

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Friday, March 22, 2019
9:30 a.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

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

Members not present: Diane Dean, Sarah Smelser

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

Note: In these minutes “URC” refers to the University Review Committee at Illinois State University; “ASPT Policies” refers to *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*, Illinois State University; “ASPT 2022” refers to the edition of *ASPT Policies* to be developed by URC to take effect January 1, 2022; “OEOA” refers to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access at Illinois State University; and “Caucus” refers to the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate at Illinois State University.

I. Call to order

Chairperson Joe Goodman called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. He welcomed committee members.

II. Approval of minutes

Angela Bonnell moved approval of minutes from the March 1, 2019 URC meeting. Yoon Jin Ma seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on voice vote.

III. Equity review plan

Goodman stated that his goal for the meeting is to complete discussion of the draft equity review plan so URC can send its recommendations regarding the plan to the Caucus before the end of the spring term. Goodman said the only section of the draft plan remaining for URC to discuss is phase five. He directed committee members to that section (see attached). Goodman said he suggests just one change to the draft: replacing the phrase “overall percentage” in the second paragraph with “overall count.” He explained that overall percentages are likely to be very small and may erroneously be interpreted to mean that there are no equity issues to be studied. Bonnell asked Goodman if he would consider including references to both “overall percentage” and “overall count” in that paragraph. Goodman said doing so would be acceptable to him.

Kevin Edwards asked about the intent of the passage in the second paragraph that states, “in the aggregate, with dismissals not separated from suspensions, suspensions not separated from sanctions.” He said the phrase seems redundant since “in the aggregate” means that data are not separated. Sam Catanzaro suggested replacing the second paragraph in its entirety for clarity, with “The Provost’s office will provide the total number of faculty disciplined in any way, i.e., sanctioned, suspended, or dismissed, by year, with the total number of ASPT faculty provided for context.” Bonnell asked about the term “ASPT faculty,” noting that it is not often used. Catanzaro explained that the term refers to faculty members who are subject to ASPT guidelines, thus excluding faculty members with administrative appointments who are not evaluated through the ASPT system. Committee members concurred with the wording suggested by Catanzaro.

Referring to the third paragraph, Rachel Shively said the word “discipline” should be changed to “disciplined.” Committee members concurred.

Goodman said he does not know what value the fourth paragraph adds to the description [*Intersections here (e.g., while male, black female, disabled older-than-peers faculty members) will be provided.*]. Shively said the original intent of the committee was to look at that data unless the numbers are too small. She added that she favors keeping

the sentence in case it is possible for the committee to obtain such data. There were no objections from committee members. Catanzaro asked if any committee member would object to replacing the wording in parentheses with “e.g., race by gender.” There were none.

Referring to the fifth paragraph, Frank Beck noted that the phrase “so may not related” should be changed to “so may not relate.” Shively noted that any references in the description to “year five” should be changed to “phase five.” Committee members agreed with both suggestions.

Referring to the sixth paragraph, Catanzaro said the clause, “individual faculty member’s privacy” should be changed to plural possessive (“individual faculty members’ privacy”). Committee members agreed. Regarding the first sentence of the paragraph [*At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus.*], Edwards asked what URC is going to report. Goodman said he thinks the committee will report violations or the lack thereof. He asked if URC should be clearer with regard to that passage. Edwards said the sentence implies that an analysis is being done and that adding wording could hamstring the committee. Regarding the sentence, “Ideally, the completion time for the study will be one year,” Ma noted that similar wording appears in descriptions of the other four phases. She suggested that the sentence read, “Ideally, the completion time for the phase five study will be one year” and that similar sentences in descriptions of the other phases be worded the same (changing only the phase number). Committee members agreed.

Edwards noted that at the prior URC meeting (March 1, 2019), the director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access offered to help URC with the equity review study. Edwards asked whether OEOA should be mentioned in the plan as a resource for the committee. Catanzaro said it is important for faculty members to conduct the work of URC, but there are case law and compliance reporting issues about which faculty members do not have knowledge. He suggested mentioning resources available to the committee in conducting the equity review, such as OEOA, in the introductory section of the equity review plan. Goodman deferred discussion of Catanzaro’s suggestion until URC has finalized its recommendations regarding phase five.

Bruce Stoffel summarized changes to the phase five description recommended by URC members thus far at the meeting: replace the second paragraph with “The Provost’s office will provide the total number of faculty disciplined in any way, i.e., sanctioned, suspended, or dismissed, by year, with the total number of ASPT faculty provided for context”; in the third paragraph change the word “discipline” to “disciplined”; in the fourth paragraph replace wording in the parentheses with “e.g., race by gender”; in the fifth paragraph change the clause “so may not related” to “so may not relate” and change the phrase “year-five studies” to “phase five studies”; in the sixth paragraph change the clause “individual faculty member’s privacy” to “individual faculty members’ privacy”; and, also in the sixth paragraph, change the sentence “Ideally, the completion time for the study will be one year” to “Ideally, the completion time for the phase five study will be one year” while changing similar sentences in descriptions of the other four phases for consistency. Shively moved to approve the phase five equity review plan description with those revisions. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion passed on a vote of six ayes, one nay (Goodman), and no abstentions.

