

**UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
Illinois State University

Friday, November 8, 2019  
12 p.m., Hovey 401D

**MINUTES**

Members present: Chad Buckley, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Diane Dean, Kevin Edwards, Yoon Jin Ma, Nancy Novotny, Rachel Shively

Members not present: Frank Beck, Joe Goodman, Melissa Oresky

Note: In the 2019 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,” as in “ASPT policies” or “ASPT document,” refers to Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure; “ASPT 2022” refers to the ASPT policies document to be drafted by URC, recommended by the Caucus, and approved by the President to take effect January 1, 2022; “CFSC” refers to College Faculty Status Committee as provided for in ASPT policies; “DFSC” refers to Department Faculty Status Committee as provided for in ASPT policies; “SFSC” refers to School Faculty Status Committee as provided for in ASPT policies; and “AFEGC” refers to the Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee as provided for in University Policy 3.3.8A and referenced in the ASPT document. Any and all references in these minutes to DFSC or SFSC are intended to refer to both DFSC and SFSC. “PRPA” refers to the Office of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis at Illinois State University. "OEOA" refers to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access.

I. Call to order

Chairperson Rachel Shively called the meeting to order at 12 p.m.

II. Approval of minutes from the October 25, 2019 URC meeting

Minor corrections to the previously distributed minutes were accepted as friendly amendments. Buckley moved to approve minutes. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion passed with four ayes and two abstentions (Yoon Jin Ma; Diane Dean).

III. Update concerning November 22 meeting

ASPT 2022 Revision issues were previously identified and assigned to ASPT 2022 Working Groups; see Minutes of 9-27-19 for topics and group assignments. For November 22, URC will convene, but then split into the Working Groups to address these issues. A second room will be scheduled.

IV. Update concerning Equity Review Plan.

Shively reported the previously approved Equity Review Plan is being implemented. Shively, Goodman and Catanzaro met with PRPA representatives Angela Engel and Kilee Bell on Oct 28. An OEOA representative Jeffrey Lange was not able to attend. To begin Phase One of the Equity Review Plan, PRPA will analyze salary data across ISU units and they anticipate being able to provide URC with the results of their analysis by the end of February 2020. The URC will receive aggregated, deidentified data based on college from PRPA. It was determined at this meeting that PRPA’s analysis would look at salary data going back 10 years and if there are abnormalities, they may look back even farther. It was discussed that certain employee identity-related parameters are self-reported (e.g., race/ethnicity) or may not necessarily be reported (e.g., disability status). PRPA may need to gather more data following their (and URC's) first-pass analyses, if any abnormalities are discovered.

V. ASPT 2022

The Committee's discussion again spanned several ASPT 2022 Revision issues that were previously identified and assigned to ASPT 2022 Working Groups.

ASPT 2022 Working Group #3, reported by Dean: Changing faculty evaluation time periods is being considered, but at first appearance such changes would be rather disruptive and hard to implement. Catanzaro: if we only evaluate full professors every 2 years, we would need a significant change in the mechanism for setting raises. The main benefit to the longer evaluation period would be to decrease workload in large departments. The other type of change, staggered research/teaching/service evaluations, would not be allowed under current ASPT guidelines, which require all categories to be evaluated each year.

VI. Suggestions for ASPT revisions by Deans

Shively reported discussions with college Deans, who offered some possible directions for revisions. Ideas included improving the reward structure for 'Recruitment and Retention' activities and for activities that support and enhance diversity. It was noted that these topics could be addressed with updates to ASPT Appendix 2.

It was suggested URC should clarify the criteria for early tenure, which Catanzaro defined as a reward for highly exceptional scholarly activity in the first part of the pretenure period. Early tenure might need to remain loosely defined; it can be used on a case by case basis, is specific to each discipline, and provides an important tool for the University to retain top faculty who may be attracted to other institutions.

Discussion of teaching evaluation led to the issue that only two of several criteria are needed (ASPT Appendix 2), and that student 'teaching evaluations' are flawed measures in several regards. Yoon described the **'IDEA Student Rating of Instruction'** service used in her College.

VII. ASPT Working Group #1's meeting with S. Kalter on 11-1-19.

Shively reported Working Group #1's discussion with Senate Chair Kalter. Kalter's suggestions included separating paid administrative work from service; additions to ASPT Appendix 2 service examples; clarifications to how service is discussed in a faculty assignment letter, and review of ASPT VII-A's statement that faculty assignments should not inhibit their contributions to all three areas (research/teaching/service). The committee further considered the broader question of whether service is best assessed as an inherent responsibility woven into scholarly activity and teaching, or a separate percent time commitment.

VIII. Adjournment

Novotny moved that the meeting adjourn. Dean seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kevin Edwards, Secretary