UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Tuesday, May 7, 2019
9:30 a.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

Members present: Frank Beck, Kevin Edwards, Joe Goodman, Yoon Jin Ma, Nancy Novotny, Rachel Shively, Sarah Smelser

Members not present: Angela Bonnell, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Diane Dean

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 document" refers to *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*, Illinois State University; "ASPT 2022" refers to the ASPT document to be drafted by URC, recommended by the Caucus, and approved by the President to take effect January 1, 2022; and "CFSC" refers to College Faculty Status Committee as provided for in the ASPT document.

I. Call to order

    Chairperson Joe Goodman called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

II. Welcome and recognition of committee members

    Goodman welcomed committee members. It was noted that the terms of two committee members will expire on May 15, 2019: Sarah Smelser (who has represented the College of Fine Arts on the committee from fall 2016 through spring 2019) and Angela Bonnell (who has represented Milner Library on the committee from fall 2013 through spring 2019). Thanks were offered Smelser and Bonnell by their committee colleagues.

III. Approval of minutes

    Sarah Smelser moved approval of minutes from the April 19, 2019 URC meeting as distributed to committee members prior to the meeting. Frank Beck seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote with four committee members voting aye and two committee members abstaining (Goodman and Yoon Jin Ma). [Note: At the time of the vote, Nancy Novotny had not yet joined the meeting and, therefore, did not vote on the motion.]

IV. Approval of annual reports via email

    Goodman announced that three types of reports will soon be posted online in an Office 365 OneDrive folder for review and approval by committee members. Bruce Stoffel will email committee members a link to the folder after the meeting. Goodman asked committee members to review the materials by May 15 and vote whether to approve them. Stoffel explained that committee member can cast their votes in a Word file that has been uploaded to the OneDrive folder. Beck asked what he should consider when deciding how to vote. Stoffel explained that committee members are asked to consider whether to accept the CFSC reports and the Faculty Review Committee report as complete and whether to approve the URC annual report with respect to its content.

V. Equity review plan

    Goodman reported that the Caucus considered the URC recommendations regarding equity review, passed by URC on April 5, 2019, as an information item at the April 24, 2019 Caucus meeting. Goodman noted that URC was represented at the Caucus meeting by Diane Dean, former URC member and chairperson Doris Houston, Sam Catanzaro, and him. In the course of Caucus discussions regarding the URC recommendations, Caucus

chairperson Susan Kalter asked URC to revise the equity review plan it had recommended to the Caucus, for internal consistency in its formatting. Goodman described the revisions subsequently approved by URC members via email (on April 30, 2019) and forwarded to the Caucus for consideration at the May 8, 2019 Caucus meeting (see attached). Goodman said he plans to represent URC at the May 8 Caucus meeting and will update URC members after that meeting regarding the status of equity review. Goodman noted that if the Caucus approves an equity review plan at the meeting, the next step in the equity review process will be to ask PRPA (Office of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis) to proceed with compiling data for the phase one study (salary), in advance of the fall 2019 semester.

Discussion briefly turned to the additional work the equity review will require of URC in the years ahead. Goodman said URC may need to consider adding members to the committee to be able to handle the numerous tasks ahead. Smelser agreed while cautioning that it would be important to maintain equitable representation on the committee across the colleges and noting that it may be more difficult to find a time convenient for all committee members to meet.

Goodman announced that Sam Catanzaro had been detained in another meeting but plans to join the URC meeting as soon as he can. Goodman suggested deferring discussion of ASPT 2022 until Catanzaro arrives. Committee members agreed. Goodman asked that the committee proceed with the discussion of CFSC annual reports (see VII below).

