

## UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Tuesday, April 21, 2020

9 AM, Zoom teleconference

### Minutes

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

Absent: Joe Goodman

- Call to Order  
Shively convened the meeting at 9:02 A.M.
- Approval of minutes from April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020 meeting  
Beck moved that the meeting minutes be approved. Buckley seconded. Motion passed with 6 voting in favor.

Shively - any updates on the equity review. Sam - I have a few questions for them still. Now that the ASPT memo is ready to go out, I will return my attention to this

- ASPT Interpretations and Guidance in Light of Coronavirus
  - Memo is queued up and should go out today or tomorrow
- ASPT subcommittees will report back about discussions since the last meeting
  - Subgroup 1 (Shively, Edwards, Ma):
  - Subgroup 3 (Beck, Dean, Goodman):
  - **Goodman's email from last time:**  
Insert into Section XII.A.6

6. Salary Enhancement: Faculty with the rank of Professor are eligible for a salary enhancement review. The faculty member is eligible for up to a 10% salary enhancement in addition to standard merit increases. Faculty may submit a condensed evaluation dossier in five (5) year increments following the promotion to Professor. Each evaluative dossier will include the following:

- a. A personal statement for consideration;
- b. A letter from the DFSC/SFSC noting the previous five (5) evaluation ratings; and
- c. An annotated curriculum vita for the five (5) year evaluation period.

The Provost shall review submissions in a timely manner and make recommendations to the President.

Original description:

#### *SALARY INCREMENTATION*

*The Working Group on Tenure and Promotion Salary Increases (Joe Goodman and David Rubin, Spring 2016) concluded that a full departure from the precedent at the University of using fixed monetary salary increments (rather than percentage-based increments) appears unwarranted. The working group recommended a full peer group compensation survey be conducted to examine salary increment amounts at Illinois State, which, the working group, observed are below the mean and median of the IBHE peer comparison group. The working group*

*recommended a full evaluation of faculty turnover rates and costs by academic rank. The working group report cited the "salary enhancement policy" utilized by West Virginia University. URC approved the working group report on April 27, 2016.*

*Section(s): VIII, XVI.A*

*[See also Kalter et al. in this document]*

Beck: in part is about compression and inversion. This is about salary bumps post ranking of full professor. Do we want to have discussion of this now? Rachel - yes, let us discuss it now, take notes, and then combine together. Any comments about the new language? Sam, do you think that this responds to the charge given to the subcommittee?

Catanzaro - Yes. I think that this addresses the question.

Shively - Did you imagine that this a merit based increase or an automatic increase?

Beck - it is a percentage that would be part of the annual merit increase (but it is done every 5 years)

Dean - I seem to remember this being up to a Provost enhancement, separate from the annual merit pool of resources.

Catanzaro - It is performance based (rather than "merit").

Dean - this would still be voluntary, faculty would request to be considered for it.

Does this trigger post-tenure review?

Catanzaro - is it "all or none" or can one ask for a portion

Dean - we didn't discuss the possibility of having it spread out over a span of years

Beck - I don't see the College in here. Goes from Dept./School to Provost.

Catanzaro - did you consider an appeals process?

Beck - we didn't

Dean - one of Joe's concerns was that this might become a mandatory review

Catanzaro - I'm thinking about jumping ahead to implementation.

Does this address the compression issues?

Beck - how does this normally work?

Catanzaro - typically two ways that departments can address this: departments

The other mechanism: not referred as equity adjustment, when there is a 2% increase, 10% of that pool is reserved for Provost allocation. Prioritized by the Deans, awarded by the Provost. Used to address compression and inversions.

The proposed policy here is ... 10% is too much. We do want a performance based system to keep the Professors going. Needs to be systematic, need to have an appeal mechanism, need to think about the labor that would be involved, what is the budgetary/labor cost ratio, etc. How does this impact DFSC/SFSC's and the decisions that they need to make. There is a risk of adding another layer of possible rejection.

Shively - what changes would you recommend that would improve this policy recommendation?

Catanzaro - thinking about this as another "promotion" situation and the steps that are involved with our other promotion policies. (post promotion and review increment). Think about minimal performance triggers that would make somebody eligible for this process. Each department may have to develop their own triggers.

Shively - There is nothing in the draft text that directly mentions that this is intended to address compression and inversion. Should that be part of the trigger? Maybe in addition to performance?

Beck - I think that the subcommittee should talk about these issues some more. If compression and inversion are issues and there are 1 or 2 processes already in place that are intended to address this but are underfunded, then fixing those mechanisms is a better place to try to fix these (rather than this additional mechanism that we proposed). So what other comments do you have

Novotny - I think that this is really intended to be inserted into section 16

Oresky - If something like this in place, there would be an expectation that this would be the route that you have to pursue this to address compression. When I achieved the Professor rank, one of the perks was the notion that I'd never have to go through the promotion process again. That future raises would be merit based.

Edwards - This seems like there is less information in this review, which doesn't seem like the best way to address things with the limited budget pool.

Shively - so how do we write a policy to get more money. If there are existing processes that work, but the real issue that there isn't enough money to address it.

Catanzaro - If we wrote a policy that the university couldn't fund, what would happen? Well, the university wouldn't fund it. We started talking about these issues pre-COVID. We don't know how this is going to impact university budgets. We are already a very lean university. Finding the funds is a cabinet level decision. Given that the context has changed, what we have valued, what costs we have, are also going changing. If a policy like this were made, we need to make sure that there is a financial model that would allow the policy to be implemented. This is an issue that is valued, but it may not be something that can be addressed/solved at this time.

Shively - what sort of timeframe should the subcommittee have?

Catanzaro - I will try to talk to the Provost sometime this week and get back in touch with the subcommittee after that meeting. I want to keep this conversation going. It is a very important issue and I want us to keep working on developing something that will work. We need a solution that is sustainable and doesn't put the university at risk in dire budgetary times.

- Subgroup 2 (Buckley, Novotny, Oresky):

- PROMOTION, COMMON STANDARDS

- Rewrite last two sentences to clarify two distinctions: (1) the difference between criteria for promotion (provided in VIII.F1 and VIII.F2) and the evidence presented that the criteria have been met (provided in Appendix 2), and (2) how Appendix 2 should and should not be used.

- Section(s): VIII.F

- Shively - can we discuss items (1) and (2)?

- Catanzaro - This rests of different levels of abstraction of criterion ("established an impact"), while the data/evidence on which these are based are less abstract (number of publications, exhibitions, etc.). This is the context that I'm approaching this issue.

- Oresky - this helps.

- Buckley - our group need to go back to discussing things within this context.

- Oresky - some of this results from not using the University guidelines to micromanage depts.

- Catanzaro - yes, that's what I'm looking for here, providing some guidance to departments.

- Edwards - can we essentially 'ban' the numbers (quantitative data) and tell them to focus on the qualitative data?

- Catanzaro - There are upsides and downsides. Another concern is moving targets from year to year. What we need to do if find a balance. To create space to be able to exercise judgement. It isn't a counting exercise, but rather an exercise in judgement.

Shively - I'm working on the assumption that we aren't working over the summer. So please send me any additional draft language by the next meeting. It will be our final meeting of the semester. I will compile all the draft language from the subgroups from this year and the next URC committee can return to the topic in the fall.

- Adjournment  
Dean moved that the meeting be adjourned. Buckley seconded. Meeting adjourned at 9:59.