Goodman said he greatly appreciates the work Doris (Houston) and Diane (Dean) have done to develop the draft equity review plan that URC has just reviewed (through their service on the Ad Hoc Working Group for ASPT Equity Review and on URC). Goodman explained that he voted “no” on the motion because he wants it to be known that URC considered the ad hoc committee recommendations very seriously. Shively asked if the committee’s work on the equity review plan is now complete. Goodman responded that he will email the equity review plan as thus far revised by URC to committee members for their final review prior to the next URC meeting.

IV. Initial discussions regarding the process for the next ASPT Policies five-year review

Goodman distributed a list (see attached) of ASPT-related issues Caucus Chairperson Susan Kalter would like URC to consider as it develops recommendations for the next edition of ASPT Policies (ASPT 2022). Shively asked when URC will start compiling that document. Goodman said URC is scheduled to begin discussing ASPT 2022 in fall (2019). Catanzaro noted that he has other issues he would like added to the list (see minutes of the January 25, 2019 meeting).

Shively referred to the fifth suggestion on the list [*When making a counteroffer to retain a faculty member who has a job offer [from] another institution, consider allowing the Provost to raise the salaries of similarly situated faculty members in the same department (not just the faculty member to whom the counteroffer was made).*]. She asked how realistic that would be. Goodman said research regarding the practice in business of making counteroffers to retain employees suggests that employees are likely to leave a company even if the company makes a counteroffer. He cautioned that experiences with counteroffers at universities may be different. Catanzaro said he would not want faculty members to seek employment elsewhere just to get a counteroffer from the University to raise their salary. He said some other universities specify a shelf life when they make counteroffers (e.g., a faculty member is not allowed to request a counteroffer every year). Goodman reported the case of a biology professor at a Colorado university who faked a job offer letter to get a counteroffer from the university to raise his salary. Goodman said the professor argued that the practice of seeking an employment offer from another university as a way of soliciting a counteroffer is part of the culture at his university. Goodman said the issue of counteroffers relates to work he did with David Rubin (former URC member) several years ago as a URC working group charged with studying salary increment policies. Through their research, Goodman said, they learned that West Virginia University allows tenured faculty members to periodically submit a request for a salary bump. That is a more stable way to address salary equity than encouraging faculty members to seek counteroffers, Goodman said.

Goodman said another issue for URC to consider as it prepares ASPT 2022 is how the University Professor and Distinguished Professor designations fit into the ASPT process. Beck said those designations are considered awards at Illinois State University not promotions. He said he thinks that is the case at other universities. Catanzaro agreed, adding that his first inclination is to not support including the designations in the ASPT system.

Committee members next discussed the second suggestion on the list of ASPT issues [*For tenured professors, consider evaluating scholarship once every three years, teaching once every three years, and service once every three years.*] Bonnell said the issue relates somewhat to the work of another prior URC working group (charged with studying faculty performance evaluation practices). She said the Caucus has not yet seen the URC recommendations resulting from work of that group. Beck asked why such an approach to faculty evaluation should be considered. Catanzaro said the idea is to reduce the burden on faculty members and on DFSC members, because some faculty members in some departments spend so much time preparing voluminous dossiers for DFSC consideration. Committee members discussed pros and cons of the suggestion. Catanzaro said he would be concerned that not evaluating faculty work in teaching, scholarship, and service each year could negatively impact pedagogical practices at the University. Shively pointed out that staggering evaluation of performance areas could impact merit raise practices. She asked what a department would do if a faculty member has a productive year in one evaluation area but that area is not being rated by the department that year. Ma said staggering evaluation areas could make it possible to show how faculty members develop over a three-year term in each area. Bonnell said staggering evaluation areas does not seem holistic and may involve more work for the individual faculty member.

Goodman said URC will continue discussion of Kalter's suggestions at upcoming committee meetings. He noted that he already has had a few weeks to consider Kalter's suggestions and said he would like all URC members the opportunity to do so.

Regarding upcoming committee meetings, Goodman noted that URC is scheduled to meet on April 19, which is Good Friday. He apologized for scheduling a committee meeting for that day without consulting committee members. He asked members to email him whether they will be available to attend that meeting so he can adjust the committee schedule if necessary. Goodman said he will send committee members an email reminding them of his request.

V. Adjournment

Beck moved that the meeting adjourn. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 10:25 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Shively, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

“Phase Five: Disciplinary Actions,” from *ASPT Equity Review Cycle, University Review Committee*, Draft, February 8, 2019.

