

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Thursday, November 1, 2018
1 p.m., Hovey 401D

MINUTES

Members present: Frank Beck, Angela Bonnell, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Kevin Edwards, Joe Goodman, Yoon Jin Ma, Nancy Novotny, Sarah Smelser

Members not present: Diane Dean, Rachel Shively

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, Illinois State University, as subsequently amended; “CFSC” refers to college faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT policies; “DFSC” refers to department faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT policies; “Mennonite” refers to Mennonite College of Nursing at Illinois State University; “Milner” refers to Milner Library at Illinois State University; and “CAS” refers to the College of Arts and Sciences at Illinois State University. Any general reference in these minutes to “DFSC” (i.e., a reference other than to the DFSC of a particular unit) refers to both DFSC and SFSC, and any reference to “department” or “school” (other than to a particular unit) refers to both department and school.

I. Call to order

Chairperson Joe Goodman called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. He welcomed committee members.

II. Approval of minutes

Frank Beck moved approval of minutes from the October 18, 2018 URC meeting. Sarah Smelser seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

III. Revisions to disciplinary articles proposed by Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing

Goodman reviewed the request submitted by Mennonite for an exception-exemption from certain recusal provisions of new Article XII (Disciplinary Actions: General Considerations) of the ASPT policies (see attached). He reported that the request has been approved by Mennonite faculty by a vote of 19-1 and by Milner faculty by a vote of 9-0. Smelser asked where the proposed text would be inserted in the policies. Goodman responded that the location has not yet been decided by the Caucus but that the text would likely either be added to Section XII.B.3 or inserted as a new Section XII.B.4. Angela Bonnell pointed out the phrase “single department Colleges” in the proposed text. She reported that Milner faculty is unanimous in its preference for use of that phrase rather than the reference to Milner as having no departments (in Section IV.A.2).

Smelser moved to recommend to Caucus the following exception-exemption request submitted to URC by Mennonite and approved by both Mennonite and Milner faculty.

Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing, as single-department Colleges, are exempt from the requirement that CFSC members must automatically recuse themselves from disciplinary proceedings involving members of their own departments. When CFSC members in Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing have conflicts of interest arising from other circumstances, they should recuse themselves from disciplinary proceedings as required in XII.B.3. The faculty of Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing will delineate in their College ASPT policies the means by which they will

ensure that disciplinary proceedings are heard by a panel of at least five faculty (which can include the dean or designated associate dean as chair of the committee).

Kevin Edwards seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Bonnell informed committee members that the Milner faculty has decided to increase the size of its CFSC, from two faculty members and the dean to up to four faculty members and the dean. But for Milner to be able to do so, she said, the Caucus needs to eliminate the exception in Section IV.A of the ASPT policies, which addresses the composition of the Milner CFSC. Specifically, Section IV.A.2, which prescribes a Milner CFSC as comprised of two faculty members and the Dean, would have to be deleted by the Caucus. If that were done, the composition of the Milner CFSC would be governed by Section IV.A.1, which states that “Each College shall have a CFSC that comprises three to six faculty members ... and the Dean ...” Sam Catanzaro asked Bonnell if Milner faculty wants that change to be effective January 1, 2019. Bonnell responded in the affirmative, explaining that the vision of Milner faculty is to no longer be considered an exception with respect to composition of its CFSC. Catanzaro asked Bonnell if Milner faculty is asking that all of Section IV.A.2 be deleted. Bonnell responded that all of Section IV.A.2 needs to be deleted except the last sentence (which reads, “Since Milner Library has no departments, Milner Library CFSC members may participate in all deliberations unless these deliberations involve them as individuals.” Bonnell suggested moving that sentence to the end of Section IV.A.1 and deleting what would be left of Section IV.A.2.

Committee members then discussed whether the sentence moved from Section IV.A. 2 to Section IV.A.1 should retain the reference to Milner as has having no departments, when the exemption-exception passage URC recommended to the Caucus earlier in the meeting describes Milner and Mennonite as “single-department Colleges.” Smelser recommended that the reference be consistent across the ASPT policies. Goodman conducted a scan of the electronic version of the ASPT policies and reported that there are no other references to Milner or Mennonite as having no departments other than the reference in Section IV.A. Catanzaro said he believes it is appropriate to refer to Milner (and Mennonite) as being a single-department college since it has a DFSC.

