

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Friday, February 8, 2019
9:30 a.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

Members present: Frank Beck, Angela Bonnell, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Diane Dean (joined the meeting in progress), Kevin Edwards, Joe Goodman, Yoon Jin Ma, Rachel Shively

Members not present: Nancy Novotny, Sarah Smelser

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

Note: In these minutes “URC” refers to the University Review Committee at Illinois State University; “Caucus” refers to the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate at Illinois State University; “ASPT policies” refers to *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies* of Illinois State University; “CFSC” refers to college faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT policies; “CAST” refers to the College of Applied Science and Technology at Illinois State University; “COB” refers to the College of Business at Illinois State University; and “OEOA” refers to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access at Illinois State University.

I. Call to order

Chairperson Joe Goodman called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. He welcomed committee members.

II. Approval of minutes

Kevin Edwards moved approval of minutes from the January 25, 2019 URC meeting. Angela Bonnell seconded the motion. The motion was approved on voice vote, with three members voting aye and three members abstaining (Frank Beck, Yoon Jin Ma, and Rachel Shively).

III. Chairperson’s update

Goodman reported that his meeting with Susan Kalter, Academic Senate/Faculty Caucus Chairperson, scheduled for February 1 did not occur due to illness. He said the meeting will be rescheduled. Goodman reported that Kalter has provided him a list of items she would like URC to consider as it prepares its recommendation to the Caucus for the next edition of ASPT policies. Goodman said he plans to talk with Kalter about the list when they meet and then incorporate Kalter’s suggestions and requests received from Sam Catanzaro at the prior URC meeting (on January 25, 2019) into a report for discussion by URC.

IV. Approval of revised CFSC standards

Goodman reminded URC members that CFSC standards of the College of Applied Science and Technology and the College of Business had not yet been approved by college faculty at the time of the final fall 2018 URC meeting. He noted that URC voted to allow the two colleges to submit their CFSC standards to URC in 2019 for review and final approval by the committee. Goodman referred URC members to revised CAST CFSC standards (see attached), which were included with materials distributed to URC members in advance of this meeting. He noted that CAST has made the changes URC requested in fall 2018, adding that the document was approved by CAST faculty in December 2018. Goodman distributed revised COB CFSC standards (see attached), which, Goodman reported, he received earlier in the day. He reported that COB has made the changes URC requested in fall 2018, adding that the document has been approved by COB faculty.

Beck moved to accept revised college standards as submitted to URC by the College of Applied Science and Technology and the College of Business. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on voice vote.

V. Equity review plan, phase five and next steps

Goodman reminded URC members that the committee has approved recommendations to the Faculty Caucus regarding phases one through four of the equity review plan and has just the description of phase five yet to review before URC can submit its recommendations regarding equity review to the Caucus. Goodman distributed a re-draft of the phase five description to URC members for their consideration (see attached). He stressed that he compiled the draft to facilitate URC discussion and that committee members should feel free to suggest revisions. Shively noted that the re-draft does not provide for data by gender, race/ethnicity, and other identifies as does the “simple edits” re-draft of the phase five description. Without that data, she noted, URC would not be able to study equity (in the ASPT system). Goodman explained that he excluded references to provision of data by race and gender because URC might not be able to obtain such data due to the expected low number of disciplinary cases. With disaggregated data, he explained, URC members might be able to identify the faculty members involved in the cases. Edwards suggested approaching the study of sanctions, suspensions, and dismissals in a different way. He recommended stating in the phase five description that the number of cases can determine whether an analysis of equity can be done in a statistically valid way and can also determine what data can be released to URC. Shively noted that even though a statistically valid analysis might not be possible due to a low number of cases, patterns could emerge from the counts that raise equity concerns.