ASPT Issues for University Review Committee Consideration When Drafting Recommendations to the Faculty Caucus for ASPT 2022, compiled January 22, 2019, updated March 18, 2019.

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.

ASPT Issues for University Review Committee Consideration
When Drafting Recommendations to the Faculty Caucus
For ASPT 2022

The following is a list of suggestions and requests regarding potential ASPT document changes submitted to the University Review Committee recorder by Dr. Susan Kalter, Chairperson, Academic Senate and its Faculty Caucus.

1. Consider relaxing the deadline for DFSC/SFSC completion of performance evaluations to give those committees more time to complete their work. Perhaps extend the deadline for completion of tenured persons' letters.
2. For tenured professors, consider evaluating scholarship once every three years, teaching once every three years, and service once every three years.
3. Consider rewording Section I.D (regarding confidentiality) to clarify that DFSCs, SFSCs, and CFSCs may openly talk about ASPT policies and other committee business for which there is no need for confidential treatment.
4. Consider clarifying that the confidentiality of the ASPT process cannot be used as a gag rule that prevents AFEGC from thoroughly investigating referrals/complaints regarding ethics or academic freedom violations in ASPT deliberations. AFEGC hearings must be conducted in ways that keep confidential issues confidential, but that allow the AFEGC hearing panel into the confidences (with the same expectation of keeping those confidences).
5. When making a counteroffer to retain a faculty member who has a job offer another institution, consider allowing the Provost to raise the salaries of similarly situated faculty members in the same department (not just the faculty member to whom the counteroffer was made).
6. Consider a residency requirement for tenure eligibility. That is, consider requiring that a faculty member come to campus to teach and serve on a regular basis and not allow the granting tenure to a faculty member who Skypes into their classes and serves only virtually on committees or not at all.
7. Make sure AFEGC is mentioned where needed whenever violations of academic freedom are mentioned, or make sure the reader is referred to an appeals section where AFEGC is mentioned.
8. Make sure ASPT Article XII (Appeals Policies and Procedures) conforms to the referrals part of the jurisdiction of AFEGC in University Policy 3.3.8.
9. Make sure ASPT policies explicitly permit a faculty member to individually enter a complaint with AFEGC regarding performance evaluations, tenure and promotion decisions, and post-tenure review rather than just permitting an ASPT committee to do so. Follow national standards in this regard.
10. Compare mention of AFEGC in ASPT policies with current AFEGC policy to identify gaps and conflicts.
11. Compare the Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activities policy to ASPT policy and identify areas in the ASPT policy where the integrity policy may need to be mentioned. Just as we mention AFEGC in ASPT, and just as URC has been charged with making sure these AFEGC references appear in all the right places and are consistent with national norms, URC might recommend changes to the AFEGC policy or the integrity policy if either policy is inadequate in this regard.

12. In non-reappointment policies, make sure the timeline and notifications processes for AFEGC appeals (whether referrals or complaints) is quite clear (so that the Provost does not prematurely send out a final notification).
13. Consider expanding the right to file an appeal with CFSC to include a general appeal, in addition to a procedural appeal, so CFSC may correct or call attention to any potential bad situation with a DFSC that might arise.
14. Incorporate changes recommended by URC to Appendix 2 since adoption of ASPT 2017 regarding evaluation of teaching. Related review the report of the ad hoc Teaching Learning Community group that met in 2018-2019 (at the request of the Faculty Caucus?) to examine student responses to instruction. See the Academic Senate office or Dr. Kalter for the report.
15. Provide clarification in ASPT policies regarding expectation of faculty regarding service contributions, how service is assigned, and how service is evaluated in annual performance evaluations.
16. Replace references in ASPT policies to "Academic Senate" with references to "Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate."
17. Review item 5) in Section II.E to clarify its intent and meaning and to clarify what the report is to consist of and why. Is this being done? Should it be? If so, what processes and procedures should be followed?
18. Discuss whether the practice of granting a rise in base salary to faculty members granted Distinguished Professor or University Professor status should be addressed in ASPT policies (through the addition to the ASPT document of policies and procedures for doing so).
19. Explore the wisdom and feasibility of a stepped salary system at the full professor rank, such as those negotiated at other state universities through unions. The idea is that once an individual receives the full professor rank, they would stay at that rank, but their productivity afterward would make them eligible for a bump increase after a certain set number of years and stated productivity expectations, similar to a promotional increment, with limits on the number of bumps and their spacing. It is quite possible that this system is either not wise or not feasible here at ISU, or both, but we should find out and see if we can be more competitive if we adopted such a system.
20. Adding a Clinical Professorship to the faculty ranks. In ASPT policies and also as an amendment to 3.3.3.

Compiled January 22, 2019
Updated March 18, 2019