

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Friday, April 5, 2019
9:30 a.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

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

Members not present: 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 Policies” refers to *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*, Illinois State University; and “ASPT 2022” refers to the edition of *ASPT Policies* to be drafted by URC, recommended by the Caucus, and approved by the President to take effect January 1, 2022.

I. Call to order

Chairperson Joe Goodman called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m. He welcomed committee members.

II. Approval of minutes

Frank Beck moved approval of minutes from the March 22, 2019 URC meeting. Kevin Edwards seconded the motion. The motion was approved with one abstention (Sarah Smelser).

III. Equity review plan

Goodman stated that the primary item for URC consideration at this meeting is finalizing committee recommendations to the Faculty Caucus regarding the equity review plan drafted by the Ad Hoc Committee on ASPT Equity Review. Goodman referred committee members to an email sent to them by committee colleague Kevin Edwards on April 4, 2019, raising questions regarding the equity review phase one description previously recommended by URC (on May 10, 2018). In his email, Edwards asked for clarification regarding the following passage.

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.

Edwards said he does not think URC intends the passage to imply that URC will visit with each CFSC to identify and resolve problems identified in the data, rather that URC will expect each CFSC to identify and resolve problems on their own. He observed that the passage is also unclear whether URC will analyze the data and inform CFSCs of potential problems to be investigated by the CFSCs or whether URC will send the CFSCs raw data so they can identify potential problems and investigate them. Either way, Edwards said, it seems likely that the Caucus will prefer setting forth a timeline for the CFSCs’ work so it does not extend into infinity.

Catanzaro agreed that the passage cited by Edwards is unclear. He said he has envisioned URC conducting an analysis to determine how far instructors’ salaries vary from predicted or expected salaries and sending that information to the appropriate CFSC for further analysis. He said he has envisioned each CFSC reviewing the circumstances of each faculty member cited in the report received from URC, flagging any instances the CFSC deems a problem and developing corrective actions to address those problems. Catanzaro noted that the CFSCs may need to work through the Provost’s office to take corrective actions since the CFSCs will likely need

additional financial resources from the Provost's office to do so. Catanzaro suggested the following restatement of the passage cited by Edwards.

Following receipt of the raw and intersectional data by URC, URC will conduct the necessary analysis. URC will then provide CFSCs analysis results for their colleges so that the CFSCs can make contextualized assessments of the implications of the results in light of faculty performance.

Smelser moved to adopt the replacement passage suggested by Catanzaro. Dean seconded the motion. Smelser asked Catanzaro if the passage should indicate that CFSCs are to report back to URC, as the passage cited in Edwards' email does. Catanzaro responded in the affirmative. Novotny said the wording about CFSCs reporting back ("...with CFSCs reporting back to URC regarding findings and corrective steps, if identified") might be interpreted to mean that CFSCs need not report back to URC if they have no findings to report. Diane Dean suggested instead adding the following sentence to the Smelser's motion: *CFSCs will report back to URC regarding findings and any identified corrective steps.* Novotny said she favors the suggested wording change, and Smelser accepted Dean's addition as a friendly amendment to the motion. Goodman called for a vote.

Committee members then discussed whether to set forth a deadline for CFSCs to report their findings to URC and where to insert such a deadline into the phase one description. Goodman noted that URC has been reluctant to set forth timelines in the document since URC has no experience conducting equity reviews. Dean concurred. Novotny asked if a timeline for CFSCs reporting back to URC is needed, since the last paragraph of the phase one description states: *Ideally, the completion time for the phase one study will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review.* Goodman noted that the passage cited by Novotny refers to completion of the entire phase, adding that setting forth a timeline for CFSCs to report to URC could be helpful. Edwards suggested asking CFSCs to report their findings to URC by the end of the semester following the semester in which they receive the information from URC. Catanzaro concurred, noting that CFSCs could begin work on equity review in March, after attending to faculty evaluations and promotion and tenure requests, with a goal of completing their equity review work by the end of the spring semester.

Edwards moved that the following sentence be added to the end of the passage approved by URC earlier in the meeting: *Ordinarily the CFSCs will report back by the end of the following semester, excluding summer.* Smelser seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (see note below).

Smelser moved to approve the entire equity review plan as revised by URC and to send the revised plan to the Caucus for its consideration. Angela Bonnell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Smelser suggested that the cover memo transmitting the URC recommendations to the Caucus point out that the equity review plan may need to be revised as URC gains experience with its implementation. Committee members concurred.

Thanks were offered to Dean, Doris Houston (former URC member), and Catanzaro for their service on the Ad Hoc Committee for ASPT Equity Review, which developed the equity review recommendations for consideration by URC.

IV. ASPT 2022

Goodman entertained comments regarding the list of ASPT issues submitted by Caucus chairperson Susan Kalter for consideration by URC as it drafts recommendations for ASPT 2022 (see attached).

Smelser referred to item two on the list: "For tenured professors, consider evaluating scholarship once every three years, teaching once every three years, and service once every three years." She asked if the intent of the suggestion is for faculty members to report just about their work during the year of activity being reviewed or if the review would be cumulative (i.e., the faculty member would report activities conducted during the year being reviewed and the prior two years). Dean said she thinks the report should be cumulative. Catanzaro agreed while noting that a cumulative review would not likely reduce faculty workload, which, he said, seems to be the intent of the suggestion. Catanzaro added that he is having trouble understanding how evaluating just one part of faculty work relates to the teacher-researcher model embraced at the University. Frank Beck agreed, stating that he favors holistic faculty evaluation. He added that if some faculty members are submitting more

documentation for their annual performance evaluation than is needed by their DFSC, the issue that should be addressed is department culture rather than ASPT policies.

Bonnell reminded committee members that an ad hoc working group of URC members has already studied the performance evaluation process, a few years ago at the request of the Caucus. She explained that the Caucus had asked URC to investigate how much time faculty members were spending to compile their annual evaluation papers and how that time might be reduced. She said the working group completed its report to URC but the report has not yet been considered by the Caucus. She conjectured that Kalter may have forgotten about that Caucus request when she suggested item two on her list. Bruce Stoffel confirmed that the working group report has not yet been sent to the Caucus, per Kalter's request. He reported that Kalter has instead asked URC to consider recommendations of the working group when drafting its recommendations for ASPT 2022.

V. Other business

Goodman announced that the next URC meeting will be held on April 19. He said he will be unable to attend and asked Smelser if she would be willing to chair the meeting in her capacity as URC vice-chairperson. Smelser responded that she can and plans to do so. Goodman thanked her.

VI. Adjournment

Smelser moved that the meeting adjourn. Bonnell seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 10:32 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

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.

NOTE: Taken together, the motions passed by the committee regarding ASPT equity review resulted in the following change to the phase one description in the ASPT equity review document.

Replaced: 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.

With: Following receipt of the raw and intersectional data by URC, URC will conduct the necessary analysis. URC will then provide CFSCs analysis results for their colleges so that the CFSCs can make contextualized assessments of the implications of the results in light of faculty performance. CFSCs will report back to URC regarding findings and any identified corrective steps. Ordinarily the CFSCs will report back by the end of the following semester, excluding summer.

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