Smelser moved to recommend to the Caucus that Section IV.A.2 of the ASPT policies document be deleted, that Section IV.A.1 be renumbered Section IV.A, and that the following sentence be appended to new Section IV.A.

Since Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing are single-department colleges, their CFSC members can participate in all deliberations unless those deliberations involve them as individuals, or if they have other conflicts of interest.

The motion was seconded by Bonnell. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Bonnell asked if there are any references in the disciplinary articles to Section IV.A.2, noting that any such reference would need to be deleted or revised if the Caucus accepts the URC recommendation to delete that section. Goodman noted that Catanzaro and Caucus Chairperson Susan Kalter will attend to that matter when finalizing the ASPT policies for reprinting.

IV. Review of CFSC standards

Mennonite College of Nursing

Committee members then considered a request by Mennonite for URC approval of the Mennonite CFSC standards as revised by the college to accommodate the new disciplinary articles (see attached). Goodman commented that the standards read more like DFSC guidelines to him in terms of their detail. Catanzaro noted that it is usually the case, but not always, that DFSC guidelines are more detailed than CFSC standards. Goodman noted the statement on page one of the standards that, “On occasion, initial appointments may be at the associate or full professor level.” He asked how often that occurs. Nancy Novotny (the Mennonite representative on URC) responded that she does not know of any case in which that provision was used by Mennonite. Catanzaro explained that the ability of a college to make initial appointments at the associate or full

professor level is provided for in the ASPT policies. He added that such appointments are happening more frequently at the University, especially in the College of Applied Science and Technology, as new faculty members are being hired with unique experiences in emerging fields. Goodman said he sees no glaring issues with the Mennonite CFSC standards as presented to URC. Smelser agreed. Smelser moved that URC approve Mennonite CFSC standards as submitted to URC. Novotny seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

College of Arts and Sciences

Committee members next considered a request by the College of Arts and Sciences for URC approval of the CAS CFSC standards as revised by the college to accommodate the new disciplinary articles (see attached). Goodman referred to the last sentence of the second paragraph under the heading “CFSC Policies” on page one of the document, which reads: “Individuals may not serve on CFSC the year they are being considered for Tenure, Promotion, Distinguished or University Professor.” He suggested striking the word “Tenure” from that sentence, because a faculty member must have tenure to be eligible to serve on a CFSC. Goodman also suggested removing the parentheses from the first sentence of that same paragraph; he noted that the phrase “including appeals” had been deleted from that sentence but not the parentheses before and after that phrase. Edwards moved to approve the CAS CFSC standards as submitted to URC with the two changes suggested by Goodman: removal of the word “Tenure” from the last sentence of the second paragraph under the heading “CFSC Policies” on page one of the document and removal of the parentheses from the first sentence of that same paragraph. Smelser seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

V. Update regarding service assignments research

There was none.

VI. Continued discussion of equity review plan

Committee members considered revisions to the description of equity review phase four, as drafted by Edwards based on initial discussion of the phase at the October 18, 2018 URC meeting (see attached). Regarding the parenthetical in the first sub-paragraph of the draft (“as in the Year 1 analysis”), Smelser said she thought URC had decided to refer to the five components of equity review as phases rather than as years. Edwards said he would make that change. Goodman added that he will do a global check of the document to identify any other revisions that are needed for consistency, once URC has completed its review of the entire document.

Catanzaro asked about the last sentence of the first sub-paragraph, which reads: “The data will be analyzed for statistically significant differences among groups.” He noted that even by expanding the data to be examined from one year of data to five years of data, there could be dramatic differences in sample sizes. As a result, there could be meaningful differences that do not meet the criteria for being statistically significant, and there could be differences that meet those criteria but are not meaningful, he said. Beck noted that there some differences may be statistically significant and some may be practical. Edwards suggested changing the phrase “statistically significant differences” to “quantitative differences.” Goodman suggested further generalizing the sentence to read, “The data will be analyzed for differences among groups.” Edwards said that while he used the phrase “statistically different” because some may want to glean significance from a small sample, he finds the change suggested by Goodman acceptable.