VI.   ASPT 2022

Goodman suggested that the committee proceed with its discussion of ASPT 2022 even though Catanzaro had still not been able to join the meeting to help guide the discussion. Committee members first focused on deciding what ASPT issues URC and any subgroups URC forms should consider when preparing its recommendations to the Caucus regarding ASPT 2022. To guide URC discussion of the issues, Goodman directed committee members to the color-coded table prepared by Catanzaro (see attached). The table illustrates Catanzaro's perceptions of the relative importance of each ASPT issue and the time it might take for URC to address each. The table assigns each issue to one of three URC subgroups (issue assignments in the table had been previously suggested by Smelser).

Kevin Edwards stated that the issue of service assignments seems important for URC to address since it has been cited by Catanzaro, Kalter, and URC as a priority for discussion. He said URC might consider providing general guidance regarding service in ASPT 2022 and ask CFSCs to the address the issue in more detail in their college ASPT documents. Goodman expressed concern that some issues listed in Catanzaro's table may warrant broader university input than URC can provide. Shively suggested asking subgroups to consider whether URC should tackle such issues. Goodman also expressed concern that as URC removes ambiguities from the ASPT document, colleges and departments may have less flexibility to create policies appropriate to circumstances unique to their units. He said he would rather keep ASPT policies general, adding that URC could address some of the issues raised by Kalter and Catanzaro in other ways (i.e., other than writing policies into the ASPT document).

Committee members agreed that a balance of issues across the three subgroups would be desirable to balance the workload. Committee members agreed to remove non-substantive editorial changes from the tasks assigned to subgroups and to instead ask Catanzaro to address them. Committee members agreed to reorder the list of issues for each subgroup by placing the green-coded issues (higher priority involving shorter discussion) and the pink-coded issues (higher priority involving longer discussion) at the top of each list. Committee members agreed to move service assignments from subgroup three to subgroup one and salary incrementation (stepped salary system) from subgroup three to subgroup two. It was also agreed to delete salary incrementation for distinguished professors and university professors from the assignments (since URC had already decided at a prior meeting to do so).

Discussion then turned to whether URC should convene the subgroups in summer 2019 to begin work on the project or to wait until fall 2019 to do so. Committee members agreed to convene the subgroups during the summer so URC has a first draft of ASPT 2022 ready for submission to the Caucus by the end of October 2019. The committee discussed a three-phase approach to developing the first draft prior to fall 2019. During phase one, between May 15 and June 30, each of three subgroups will meet to discuss issues assigned to it. Catanzaro

would be asked to attend each subgroup meeting to provide input and feedback. In July Catanzaro would compile revisions to the ASPT document based on the subgroup discussions. Catanzaro would then present the revisions to the subgroups in early August for their review of the revisions prior to the start of the fall semester. URC would review the revised ASPT document as a committee of the whole starting in fall 2019 and would submit its recommendations to the Caucus by the end of October.

The committee agreed on the following details regarding the phase one subgroup discussions, subject to concurrence by Catanzaro based on his summer schedule and subject to Provost Murphy offering summer stipends to URC members participating in summer subgroup meetings. It was agreed that committee members could participate in subgroup discussions remotely if they are not on campus during the summer.