Beck noted that minutes of the last URC meeting reference OEOA (the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access) while the phase five description re-draft does not. Catanzaro said URC might consider stating in the phase five description that URC will consult OEOA staff regarding the data and ask whether OEOA staff believes the data suggests concerns regarding equity. Catanzaro added that there may be identities of concern other than gender and race (e.g., religion) which URC members might not know about unless informed of them by OEOA. Catanzaro suggested inviting someone from OEOA staff to talk with URC about what data the committee will be able to access to conduct the equity review. He said he could send Tony Walesby, OEOA Director, an invitation to attend an upcoming URC meeting to discuss this matter. Committee members agreed with Catanzaro’s suggestion.

[Diane Dean joined the meeting.]

URC members decided that providing Walesby information regarding the types of data URC members would like to receive as inputs to an equity review might facilitate the conversation with Walesby. Committee members agreed to send Walesby the descriptions of phases one through four as revised by URC in fall 2018 and the “simple edits” version of phase five (compiled by then URC chairperson Diane Dean in spring 2018 for discussion by URC). Goodman asked Catanzaro if it will be possible for Walesby to attend the next URC meeting (February 22, 2019). Catanzaro responded that both he and Walesby will be unable to attend that meeting because they both need to attend the Board of Trustees meeting that morning. Catanzaro added that he will not be available to attend the March 8 URC meeting either. Catanzaro said he will consult Walesby regarding his availability and report back to Goodman.

VI. Other business

Goodman asked Catanzaro if the ASPT training session (regarding evaluation of scholarship), initially planned for fall 2018, has been scheduled for spring 2019. Catanzaro responded that it has not. He said he will keep URC informed regarding training plans.

Committee members acknowledged and welcomed Diane Dean back to the committee.

VII. Adjournment

Shively moved that the meeting adjourn. Beck seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Shively, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

CFSC standards, College of Applied Science and Technology, as approved by CAST faculty, December 2018

CFSC standards, College of Business, as approved by COB faculty, February 8, 2019

Re-draft of the Year 5 description in the proposed equity review plan, Dr. Joe Goodman, February 8, 2019

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
COLLEGE FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE STANDARDS
FOR APPOINTMENT, SALARY, PROMOTION, TENURE
Effective January 1, 2019

Overview

The CFSC for the College of Applied Science and Technology (the College) provides herein a statement of standards that further interpret University ASPT Policies. The Department Faculty Status Committees (DFSCs) and School Faculty Status Committees (SFSCs) in the College have, by majority vote, accepted these standards. The standards are subject to on-going revision and interpretation by the CFSC as inquiries and cases come before the Committee. The CFSC, DFSCs, and SFSCs will follow the guidelines as described in the *Faculty ASPT Policies, January 1, 2017*.

Composition of CFSC

The six elected members of the CFSC must be tenured and hold the minimum rank of Associate Professor. At least three elected members of the CFSC must hold the rank of Professor. The dean is an ex officio voting member and Chairperson of the Committee.

Recusal Policy

The members of the CFSC accept the obligation to render opinions that are derived from the evidence submitted to the committee and that are fair, without prejudice, and based on the appropriate and applicable rules as described in the Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and tenure Policies, effective January 1, 2017. Members of the committee may be present during, and participate in, deliberations in cases where faculty members from the same department or school may be under review, but must recuse themselves from rendering an opinion by voting as to the merit of any case where a faculty from the same department or school is under consideration for tenure or promotion. This recusal policy applies to any and all appeals that may come forward by a member of the faculty.

If the recusal of a CFSC member results in fewer than 5 voting members for disciplinary cases, a temporary voting member of the CFSC will be selected by the Dean from the pool of past CFSC members from the College of Applied Science and Technology, in accordance with ASPT Section XII.B.3.a.

For CFSC proceedings related to disciplinary matters, faculty members on the CFSC must be recused from the disciplinary proceedings for a faculty member from the same department/school as the CFSC member. The Dean may serve on cases from their home department/school but must self-recuse when s/he have a specific conflict of interest. If the Dean is recused from a disciplinary matter, an associate dean previously designated by the Dean to substitute in disciplinary cases will chair the CFSC deliberations. Substitutes and the order in which s/he will succeed one another in case of conflict or lack of availability will be designated annually on July 1. The associate dean will have full voting rights as acting dean in the case.

