

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Friday, March 1, 2019
9:30 a.m., Hovey 302

MINUTES

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

Members not present: None

Others present: Angela Engel, Director, Office of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis, Illinois State University; Anthony (Tony) Walesby, Office of Equal Opportunity and Access, Illinois State University; Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

Note: In these minutes “URC” refers to the University Review Committee at Illinois State University; “CFSC” refers to college faculty status committee as provided for in *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies* of 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 and guests Tony Walesby, Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access, and Angela Engel, Director of the Office of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis.

II. Approval of minutes

Frank Beck moved approval of minutes from the February 8, 2019 URC meeting. Angela Bonnell seconded the motion. The motion was approved on voice vote, with eight members voting aye and one member abstaining (Smelser).

III. Equity review plan

Goodman explained that URC invited Walesby and Engel to attend the meeting to discuss the draft equity review plan (see attached) compiled by URC from recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Committee on ASPT Equity Review. Goodman thanked Walesby and Engel for their willingness to attend. URC members and guests then discussed availability of data identified in the draft plan, the level at which data would be compiled, whether data once compiled could be made available to URC for its review, and how data might be used to address any inequities identified through the review.

Engel reported that data for metrics cited in the equity review plan drafted by URC are available. She noted that her office already has access to much of the data but would need to consult with other offices at the University regarding access to data for some metrics.

The group discussed benefits and challenges of working with aggregate university-level data and working with college- or department-level data. Issues cited include having large enough data sets to conduct statistically significant analyses, the ability to determine the unit location of potential inequities identified in the data so they can be studied and addressed, and the possibility of being able to identify individual faculty members through review of the data if counts are small. Walesby said he prefers working with data at the unit level so potential problems can be located and addressed. But he cautioned that there may be limitations on information PRPA can share with URC due to confidentiality guidelines. Legal counsel would need to be consulted regarding this matter, he said. The committee and guests discussed options that might be explored if it is determined that some data cannot be shared with URC. Options discussed include masking sensitive data and releasing reports with different levels of detail to different audiences.

The group discussed how equity review findings might be used by URC to address any inequities identified through the analyses. Approaches mentioned include identifying broad issues that could be addressed through policy changes and asking CFSCs to study and address specific cases identified in the data. Walesby said that regardless how URC decides to use equity review findings, OEOA will need to investigate any potential inequities identified through the review so they can be remedied.

Walesby said he sees no reasons not to proceed with the equity review as described in the draft URC document. He said he likes the phased approach and likes the approach set forth by URC in each phase. Engel said PRPA is prepared to proceed with data compilation with the caveat that PRPA will need to seek guidance from legal counsel regarding what data PRPA can release to URC. Goodman stated that before the review can proceed, URC needs to finalize its recommendations to the Faculty Caucus. He noted that URC is scheduled to meet next on March 22 to do so.

IV. Other business

There was none.

V. Adjournment

Shively moved that the meeting adjourn. Dean seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Shively, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

ASPT Equity Review Cycle, University Review Committee, Draft, February 8, 2019

ASPT EQUITY REVIEW CYCLE University Review Committee

DRAFT February 8, 2019

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 and Salary Counteroffers
- Phase Five: Disciplinary Actions

These studies are described below.

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-variates 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 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

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.¹

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:

¹ 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.

- 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)²
 - “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)³
 - “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 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:⁴

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

² 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.

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

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.

Phase Three: Full Professor/Second Promotion

Quantitative analysis of the data on progress from tenure through resignation/retirement

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 phase three study, fifteen years during phase eight, and twenty years in subsequent phases.

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.

Phase Four: Performance Reviews and Salary Counteroffers

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 Phase 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 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 Phase 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.

Phase Five: Disciplinary Actions

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 phase 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 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.