SUBGROUP	FIRST PHASE MEETING PERIOD	ISSUES
Subgroup 1 Shively Edwards	June 1 to June 15	<u>Higher + Shorter</u> Conflicts of Interest (Catanzaro, p. 1, Kalter p. 5) ??Faculty Assignments (Catanzaro, p. 1) <u>Higher + Slower</u> Service Assignments (Catanzaro, p. 2, Kalter, p. 5, URC, p. 8) Confidentiality (Kalter, p. 3) Program Faculty Status Committee (Kalter, p. 5) <u>Lower + Shorter</u> Policy Development and Revision, CFSC and DFSC/SFSC (Catanzaro, p. 2) Reporting Requirements (Catanzaro, p. 2, Kalter, p. 5)
Subgroup 2 Smelser Novotny	May 15 to May 31	<u>Higher + Shorter</u> AFEGC, Complaints to (Kalter, p. 3) Promotion, Common Standards (Catanzaro, p. 2) <u>Higher + Slower</u> Mid-Probationary Review (Catanzaro, p. 1) Promotion, External Reviewers (Catanzaro, P. 2) Salary Incrementation, Stepped Salary System for Full Profs (Kalter, p. 5) <u>Lower + Slower</u> Tenure, Residency Requirement (Kalter, p. 6) Clinical Professorship (Kalter, p. 3) Counter Offers (Kalter, p. 4)
Subgroup 3 Beck Goodman	June 15 - June 30	<u>Higher + Shorter</u> Performance Evaluation, Timing and Documentation (Kalter, p. 4, URC, p. 7) <u>Higher + Slower</u> Performance Evaluation, Guidelines and Criteria (Catanzaro, p. 2) Performance Evaluation, Teaching (Kalter, p. 4, URC, p. 6) Appeals, General (Catanzaro, p. 1) <u>Lower + Shorter</u> Integrity in Research (Kalter, p. 4) <u>Lower + Slower</u> Performance Evaluation, Three-Year Cycle (Kalter, p. 4) <u>More information needed</u> Appeals, Non-Reappointment (Catanzaro, p. 1, Kalter, p. 3) Salary Incrementation (URC, p. 7)

Goodman said he will contact Angela Bonnell and Diane Dean, who were unable to attend this meeting, to invite them to participate in the summer project as well. Goodman said he will ask Bonnell and Dean if either would be willing to serve on subgroup 1 so more than one college is represented on the group (so there are multiple college perspectives to draw upon in subgroup discussions).

VII. CFSC annual reports, five-year data

Goodman directed committee members to a set of tables distributed with meeting materials titled *CFSC Annual Report Data Five-Year Totals: Fiscal 2015 Through Fiscal 2019*. Stoffel explained that the tables present total counts from CFSC reports submitted to URC during the last five years. Stoffel cautioned that Catanzaro had found two errors in the data. Stoffel said he intends to correct the errors and send the revised tables to URC members.

Committee discussion ensued regarding the data. Beck said his review of the data reminds him that that a change of department leadership could make a difference in the outcomes documented through the equity review studies. He asked how URC can account for such differences when conducting the equity review. Goodman responded that URC will ask the CFSCs to contextualize any anomalies in the data. Shively and Goodman talked about promotion cases in which faculty members withdraw their promotion applications before decisions are rendered by ASPT committees, noting that such cases might not be reflected in the data. Yoon Jin Ma suggested that it may be helpful to know how many of the performance evaluation appeals relate to overall unsatisfactory ratings and how many relate to cases in which a faculty member has received an overall satisfactory rating but is appealing an assignment rating or statement in the performance evaluation letter. Ma also noted that it might be helpful to have counts presented in the tables disaggregated by year. Shively pointed out that multiple counts in a table cell could represent multiple cases involving the same faculty. It was noted that only one of the 13 non-reappointment cases documented in the tables was appealed, which may be due to the current restriction of such appeals to procedural matters. It was noted that Kalter has asked URC to consider expanding non-reappointment appeals to include substantive matters as the committee compiles its recommendations for ASPT 2022. It was also pointed out that no appeals were reported in cumulative post-tenure review cases and that URC may want to study this matter further as it discusses recommendations for ASPT 2022.

VIII. Other business

There was none

IX. Adjournment

Edwards moved that the meeting adjourn. Shively seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 11:02 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:
Phase three and phase five edits (equity review plan recommendations to the Faculty Caucus),
    approved by the University Review Committee on April 30, 2019
Priorities for ASPT 2022 working group tasks, Sam Catanzaro, April 19, 2019

Phase Three: Full Professor/Second Promotion

<mark>The third phase of the ASPT Equity Review Cycle will focus on faculty progression from associate to full professor.</mark> Quantitative analysis of the data on progress from tenure through resignation/retirement <mark>will be evaluated.</mark>

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 phase three 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 Five: Disciplinary Actions

<mark>The fifth phase of the ASPT Equity Review Cycle will focus on faculty disciplinary actions;</mark>
sanctions/suspension/dismissal outcomes

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.