General Statement on Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College. Documentation submitted for evaluation should provide multiple indicators of teaching quality; one of these must be student reactions to teaching performance. For illustrative examples of teaching activities and evaluation factors that may be used, see pages 60-62 of the *Faculty ASPT Policies, January 1, 2017*.

General Statement on Scholarship

Scholarship is a fundamental responsibility for tenure and promotion considerations. Reviews of scholarly and creative productivity by the CFSC, DFSCs, and SFSCs are broadly defined to recognize scholarship that includes discovery, integration, application and outreach. Evaluation materials should document a scholarly approach to the development, performance and communication of these activities. For illustrative examples of scholarly activities that may be recognized see pages 62-63 of the *Faculty ASPT Policies, January 1, 2017*.

General Statement on Service

Faculty are expected to provide service to their departments, the College, and the University as well as to their professional organizations and practitioners. The applied nature of programs in the College provides multiple opportunities for faculty members to engage in service activities. Service in which faculty members apply their unique expertise to improve professional practice or to enrich community life is highly valued. For illustrative examples of service activities that may be pursued see pages 63-64 of the *Faculty ASPT Policies, January 1, 2017*.

Granting of Tenure

Probationary tenure-track faculty members are responsible for demonstrating that the granting of tenure is warranted through their performance during the probationary period. An annual Performance Review and Department Chair/School Director oversight, through ongoing supervision and communication, will guide probationary faculty members.

To be granted tenure, faculty must document high-quality professional contributions, throughout the probationary period, in all three areas of performance review. Their work should demonstrate a positive impact on teaching, scholarship, and service in their department and discipline. Faculty must show evidence of developing a focused area of scholarly expertise and demonstrate the ability to function as a contributing colleague within the culture of their Department or School College and University. An individual who cannot qualify for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure shall ordinarily not be recommended for tenure.

Promotion In Rank

Associate Professor. Except in unusual circumstances, promotion to this rank will not be granted prior to recommendation for tenure. Earning this rank requires a level of accomplishment that is expected to take most entry-level faculty members six years to achieve.

Specifically, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires a high level of competence as a teacher. Successful candidates for promotion to Associate Professor will document an ability to teach courses important to the department's mission. S/he will have a record of high quality teaching. S/he will have contributed to curriculum development in their department, demonstrated good mentoring of students in and out of the classroom, and/or demonstrated an ability to help students apply theory to practice. Successful candidates for Associate Professor must document scholarly accomplishments that include, among other

scholarly and creative activities, peer reviewed publications and a developing, focused area of scholarship. These accomplishments must establish a level of expertise recognized at least at the regional level by their colleagues in higher education and/or industry. Successful candidates for Associate Professor must document significant departmental service and active involvement in College, University and discipline based service activities. Documentation of high quality teaching and scholarly productivity is more critical to being promoted to Associate Professor than service.

Professor. This is the highest rank faculty may earn and it is not attained solely by time as an Associate Professor. Successful candidates must demonstrate teaching, research, and service accomplishments that exceed minimal criteria for satisfactory annual performance. Successful candidates for this rank will provide evidence of continuing high quality teaching and significant participation in their Department/School teaching mission, which may include involving students in their area of scholarship, influencing curriculum development in their department, and/or mentoring junior faculty. Successful candidates for Professor will document their expertise and scholarship are important to society or to the work of other scholars and/or the practices and policies of their professional area. Successful candidates for Professor will document that their provision of service is meaningful and has had a demonstrable impact to their Department or School, College, University, professional organizations and/or society. Promotion to this rank requires sustained accomplishments across all three areas of performance review over a significant period of time. Successful candidates for Professor must be truly outstanding in at least one area of performance review.