Novotny noted that the second sub-paragraph ends with a description of the intent of the study: “The intention of this study will be to qualitatively examine the success/failure of our efforts to retain faculty and the ability of ISU to offer competitive salaries.” She asked if committee members want to add a sentence regarding intent to the end of sub-paragraph one. Edwards noted that he thought about adding such a sentence to sub-paragraph one but decided not to do so due to the issue of sample size. Noting that URC recommendations regarding equity review will be carefully studied by the Caucus and that the Caucus may refer the matter back to URC, Goodman said he is fine with not including a statement of intent in sub-paragraph one. Smelser agreed, stating that there may be many reasons to look for differences; she said she could think of several.

Edwards moved to approve the description of equity review phase four as re-drafted by Edwards but with the following two revisions: changing the references in sub-paragraphs one and two from “Year 1” to “Phase 1” and replacing the last sentence of sub-paragraph one with the following sentence: “The data will be analyzed for differences among groups.” Beck seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Goodman thanked Edwards for his work re-drafting the description of equity review phase four.

VII. Other business

There was none.

VIII. Adjournment

Smelser moved that the meeting adjourn. Novotny seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 1:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

Email from D. Wilson to J. Goodman re MCN exception-exemption request, 10-26-18
CFSC standards, Mennonite College of Nursing, October 2018, pending URC review
CFSC standards, College of Arts and Sciences, October 2018, pending URC review
Proposed re-draft of equity review phase four, K. Edwards, 10-30-18

EMAIL

From: Dr. Denise Wilson, Associate Dean for Academics, Mennonite College of Nursing
To: Dr. Joe Goodman, Chairperson, University Review Committee
Date: October 26, 2018
Re: ASPT changes

Hello, Joe,

I am writing on behalf of Dr. Judy Neubrandner, our Dean and chair of our CFSC, myself as chair of our DFSC, and all of our tenured/tenure track faculty with 2 requests. Our tenured/tenure track faculty voted 19-1 in favor of these changes.

First, Mennonite College of Nursing is requesting that the Caucus approve the following exception/exemption:

Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing, as single-department Colleges, are exempt from the requirement that CFSC members must automatically recuse themselves from disciplinary proceedings involving members of their own departments. When CFSC members in Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing have conflicts of interest arising from other circumstances, they should recuse themselves from disciplinary proceedings as required in XII.B.3. The faculty of Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing will delineate in their College ASPT policies the means by which they will ensure that disciplinary proceedings are heard by a panel of at least five faculty (which can include the dean or designated associate dean as chair of the committee).

Second, we are asking for approval by URC of our amended College Standards to incorporate the above change. Please see the attached file.

Thank you in advance for your efforts in getting these requests approved. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Take care,

Denise

Denise Wilson, PhD, APN, FNP, GNP, CDE
Associate Dean for Academics
Professor
Mennonite College of Nursing
Illinois State University
Campus Box 5810
Normal, IL 61790-5810
(309) 438-2358
ddwilso2@ilstu.edu

MENNONITE COLLEGE OF NURSING AT ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
College Standards Supplemental to University Guidelines and
Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Drafted 4/8/05, Effective January 1, 2006,

Revised December 2010, Approved by URC January 19, 2011, Mandatory Revisions November 2011,

Approved by URC November 8, 2011

Effective January 1, 2012

Revised October 2018

Mission

Mennonite College of Nursing at Illinois State University creates a dynamic community of learning to develop exceptionally prepared nurses who will lead to improve health outcomes locally and globally. We promote excellence in teaching, research, service and practice with a focus on the vulnerable and underserved. We are committed to being purposeful, open, just, caring, disciplined and celebrative.