It will also provide data regarding how the persons disciplined break down by gender, race/ethnicity, etc., according to our phase one scope.

Intersections here (e.g., race by gender) 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 relate directly to these phase 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 members' privacy. Ideally, the completion time for the phase five 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 2022 Working Groups (ASPT 22 Working Groups Task Ideas)
Draft 4-12-19 (and 4-19-19)

Guiding Principles:
1. Maintain an efficient and effective ASPT policy for faculty, committees, and administrators.
2. Revise conflicting policies, nomenclatures, or other issues contrary to Illinois State University's mission, by-laws, and shared governance.
3. Articulate clear and precise roles for faculty, committees, and administrators across all ASPT Policies and Procedures.
4. Substantive, non-editorial, changes to ASPT 2017 for the Faculty Caucus' consideration are approved with a majority URC committee vote (50% +1).
5. A College may not be the majority composition of any subgroup.

Scheme: Relative Priority (Higher vs Lower) X Time to Completion (Shorter vs. Slower)
Higher + Shorter = Green   Higher + Slower = Pink
Lower + Shorter = Turquoise   Lower + Slower = Yellow
Non-Substantive Editorial Changes = Gray

	Subgroup 1 (ASPT Committee Structure & Appendix Issues)	Subgroup 2 (ASPT P&P, Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, & Post-Tenure issues)	Subgroup 3 (Performance Evaluation & Salary Increment, Appeals, Personnel Documents Issues)
1.	Policy Development and Revision, CFSC and DFSC/SFSC (Catanzaro, p. 2)	AFEGC, Complaints to (Kalter, p. 3)	Performance Evaluation, Guidelines and Criteria (Catanzaro, p.2)
2.	References to OEOA (Catanzaro, p. 2)	Mid-Probationary Review (Catanzaro, p. 1)	Performance Evaluation (Kalter, p. 4) *three-year cycle*
3.	References to Academic Senate (Kalter, p. 5)	Promotion, Common Standards (Catanzaro, p. 2)	Performance Evaluation, Teaching (Kalter, p. 4. URC p. 6)
4.	Reporting Requirements (Catanzaro, p. 2. Kalter, p. 5)	Promotion, External Reviewers (Catanzaro, p. 2)	Performance Evaluation, Timing and Documentation (Kalter, p. 4. URC, p. 7)
5.	Conflicts of Interest (Catanzaro, p. 1. Kalter, p. 4)	Tenure, Residency Requirement (Kalter, p. 6)	Appeals, General (Catanzaro, p. 1)
6.	Confidentiality (Kalter, p. 3)	Clinical Professorship (Kalter, p. 3)	Appeals, Non-Reappointment (Catanzaro, p. 1. Kalter, p. 3) *need more info*
7.	Program Faculty Status Committee (Kalter, p. 5)	Counter Offers (Kalter, p. 4)	Salary Incrementation, Distinguished Prof. & University Prof (Kalter, p. 5) *recommend against this suggestion*
8.	?? Faculty Assignments (Catanzaro, p. 1)		Salary Incrementation, Stepped Salary System for Full Profs (Kalter, p. 5)
9.			Salary Incrementation (URC, p. 7) *reports available from PRPA, unclear if additional policy changes necessary*
10.			Integrity in Research (Kalter, p. 4)
11.			**Service Assignments (Catanzaro, p. 2. Kalter, p. 5. URC, p. 8)**

Items constituting this list are recommendations received from faculty, URC members, the Faculty Caucus, the Faculty Caucus Chairperson, and the Provost or Provost's designee, ex officio nonvoting representative. Items may be considered as issue(s) arise; however and ideally, substantive ASPT changes will be agreed upon prior to the conclusion of the 2018-2019 URC term.