a process distinct from the award of tenure, although both normally occur at the same time. Accordingly, this series of studies examines tenure and first promotion separately.

<sup>11</sup> ISU ASPT policy (IX, C.5) specifies that faculty members should hold the rank of Associate Professor or higher at the time of tenure, or be recommended for promotion to that rank when tenure is awarded. Ordinarily, promotion to Associate Professor shall not occur prior to recommendation for tenure (VIII.F.1.b); and an individual who cannot qualify for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure shall ordinarily not be considered for tenure (IX.C.5). However, the language of ISU ASPT policies does not preclude the potential for awarding tenure without promotion, or for promoting faculty prior to tenure.

encompass only assistant professors who were awarded tenure but were not promoted to associate professor (if any).

For the above analyses, variables of interest include the following categories related to equal opportunity and access:<sup>12</sup>

1. Gender
2. Race/ethnicity
3. Disability status, if possible
4. U.S. citizenship status versus citizenship status from each continent of origin if not U.S.
5. Military veteran/non-military veteran, if possible
6. Age (40 or over)
7. Intersections of the above as determined by the URC and PRPA

All data will be examined at the aggregated university-wide level. College, school or departmental affiliation will not be used in the initial cycle of this study. It will be the judgment of URC and the administration whether or not to include college, school, or departmental affiliation in subsequent cycles.

**Commented [DD12]:** Reference to “controls” removed because these are descriptive studies.

Overview of Process: The Provost’s office and PRPA, and OEOA if necessary, will work together to prepare raw data. Following preparation of the data, URC will work with PRPA or other offices as needed to conduct appropriate quantitative analyses. Analyses will be conducted centrally at the university level to ensure uniformity and consistency of analytic procedures. Specific analytic procedures will be determined by the URC in consultation with PRPA and other offices as needed. The analyses will be conducted by PRPA, or other offices as needed, with URC providing direction and oversight.

The purpose of the analyses will be to create and review a comprehensive picture of how ISU tenure-track faculty progress from appointment through tenure and first promotion, and whether any elements of that picture suggest that possible equity concerns may be present. The URC recognizes that patterns found, if any, do not necessarily indicate that an equity concern is present. For example, faculty depart voluntarily for a variety of personal and professional reasons that cannot be investigated through this study. Furthermore, the granting of tenure is not automatic based on the fulfillment of a probationary period and yearly performance-evaluation ratings, but is a major decision based on a qualitative review of the candidate’s fulfillment of the criteria for tenure.<sup>13</sup>

At the conclusion of the analyses, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty members’ privacy. If the findings suggest that possible equity concerns may be present, the URC may make recommendations regarding those findings, and/or recommendations for further analyses. The URC will ask ISU legal counsel for a review of its report prior to its release.

---

<sup>12</sup> For the variables of interest, race/ethnicity and country of origin will be defined here as “at the time of hire;” age will be defined here as “40 or older at the time of action: yes/no,” in accordance with the Age Discrimination Act; gender, disability status and military veteran status will be defined as “at the time of action,” or last year tracked “Time of action” is defined as the time of either voluntary departure, non-reappointment, tenure/tenure denial, or promotion.

<sup>13</sup> ISU ASPT policies IX.C. and IX.D.

Ideally, the timeline for phase two will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of phase two, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future tenure / first promotion reviews.

As this is a new initiative that has not been pilot tested, the URC may need to modify variables or analyses. Any modifications made will be explained in the URC report.

### Phase Three: Full Professor / Second Promotion

The third phase of the ASPT Equity Review Cycle will focus on faculty progression from associate to full professor.<sup>14</sup>

**Commented [DD13]:** See previous comment re: "conditions or dynamics."

The URC recognizes that ISU ASPT eligibility criteria for promotion to full professor include: terminal degree or highly recognized stature in the field, time-in-rank as an associate professor, time-in-service as an ISU faculty member, and excellence of quality that reflects sustained past performance and is indicative of meritorious future performance.<sup>15</sup> This review will only consider time-in-rank and time-in-service.

For the remainder of the description of phase three, "eligible," means eligibility in terms of time-in-rank and time-in-service.

The population for the study will include a) all associate professors who voluntarily departed from ISU since 2010, prior to promotion to full professor; and b) all faculty employed at ISU at the time of the study who either currently hold the rank of full professor or who c) hold the rank of associate professor and have enough time-in-rank and time-in-service to be eligible for promotion to full professor.<sup>16</sup> Faculty holding the rank of assistant professor will not be included in the study, nor will associate professors who lack sufficient time-in-rank or time-in-service to be eligible for promotion, nor will faculty who were promoted to full professor but are not currently employed at ISU (e.g. resignation, retirement).