Candidates submitting materials for promotion to Professor are encouraged to include written evaluations from peer evaluators external to ISU who are qualified to comment on contributions to the discipline. The strongest evidence of performance in the area of scholarship and creative activity comes from one's peers within the discipline. Generally, those who can best judge the quality of such work are those who have similar academic interests and work outside of this University. On the other hand, the best evaluations of the quality of a faculty member's teaching and service are peers within the academic department.

Salary Incrementation

Department/School policies must maintain the ability to make significantly different awards for differential performance.

Departments/Schools may not develop policies that circumvent the need to make salary incrementation awards to faculty members based on performance in the three areas of performance review.

Procedures

Faculty members are responsible for submitting their documentation for performance, promotion or tenure evaluation. S/he must submit their documentation in the CFSC required formats and must include all files requested and all teaching performance data that is required by the College. DFSC/SFSC reports on each candidate for tenure and promotion are to be submitted on the form provided by the CFSC and should be accompanied by the files requested.

Disciplinary Actions

The College of Applied Science and Technology abides by the University policies for disciplinary actions (ASPT Articles XII through XV).

Review of DFSC/SFSC Policies and Procedures

The CFSC is responsible for reviewing and approving the criteria developed by each DFSC/SFSC. At a minimum, these criteria must implement the ASPT Policies as well as the CFSC Standards.

Approved by the CFSC April 4, 2005

Approved by the College DFSCs and SFSCs April 14, 2005

Approved by the URC August 30, 2005

Approved by the CFSC November 13, 2009

Approved by the CFSC October 21, 2011

Approved by the CFSC February 22, 2018

Approved by the URC April 26, 2018

Approved by the URC {date}

College of Business
College of Business Faculty Status Committee Standards
Effective January 1, 2019

I. Guiding Philosophy

The process of evaluating contributions of faculty should be a positive and motivating endeavor, and not rely on formulaic models or discrete evaluation categories. This process should encourage faculty to contribute to achieving the mission of the department, college, and university.

II. College of Business Mission

Within Illinois State University's College of Business, through our shared commitment to excellence in learning, we prepare students to become skilled business professionals who think critically, behave ethically, and make significant contributions to organizations, communities, and our global society.

III. Goals to Accomplish Our Mission

It is through our teaching, intellectual contributions, and service that we achieve our mission. As an institution emphasizing excellence in teaching, the College of Business seeks to recruit, develop, and support motivated faculty who are active teacher-scholars in their fields.

Teaching: We pursue teaching excellence through a student-centered focus, developing and enhancing students' continuous learning skills by educating them in business theory and its application to business practice. We achieve this student-centered focus by actively involving students, creating a small-class atmosphere, maintaining access to instructors, encouraging innovative methodologies, and by continuously improving our curricula.

Intellectual Contributions: In addition to basic research, the College values applied research and instructional development as intellectual contributions that help students see the relevancy of theory to business practice.

Service: By our service, the faculty and staff are role models for students through contributions to the university, the community and their profession. Faculty and staff represent the college through involvement in university committees and our professional service enhances the visibility and reputation of our college.

Accreditation: The College of Business is accredited by AACSB International; the Accounting program is separately accredited. The college is committed to maintaining these important accreditations. Accordingly, DFSC policies should articulate expectations for performance that will enable the college to continue to maintain these accreditations.

IV. CFSC: Membership, Elections, Terms, and Procedures

1. The CFSC shall be composed of one tenured faculty member from each of the four departments and the Dean of the College of Business.

2. The Dean of the college shall be an ex-officio voting member and Chairperson of the CFSC. At the beginning of each fall semester a vice-chairperson shall be elected from among its members.
3. A minimum of two candidates from each of the four departments shall be nominated by faculty who hold tenured or probationary (tenure-track) appointments. Election of nominees shall be at large by the college's tenured and probationary (tenure-track) faculty.
4. CFSC members' terms are two years. Terms of the members from each of the four departments are staggered. Therefore, two departmental members are elected each year.
5. Mid-term vacancies shall be filled by election as specified in IV.3 of these standards. The newly-elected member shall serve to the end of the uncompleted term.
6. No faculty member may serve for more than two consecutive full terms on the CFSC. Those elected to fill partial terms may serve up to two additional full terms.
7. Elections to determine membership on the CFSC shall normally be held before April 15. Terms of office normally commence with the start of the fall semester.
8. Official records of the CFSC shall be kept in the Office of the Dean.