Introduction

This document outlines Mennonite College of Nursing standards for appointment, salary, promotion and tenure. The information contained within these policies is supplementary to the *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*. Tenure track faculty are expected to review and consider both documents to fully appreciate and understand the ASPT process.

Mennonite College of Nursing is committed to a faculty evaluation system that promotes the highest standards of achievement within the discipline and at the same time is conducted in an atmosphere that promotes collegiality. The college is determined that the evaluation process will nurture faculty development and promote their success within the university and the discipline. The college is committed to rewarding faculty as they advance the college mission.

Standards for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

Appointment

Appointment to a tenure track position is predicated on an individual's ability to achieve promotion to associate professor and/or be granted tenure by the end of the probationary period. Individuals seeking appointment to assistant professor must demonstrate potential for significant achievement in teaching, scholarship and service.

On occasion, initial appointments may be at the associate or full professor level. These individuals will have already demonstrated comparable achievement of this rank at other institutions in congruence with the expectations of Mennonite College of Nursing and Illinois State University.

Appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor may be made in the case of individuals who have:

- Recently received the doctorate and have no teaching experience, or
- Candidacy status for the doctoral degree, with or without teaching experience (Note: Reappointment is contingent upon completion of the doctoral degree within a period of time specified at the time of hire).
- Under rare circumstances variations from these requirements for appointment to assistant professor may be approved.

Promotion

A faculty member applying for promotion in rank in Mennonite College of Nursing must provide evidence of a sustained record of success in teaching, scholarship and service with an emphasis on the teaching and scholarship.

All individuals seeking promotion should be effective teachers as demonstrated by student evaluations, peer-review and self-evaluation. Faculty must also provide evidence of scholarship. Such evidence must include

peer-reviewed publications or reviewed creative activity or performances. Faculty may also include presentations, abstracts, and grant awards as evidence of scholarship. Faculty scholarship should demonstrate sustained effort and expertise in a focused area of study that contributes to the discipline of nursing and furthers the mission of the college. Service to the university, discipline and community is an important component of faculty responsibility, but alone is insufficient for promotion.

Tenure

The probationary period provides tenure track faculty the opportunity to document their productivity and achievement in teaching, scholarship and service. Annual performance evaluations provide individualized critical appraisal that will guide the probationary tenure track faculty in improving the quality of their contributions to the college mission.

To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member must hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor or be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor when tenure is recommended. An individual who does not qualify for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure shall ordinarily not be considered for tenure. Granting of tenure is also predicated on the potential for ongoing meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship and service.

Post-tenure Reviews

Post-tenure reviews are primarily for the purpose of enabling faculty members to shape their continuing careers with Menonite College of Nursing and Illinois State University and to ensure that the faculty activities are meeting the mission of the college. Tenured faculty members shall receive a post-tenure review every five years following the granting of tenure.

Standards for Performance Evaluation and Salary Increments

Annual performance evaluations serve as one mechanism to reward each faculty member for their contribution to the mission of the college. Salary funds shall be distributed as performance-evaluated increments to faculty based on established policies for salary adjustments. Performance-evaluated increments shall recognize equity, and short-term and long-term contributions made by faculty members. Such increments shall be payable to raise-eligible faculty members who receive satisfactory performance ratings. Performance-evaluated increments ordinarily will not be distributed equally to all raise-eligible faculty members.

Establishment of the College Faculty Status Committee

The Illinois State University Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure guidelines provide for the establishment of the College Faculty Status Committee (CFSC). The MCN CFSC is responsible for ensuring that the college guidelines are carried out, serving as the final authority in annual review and as the first appeal body for promotion and tenure decisions. By virtue of the MCN organizational structure, CFSC members participate in, are present at, and vote in ASPT deliberations (including appeals) involving individuals within MCN. Approval of CFSC guidelines is by majority vote of all tenure track faculty.

In accordance with University Policy 1.17.12, CFSC members will avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflicts of interest. CFSC members shall not participate in their own performance, tenure or promotion evaluations. The remaining members shall render performance, tenure or promotion evaluations for the individuals under consideration.