Three analyses will be conducted. These studies are descriptive only, and include:

- Study #1 – A review of “voluntary departure prior to promotion to full professor” (yes/no)
  - Study #1 will include the full study population, as described above. “Yes” will be defined as faculty who voluntarily departed from ISU prior to promotion to full professor (e.g. resignation, retirement). “No” will be defined as all faculty employed at ISU who either currently hold the rank of full professor or who are eligible for promotion to full professor.
  - Time between appointment/promotion to associate professor and voluntary departure also will be examined.
  - The review also will examine whether or not voluntarily departing faculty had ever applied unsuccessfully for promotion.
  - After the conclusion of study #1, associate professors who departed ISU voluntarily since 2010 will be removed from the study population. For the remainder:
- Study #2 – A review of “promotion to full professor” (yes/no)
  - “Yes” will be defined as faculty who were hired as full professors or who were promoted to that rank after hire, and “no” will include associate professors who are eligible for promotion but have not yet been promoted.

<sup>14</sup> ISU ASPT policies distinctly separate the actions of promotion (VIII) and tenure (IX). Although URC recognizes that award of tenure promotion to associate professor ordinarily happens concurrently, this study focuses on the ISU ASPT definitions and practices governing the promotion from associate to full professor (ASPT VII.F.2.b).

<sup>15</sup> ISU ASPT VIII.F.2.a.b.c

<sup>16</sup> ISU ASPT policy (VIII.F.2.b) indicates that to be eligible for promotion to professor, ordinarily, faculty members must have served full-time for at least four years as an associate professor at ISU and have completed at least ten full-time years as a faculty member at the college or university level. However, eligibility does not necessarily reflect sequential calendar years, as unpaid leaves of absence and sabbatical leaves (upon prior agreement) do not count as progress towards promotion (VIII.H). In developing the study population, the Provost’s Office will assist with accurately determining eligibility for promotion.



- Time between appointment/promotion to associate professor and promotion to full professor also will be examined. For faculty who were appointed at full professor, time-to-promotion will be zero.
- After the conclusion of study #2, faculty who hold the rank of full professor will be removed from the study. For the remainder:
- Study #3 – A review of “time since eligibility,” for eligible associate professors who have not yet been promoted to full professor
  - Time since appointment/promotion to associate professor will be examined.
  - Number of applications for promotion to full professor (if any) also will be examined.<sup>17</sup>

For the above analyses, variables of interest include the following categories related to equal opportunity and access:<sup>18</sup>

1. Gender
2. Race/ethnicity
3. Disability status, if possible
4. U.S. citizenship status versus citizenship status from each continent of origin if not U.S.
5. Military veteran/non-military veteran, if possible
6. Age (40 or over)
7. Intersections of the above as determined by the URC and PRPA

Overview of the Process: The Provost’s office and PRPA, and OEOA if necessary, will work together to prepare the raw data. Following preparation of the data, URC will work with PRPA or other offices as needed to conduct appropriate quantitative analyses. Analyses will be conducted centrally at the university level to ensure uniformity and consistency of analytic procedures. Specific analytic procedures will be determined by URC in consultation with PRPA and other offices as needed. The analyses will be conducted by PRPA, or other offices as needed, with URC providing direction and oversight.

The purpose of the analyses will be to create and review a comprehensive picture of how ISU tenure-track faculty progress from associate to full professor, and whether any elements of that picture suggest that possible equity concerns may be present. The URC recognizes that patterns found, if any, do not necessarily indicate that an equity concern is present. For example, faculty depart voluntarily for a variety of personal and professional reasons that cannot be investigated in this study. Furthermore, applying for promotion to full professor is the choice of the individual faculty member. There is no university policy requiring that eligible faculty apply for promotion, no time limitations for doing so, and no penalty for applying unsuccessfully. Finally, the granting of promotion to full professor is not automatically based on the fulfillment of a required minimum time-to-eligibility, but is a major decision based on a qualitative review of a candidate’s professional activities.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> ISU ASPT policies do not limit the number of times an associate professor may apply for promotion to full professor, nor do they specify any penalties for unsuccessful applications.

<sup>18</sup> For the variables of interest, race/ethnicity and country of origin will be defined here as “at the time of hire,” age will be identified as “40 or older at the time of action: yes/no,” in accordance with the Age Discrimination Act.; gender, disability status and military veteran status will be defined as “at the time of action,” or the last year tracked. “Time of action” is defined as the time of either: voluntary departure; promotion to full professor; or (in the case of eligible associate professors who have not yet been promoted) the time of the study.