V. Goals of the Evaluation Process

The Department Faculty Status Committee (DFSC) mission, goals, policies, and procedures should clearly communicate departmental performance expectations including the expectation that all faculty maintain a level of intellectual contributions sufficient to be viewed as Academically Qualified by AACSB International. The evaluation of faculty should be explicitly linked to those expectations and should allow for flexibility. It should be based on the individual faculty member's short-term and long-term career goals and accomplishments in relationship to the department, college, and University mission.

If appropriate, the annual evaluations should provide developmental feedback. For probationary (tenure-track) faculty or those working toward promotion, the annual evaluation must explicitly address the faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion, and communicate areas in which development or improvement is needed.

The evaluation process should recognize intermediate outcomes in addition to completed outcomes. The approach used by the department to evaluate and reward multi-year contributions should be clearly explained. Departments should provide stability and consistency in the interpretation and application of standards. The chairperson is important in achieving this goal, since she or he is the collective memory of the DFSC. As a starting point in the evaluative process, the chair may take the lead by preparing, for consideration by other DFSC members, salary, promotion, tenure, and retention recommendations for each departmental faculty member.

The evaluation of faculty contributions and accomplishments should emphasize quality in addition to quantity. Furthermore, multiple measures of quality should be used. (For examples of such measures, see pages 60-64 of the *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Poli-*

cies.) For teaching, students should have the opportunity to provide reactions to teaching performance in each class, including summer courses. However, in evaluating teaching, each department shall consider additional measures of quality, thus avoiding an over-reliance on student responses. For intellectual contributions, this should include careful reading of scholarly and creative work to evaluate quality, contributions to the field, and the extensiveness of the project. In the evaluation of service, departments should focus on the significance and quality of, and time required by, a faculty member's university and professional service.

VI. Promotion and Tenure

In order to qualify for promotion or tenure, a faculty member must exhibit and document sustained and consistent high quality performance in all faculty roles. The documentation should include a concise narrative interpreting the materials presented in the candidate's portfolio of teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service accomplishments and goals. The portfolio should also include the candidate's philosophy on and contributions made in teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service.

VII. Recusal Policy

The college adopts the following recusal policy pertaining to the CFSC: CFSC members shall neither participate in nor vote at ASPT deliberations (including appeals) involving individuals from their own department/school.

VIII. Faculty Rights

If disciplinary actions are initiated against a faculty member in the college, and recusals result in a CFSC of less than five members, the CFSC shall be replenished to a minimum of 5 members through mechanism (a) as stated in Section XII.B.3 of the University ASPT policy document, and printed below:

- (a) selection of replacements for the elected members from a pool of past members of the CFSC (first by membership in the college division from which the recused member(s) were elected, if applicable; next by most recent past year of service on the CFSC; and finally by years in service) and not from the department in which the faculty member being considered for discipline is appointed and who are not themselves deemed disqualified for bias, conflict of interest, or conflict of commitment.

If the Dean is recused from the disciplinary proceedings, the Dean will designate substitutes and the order they will succeed one another in case of conflict or lack of availability annually on July 1 in accordance with Section XII.B.3 of the University ASPT policy document

Approved by COB Faculty Vote February 8, 2019

Year 5

Study of sanction/ suspensions/ dismissal outcomes

The Provost's office will provide the overall count of ASPT faculty members sanctioned/ suspended/ dismissed, with dismissals not separated from suspensions or suspensions not separated from sanctions). The data is reported to the URC confidentially and 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 are submitted annually by the Provost to the URC.

The URC will analyze data for equity violations and in accordance with Article II.D. At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will confidentially report negative findings to the Faculty Caucus.