Five (5) members are necessary for deliberations in disciplinary cases, only one of which can be a tenured faculty member holding an administrative appointment. Should elected members recuse themselves due to conflicts of interest in disciplinary cases, selection of replacements for the elected members will follow the process described in Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies. In the case of fewer than five tenured Menonite College of Nursing faculty members, additional faculty members will be sought from the CFSC of Milner Library.

Should the dean recuse from the CFSC in disciplinary cases, a tenured associate dean previously designated by

the dean to substitute will chair the CFSC deliberations. Substitutes and the order in which they succeed one another will be designated annually by July 1. The associate dean will have full voting rights as acting dean.

FACULTY APPOINTMENT, SALARY, PROMOTION, AND TENURE (ASPT) STANDARDS
College of Arts and Sciences
January 2019

The College of Arts and Sciences is committed to a system of faculty evaluation and compensation that promotes the highest quality professional work by faculty. The College standards are meant to encourage departments/schools to set high expectations for faculty performance and to offer appropriate rewards to faculty based upon their accomplishments in teaching, scholarly or creative productivity, and service that genuinely advance the mission of the department/school, College, and the University.

The most important principle of effective faculty evaluation is peer review. The strongest evidence of performance in the area of scholarship or creative productivity comes from one's peers within the discipline. Generally, the best judges of the quality of such work are those who have similar academic interests and whose judgments influence dissemination in appropriate scholarly or creative venues. The best evaluators of the quality of a faculty member's teaching and service are peers within the academic department.

CFSC POLICIES

The College Faculty Status Committee (CFSC) shall be composed of the Dean of the College, who is an ex officio voting member and six members of the College faculty who represent the three groups (Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Social Sciences, Humanities). Each group has two members elected for two-year staggered terms. No department/school can have more than one representative. All members of the committee must hold tenure. College Council members shall not be eligible to serve. No faculty member may serve more than two consecutive terms. Faculty members may serve on only one ASPT committee at a time (URC, FRC, CFSC, D/SFSC).

CFSC members may participate in, be present at, and vote in ASPT deliberations ([including appeals](#)) involving individuals from their own departments/schools, [excluding disciplinary proceedings](#). However, requests to have a CFSC member recused (regardless of departmental/school affiliation of the member) can be made by the applicant or by the Chair/Director/DFSC/SFSC of the department/school. Persons making such a request must provide the Dean a brief written explanation. These requests will be considered by the Dean and the CFSC on a case-by-case basis. A CFSC member may recuse herself/himself at any time but should not provide an explanation for his or her recusal. Individuals may not serve on CFSC the year they are being considered for Tenure, Promotion, Distinguished or University Professor.

[CFSC members may not participate in, be present at, or vote in disciplinary proceedings involving individuals from their own departments/schools. If fewer than five CFSC members remain eligible to participate in disciplinary proceedings, a replacement member will be selected by the Dean from past CFSC members who served on the CFSC one of the previous two years and who is not currently serving on a D/SFSC. If the Dean is recused from the disciplinary proceedings, the Associate Dean for Personnel, Budget and Planning will be the designee. If the Associate Dean for Personnel, Budget, and Planning is unable to serve due to a conflict, the Dean may designate another Associate Dean to serve as a replacement.](#)

PROMOTION AND TENURE

Evaluation of the professional performance of faculty cannot be reduced to simple numeric standards. D/SFSCs and the CFSC must make judgments about the overall quality of a candidate's performance in accordance with the unit's "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" standards as these committees make recommendation on promotion and tenure. Given these assumptions, the following standards should apply in considering all applications for promotion and tenure within the College:

To qualify for promotion and tenure, a faculty member must exhibit sustained and consistent high quality performance in all faculty roles.