<sup>19</sup> ISU ASPT policy VIII.F.2.c

At the conclusion of the analyses, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty member's privacy. If the findings suggest that possible equity concerns may be present, the URC may make recommendations regarding those findings, and/or recommendations for further analyses. The URC will ask ISU legal counsel for a review of its report prior to its release.

Ideally, the timeline for phase three will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of phase three, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future full professor/second promotion reviews.

As this is a new initiative that has not been pilot tested, the URC may need to modify variables or analyses. Any modifications made will be explained in the URC report.

## Phase Four: Performance Reviews & Salary Counteroffers

The fourth phase of the ASPT Equity Review Cycle will focus on performance reviews and salary counteroffers. Two types of studies will be performed:

### 1) Performance Reviews

The Provost's office will provide data on the percentage of faculty members receiving unsatisfactory ratings from DFSCs as compared to the total ASPT faculty, and will further break this data out by gender, race/ethnicity, etc. (according to our year one scope). It will compare this broken-out data to the total ISU tenure-line population to see if there are patterns of disproportionality such as would be analogous to studies in K-12 education that have found that the race/ethnicity and gender of students suspended is disproportionately African American males. If year nine data yields no remarkable results, this study might not need to be repeated in year fourteen, year nineteen, etc. The intention of this study will be to examine the success/failure of our system of rewards, including merit-based salary increments, formative feedback, and other factors intended to encourage successful faculty productivity outcomes.

### 2) Salary Counteroffers

Starting in FY19, the Provost's office will ask chairs/directors to provide data regarding all persons who leave a faculty role for positions outside of the University, with or without a request for a counteroffer, and regarding the percentage of any counteroffer in relation to current salary for all faculty who received a counteroffer, coded by whether they stayed at ISU or were not retained. This data will be collected and in year four will be provided to the URC. It will be broken down by department and by gender, race/ethnicity, etc. (according to our year one scope). These two break downs need not be intersected if to do so would reveal confidential personnel information. Records of institutions to whom we have lost faculty may also be of interest in formulating optimum retention strategies for ISU. The intention of this study will be to examine the success/failure of our efforts to retain faculty and the ability of ISU to offer competitive salaries.

**Commented [DD14]:** I did not make any edits to this section because I had questions for discussion:

- Should this be written up as a descriptive study only (like phases two, three and five); or as a causal-comparative study in which we refer findings to CFSCs for further review and elucidation (like phase one)?

- Also, should it just look at one year of data (as it seems to propose) or a range of years?

Following discussion of these and any other questions posed by URC, I will make edits (if any) in accordance with the committee's will.

**Commented [DD15]:** I did not make any edits to this section because I had questions for discussion:

- Should we study this? Salary counteroffers are not an area of ASPT jurisdiction. There is nothing in ISU ASPT policy that necessitates that a faculty member who wishes to voluntarily depart must be made a counteroffer in order to entice the individual to stay.

- Can we study this? It doesn't account for differences in the individual cost/benefit analyses of departing faculty. The decision whether or not to request a counteroffer (and the size of the offer) probably varies significantly based on subjective things such as the desirability of the job offer, its location, and the individual's relative happiness here.

- Is this redundant effort? Salaries will be examined every five years and if an individual's salary is disparately high due to a counteroffer, then that will be brought to light in the study.

- If the phenomenon of interest is faculty retention, then the following substitute would explore that more fully: Ask chairs/directors to conduct exit interviews of all departing faculty, analyze those reports on a five-year cycle, and then provide URC with a report of reasons for departure / retention issues. Arguably, voluntary departures is not an area of ASPT jurisdiction either. However, implementing "exit interviews" is a recommendation of the Campus Climate Task Force, and could be included as part of the Equity Review Cycle. <https://illinoisstate.edu/president/campus-climate-taskforce/equity-review/>

Following discussion of these and any other questions posed by URC, I will make edits (if any) in accordance with the committee's will.

## Phase Five: Disciplinary Actions

The fifth phase of the ASPT Equity Review Cycle will focus on faculty disciplinary actions. The population for the study will include all tenure-track faculty who are currently employed at ISU or were dismissed since 2019 due to disciplinary action<sup>20</sup>.

In this initial Equity Review Cycle, one analysis will be conducted. The study will be descriptive only, and will constitute a review of sanctions/suspension/dismissals (yes/no).

- “Yes” will be defined as having received one or more sanctions or suspensions, or a dismissal, and “no” will be defined as not having received any of the aforementioned disciplinary actions.

