

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Thursday, April 22, 2021

9 AM, Zoom teleconference

Minutes

Members present: Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Kevin Edwards, Miranda Lin, Chad Buckley, Melissa Oresky, Rachel Shively, Borinara Park, Ron Guidry, Frank Beck, Nancy Novotny
Absent:

- Call to Order- start time: 9:02
- Review and approval of minutes of 3-11-21 & 4-8-21 URC meetings
 - 3-11-21 not yet reviewed
 - 4-8-21 Not yet compiled
- Subgroup Updates - The goal is to have vote on specific language early Fall
 - Group 3 - continuing from earlier conversations (see 4-8-21 minutes).
 - One point of focus of the revisions is to increase the clarity for section XVII - appeals processes. One proposed revision is to create a set of tables of actions and timelines (based on another section in the book)
 - Catanzaro - agreed that this proposal is a good start, but is also thinks some sort of flow-chart presentation might be helpful. He will take a look through this. Shively and Buckley agree that the tables are helpful for clarification purposes.
 - Beck- suggests that adding some new section headers that specify "this is promotion and tenure" this is "x" this is "y"
 - Group 2 -
 - The group is still waiting for salary equity report before doing too much work on the step salary approach (Oresky notes that this charge overlaps with some of those in subgroup 3's discussion)
 - To date, the members have only identified one other university (in CA) that uses that model. The practice does not appear to be very wide-spread. The members noted, this is going to be an area where policy intersects with budgetary constraints and suggests that the committee may want to invite Dan Elkins and the budget and finance committee to a future meeting.
 - Catanzaro provided a status update on the equity analysis. There is continuing progress. Part of the problem is that ISU doesn't have a dataset with systematic performance based data. Working with PRPA to generate what we can piece together.
 - Catanzaro gave a brief introduction to multiple regression and described what has been piloted to this point
 - first step - predictors - starting salary, years at ISU, department, if individual had admin position and returned to faculty, y/n awarded distinguished or university prof, rank. (accounts for about 95% of variance)
 - Step 2 - of the residuals (the 5%) - look for patterns of deviations - this is where we are, trying to figure out the threshold to determine random error vs. outlier
 - Step 3 - process goes into CFSC review. - aiming to finish up the analysis this summer and pass it onto the CFSCs in the Fall
 - Novotny asked why the list of variables didn't include gender as a predictor variable. (race/ethnicity similar issue)
 - Catanzaro provided two answers -
 - Methodological answer - the data are constrained with respect to gender/sex because the question isn't asked well which may lead to problems in the dataset. - these questions are determined by Federal law, we can't change them. Also responses are voluntary (self-reported) and don't typically get updated over time.

- Policy answer - when the CFSC does the review of residuals/outliers relative to performance, that's when they will consider gender. Then it goes to the Office of equal opportunity (OEOA) to see if there is a discrimination case there.
- Beck suggested that there needs to be some process where the residuals need to be examined according to gender and ethnicity. Need to have a systematic process to examine patterns to the flagged outliers and a Need to also look for local patterns (e.g., look for patterns within units too).
- Edwards asked whether the demographic variables entered into the model and deemed to be not accounting for unique variability?
 - Catanzaro replied that no demographic variables were added initially.
- Shively asked what the impact of using starting salary in the model. Might this variable have some of the inequities baked into it?
- Oresky asked whether there are differences across units with respect to their performance evaluations that may be impacting this? (e.g., in some departments they may not have same range, for example they may only use a binary unsatisfactory/satisfactory (no outstanding))
 - Catanzaro presented a brief history of how units have used these ranges.
- Guidry - given that the great recession was a while ago, and that raises have been so flat since then, you would expect that starting salary would load the most.
- Clinical professorship -
 - Table until next meeting (which may be in the fall)
- Review Suggested Language for Civic Engagement Changes
 - Table until next meeting (which may be in the fall)
- Other Business
- Adjournment
 - Edwards motioned to adjourn, Shively seconded, 9 in favor. Meeting adjourned at 10:25