1. Each candidate for promotion or tenure must present evidence of high quality achievements in teaching. Evidence of high quality teaching must include a statement that addresses the candidate's teaching philosophy and goals, as well as examples of course materials (e.g., syllabi, selected assignments). It is the responsibility of the Chair/Director to provide a summary of systematically gathered student reactions to teaching performance, with results placed in the context of departmental norms.
2. Each candidate for promotion or tenure must present high-quality scholarly or creative productivity. These works may have appeared in any medium, but the scholarly or creative productivity will have been subject to external peer review appropriate to the discipline. Successful scholarly or creative records normally also include additional evidence of scholarly productivity demonstrated by activities such as conference papers, performances, invited addresses or funded external grants. Evidence of high quality scholarly or creative productivity should include a statement that addresses how the work contributes to the discipline and plans for future work.
3. Each candidate for promotion or tenure must present evidence of service activities that advance the mission of the department, college, university, discipline, or community.
4. The scholarship or creative productivity of each candidate for promotion or tenure will be evaluated by at least three and no more than six scholars from his or her discipline and external to Illinois State University. The external reviewers should be at or above the rank that the candidate is seeking and should not be former mentors, former students, spouses or significant others, co-authors, or co-investigators on grants. Guidelines for conducting the review will be developed by each department/school and added to the department/school's ASPT document.
5. The College regards the customary six-year probationary period in rank as an opportunity to observe a candidate's sustained performance in teaching, scholarship or creative productivity and service before awarding promotion and tenure. Early promotion and tenure is unusual in the College and shall occur only when the candidate has exhibited an extraordinary scholarly record, an exceptional record of teaching performance, and appropriate service.
6. Each candidate for tenure will undergo a mid-probationary tenure review conducted by the D/SFSC in the candidate's third or fourth year in order to assess the candidate's progress toward tenure.

Written departmental assignments for faculty may emphasize one of the faculty roles over others for purposes of evaluation. However, all candidates for promotion and tenure must have a record that includes peer-reviewed scholarly or creative productivity, and strong teaching.

To ensure uniformity in the presentation of information on candidates for promotion or tenure, all D/SFSCs shall utilize the College format for documentation of promotion and tenure cases.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Department/school guidelines for the annual performance review of faculty should reflect the strategic directions and values of the department/school. These guidelines should be designed to recognize faculty contributions in both short-term and long-term performance.

Faculty's overall annual performance will be evaluated in accordance with "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" standards developed by each Department/School's Faculty Status Committee (D/SFSC). departments/schools may choose to provide separate assessments of faculty performance in each evaluation category (teaching, scholarly or creative productivity, and service) as either "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory," but must provide an overall assessment of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." In addition, a separate interim appraisal of the faculty member's progress towards tenure and/or promotion must be included (see VII.E. in the University ASPT policies).

Annual performance review of faculty should be consistent with the annual assignment letters provided to each faculty member by the Chair/Director. Assignment letters should include information on the faculty member's teaching load for the year, the amount of time assigned to scholarly or creative productivity, and any other assignments expected to utilize significant portions of a faculty member's time.

SALARY REVIEW

Annual salary review should be directed toward ensuring that faculty salaries are consistent with performance and contributions to the department, in both the short term and the long term. The Chair/Director serves as chair of the D/SFSC and is responsible with presenting to the D/SFSC a set of recommendations regarding the distribution of salary increment funds. The D/SFSC is responsible for input and final approval of salary recommendations.

The College standards were approved by a majority vote of the departments/schools, [March 27-October 15, 2018](#).

The College standards were approved by the CFSC, [April 6-October 18, 2018](#).

The College standards were approved by the University Review Committee, [April 26, 2018](#).

Phase four

The fourth phase of the ASPT Equity Review Cycle will focus on performance reviews and salary counteroffers. Two 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. (as in the Year 1 analysis). Due to typically small numbers of unsatisfactory ratings, the data will be compiled for the most recent five-year span. The data will be analyzed for statistically significant differences among groups.
- 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. (as in the Year 1 analysis). The intention of this study will be to qualitatively 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.

[NOTES: this document was edited from the version: " Equity review scope, proposed simple edits compiled by Diane Dean, 5-7-18.docx " Changed text is blue; some extraneous material was deleted. Due to the small sample sizes involved, I lowered the expectations that the study would be able to reveal inequities... it cannot be characterized until it is performed and analyzed. Also I suspect the scope does not support the goal of understanding " success/failure of our system of rewards "]

ORIGINAL TEXT:

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.