For the above analyses, variables of interest include the following categories related to equal opportunity and access:<sup>21</sup>

1. Gender
2. Race/ethnicity
3. Disability status, if possible
4. U.S. Citizenship status versus citizenship status from each continent of origin if not U.S.
5. Military veteran/non-military veteran, if possible
6. Age (40 or over)
7. Intersections of the above as determined by URC and the Provost’s office

All data will be examined at the aggregated university-wide level. College, school or departmental affiliation will not be used in the initial cycle of this study. It will be the judgment of the URC and the administration whether or not to include college, school or departmental affiliation in subsequent cycles.

Overview of the Process: The Provost’s office will prepare raw data. Following preparation of the data, URC will work with the Provost’s office to conduct appropriate quantitative analyses. Analyses will be conducted centrally at the university level to ensure uniformity and consistency of analytic procedures. Specific analytic procedures will be determined by the URC in consultation with the Provost’s office. The analysis will be conducted by the Provost’s office, or other offices as needed, with URC providing direction and oversight. The purpose of the analysis will be to create and review a comprehensive picture of outcomes of faculty disciplinary actions, and whether that picture suggests that possible equity concerns may be present.<sup>22</sup> The URC recognizes that patterns found, if any, do not necessarily indicate that an equity concern is present.

At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty members’ privacy. If the findings suggest that possible equity concerns may be

---

<sup>20</sup> Or the year the proposed disciplinary articles take effect, if not in 2019.

<sup>21</sup> For the variables of interest, race/ethnicity and country of origin will be defined here as “at the time of hire,” age will be identified as “40 or older at the time of disciplinary action: yes/no,” in accordance with the Age Discrimination Act.; gender, disability status and military veteran status will be defined as “at the time of disciplinary action,” or the last year tracked.

<sup>22</sup> According to proposed Article XII.A.7, confidential reports of disciplinary actions will also be submitted annually by the Provost to the URC. However, the proposed policy does not prescribe that such annual reports must include data related to equal opportunity and access considerations.

present, the URC may make recommendations regarding those findings, and/or recommendations for further analyses. The URC will ask ISU legal counsel for a review of its report prior to its release.

Ideally, the timeline for phase five will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of phase five, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews of disciplinary actions.

As this is a new initiative that has not been pilot tested, the URC may need to modify variables or analyses. Any modifications made will be explained in the URC report.

## Proposed Scope of Equity Review Cycle

As Recommended to the Faculty Caucus by the University Review Committee  
at its May 10, 2018 meeting

The proposed ASPT Equity Review Cycle examines processes affecting tenure-track faculty, and encompasses five phases of study that include:

- Phase one: Salary
- Phase two: Tenure / First Promotion
- Phase three: Full Professor / Second Promotion
- Phase four: Performance Reviews & Salary Counteroffers
- Phase five: Disciplinary Actions

These studies are described in the following pages.

### Phase One: Salary

Salary, with each faculty member's monthly salary adjusted into an annual standard for ease of analysis and layperson comprehension, broken out by the following categories related to equal opportunity and access:

1. Gender
2. Race/ethnicity
3. Disability status, if possible
4. U.S. citizenship status versus citizenship status from each continent of origin if not U.S.
5. Military/non-military, if possible
6. Age
7. Intersections of the above as determined by the URC and PRPA, once the raw data is received

Controls or co-variables may include but are not limited to:

1. highest earned degree
2. years since appointment on tenure-line at ISU
3. rank
4. years in rank (both with and without this control; as well as intersection of rank by years-in-rank)
5. departmental affiliation by department of rank
6. past administrative appointment or not (chairs/deans/Provost office & deans offices AP roles)

Following receipt of the raw and intersectional data by URC, URC will need to work with CFSCs to combine the analyses results with assessment of individual faculty performance. This is not a URC-level endeavor, but a CFSC-level endeavor, with CFSCs reporting back to the URC regarding findings and corrective steps if identified.

A few studies from other universities that the ad hoc committee examined show the percent distribution of male/female, race/ethnic identity across departments. The Academic Planning Committee and PRPA already currently track this type of data in a different way through Academic Program Profiles and the APC

encourages diversification plans; however, seeing concentrations comparatively on one graph may be informative to considerations of how work environment may be affecting outcomes.

At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty member's privacy. Ideally, the completion time for the study will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.

## Phase Two: Tenure / First Promotion

As Recommended to the Faculty Caucus by the University Review Committee  
at its May 10, 2018 meeting

The second phase of the ASPT Equity Review Cycle will focus on faculty progression from appointment through tenure and first promotion. The population for the study will include all tenure-track faculty who were appointed without tenure since 2010 and the current year, whether still employed at ISU or not.<sup>1</sup>

Four analyses will be conducted. These studies are descriptive only, and include, but are not limited to:

- Study #1 – A review of “voluntary departure prior to tenure” (yes/no)
  - Study #1 will include the full study population, as described above. “Yes” will be defined as faculty who voluntarily departed from ISU prior to tenure (e.g. resignation, retirement). “No” will be defined as faculty who did not voluntarily depart prior to tenure, whether still employed at ISU or not (e.g. this includes faculty who departed due to non-reappointment or tenure denial, faculty who were tenured, and faculty who have not yet undergone tenure review).
  - Time between appointment and voluntary departure also will be examined.
  - After the conclusion of study #1, tenure-track faculty who departed ISU voluntarily prior to tenure will be removed from the study population. For the remainder:
  
- Study #2 - A review of “non-reappointment prior to tenure” (yes/no)
  - “Yes” will be defined as tenure-track faculty who were not reappointed prior to tenure. “No” will be defined as all tenure-track faculty who have not yet applied for tenure and faculty who progressed through to applying for tenure (whether approved or denied).
  - Time between appointment and non-reappointment also will be examined.
  - After the conclusion of study #2, tenure-track faculty who were not reappointed prior to tenure will be removed from the study population.
  - Tenure-track faculty who are not yet eligible to apply for tenure also will be removed from the study population. For the remainder:
  
- Study #3 – A review of “award of tenure” (yes/no)<sup>2</sup>
  - “Yes” will be defined as tenure-track faculty who applied for and were awarded tenure, and “no” will be defined as faculty who applied for but were denied tenure.
  - Time between appointment and tenure also will be examined.
  - After the conclusion of study #3, tenure-track faculty who applied for but were denied tenure will be removed from the study. For the remainder:

---

<sup>1</sup> A minimum of one decade of data should be represented during the initial undertaking of this analysis. In future cycles, 15 years of data should be represented in the second cycle, and 20 years of data in subsequent cycle years. If one decade of data are not available for the initial Equity Review Cycle, then the earliest year reasonably available should be used; subsequent cycles should be adjusted accordingly until the 20 years threshold is reached.

<sup>2</sup> ISU ASPT policies establish that promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor is a process distinct from the award of tenure, although both normally occur at the same time. Accordingly, this series of studies examines tenure and first promotion separately.



- Study #4 – A review of “rank at time of tenure” (associate professor or higher: yes/no)<sup>3</sup>
  - “Yes” will be defined as attainment of associate professor rank (or higher) at time of tenure, including faculty who were appointed at the associate professor rank, those who were promoted prior to tenure (if any), and those who were promoted concurrently with tenure. “No” will encompass only assistant professors who were awarded tenure but were not promoted to associate professor (if any).

For the above analyses, variables of interest include the following categories related to equal opportunity and access:<sup>4</sup>

1. Gender
2. Race/ethnicity
3. Disability status, if possible
4. U.S. citizenship status versus citizenship status from each continent of origin if not U.S.
5. Military veteran/non-military veteran, if possible
6. Age (40 or over)
7. Intersections of the above as determined by the URC and PRPA

All data will be examined at the aggregated university-wide level. College, school or departmental affiliation will not be used in the initial cycle of this study. It will be the judgment of URC and the administration whether or not to include college, school, or departmental affiliation in subsequent cycles.

The Provost’s office and PRPA, and OEOA if necessary, will work together to provide the URC with data related to successful tenure cases and promotions to associate professor, time-to-tenure-and-promotion, non-reappointments, tenure denials, and resignations/retirements prior to tenure-and-promotion.

At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. If the findings suggest that possible equity concerns may be present, the URC may make recommendations regarding those findings, and/or recommendations for future analyses. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty member’s privacy. Ideally, the completion time for the review will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.

---

<sup>3</sup> ISU ASPT policy (IX, C.5) specifies that faculty members should hold the rank of Associate Professor or higher at the time of tenure, or be recommended for promotion to that rank when tenure is awarded. Ordinarily, promotion to Associate Professor shall not occur prior to recommendation for tenure (VIII.F.1.b); and an individual who cannot qualify for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure shall ordinarily not be considered for tenure (IX.C.5). However, the language of ISU ASPT policies does not preclude the potential for awarding tenure without promotion, or for promoting faculty prior to tenure.

<sup>4</sup> For the variables of interest, race/ethnicity and country of origin will be defined here as “at the time of hire;” age will be defined here as “40 or older at the time of action: yes/no,” in accordance with the Age Discrimination Act; gender, disability status and military veteran status will be defined as “at the time of action,” or last year tracked “Time of action” is defined as the time of either voluntary departure, non-reappointment, tenure/tenure denial, or promotion.