

**UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday, May 6, 2020**  
**1 PM, Zoom teleconference**

**Minutes**

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

Call to Order

Shively convened the meeting at 1:02 P.M.

Approval of minutes from April 15<sup>th</sup> & 21<sup>st</sup> 2020 meetings

Goodman moved that the meeting minutes be approved. Dean seconded. Motion passed with 8 voting in favor (7 with one abstention for the 4/21).

Brief update regarding the ASPT memo about COVID-19 interpretations

Catanzaro - So far the memo has elicited relatively few follow-up questions. There have been a few questions/issues related to procedures regarding deadlines for stopping the clock. Traditionally the deadline has been Oct. 31 (if tenure materials due Nov. 1) although we encourage more proactive approach. We are looking for rationale beyond just COVID-19 happened. It needs to be tied to particular activities that context prevented. Framing the request appropriately is important. Catanzaro asks whether members of the URC have been hearing things? Shively reports that there were some questions about how evaluations would impact things, but those questions were pre-memo. The memo seemed to address those questions.

Review and Approval of ASPT 2020-2021 Calendar

Any questions or concerns about the posted dates? Shively notes one typo on page 7 (March "156") - move to approve - Dean, Goodman seconds. Motion passed 8 voting in favor.

Review and Approval ASPT Annual CFSC Report Forms (posted in Teams Site)

Goodman asked that we check the pdf version and word documents in physics and bio were different. The difference was disambiguated by Catanzaro.

Shively asked whether the URC is voting to say that we saw these reports and that the URC isn't approving any of the data in it. Catanzaro replied "yes", and it provides a record of activity that could be looked at later for any issues.

Shively asked whether any of the committee saw issues that should be mentioned? She also asked whether these data impact the equity review that our committee is also examining. Catanzaro replied that since these are small cell numbers, probably not.

Novotny - was there a file that aggregate these results across files? No. Also, is this information confidential? Catanzaro replied that this is sensitive and recommended treating it as confidential. With small N's there is a risk of unintended loss of confidentiality.

Vote to approve receipt of reports- moved by Goodman (all but COB), seconded Beck. Vote 8 in favor of motion.

ASPT subcommittees will report back about discussions since the last meeting

Subgroup 1 (Shively, Edwards, Ma): no report

Subgroup 2 (Buckley, Novotny, Oresky):

**The group had discussed the first item, but didn't get to the second item (see draft from last meeting)**

*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

**MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW**

*Consider developing a requirement of, and attendant guidelines for, mid-probationary review. Probably not to go beyond department unless it results in non-reappointment, in which instance the non-reappointment policies in XI and appeals policies in XVII.K apply and there is no need for additional policies. Use CAS as a model.*

Section(s): IX

*Suggest adding CAS language verbatim to IX D (p. 30) between 2. and 3.*

*“Each candidate for tenure will undergo a mid-probationary tenure review conducted by the D/SFSC in the candidate’s third or fourth year in order to assess the candidate’s progress toward tenure.”*

Oresky note that her college doesn't have this. She has had some conversations with some faculty and she thinks that it is a good idea. None of the faculty that she spoke with really wanted it, it would be a big change. The language below came from CAS documents.

Goodman noted that would we have to have all the colleges vote on this, or is this something that we vote on and then Faculty Caucus? Catanzaro answered the faculty caucus, and they would probably invite faculty input. May need to think through the addition of some guidelines for colleges to get input from their faculty at large. When CAS did this, we had a grace period. The purpose of this is to support faculty, rather than add an additional burden.

Edwards asked how does this work? Is it just pulling in the data from the usual annual reports? Or is it adding something new like a full tenure review portfolio? Is that required, or just recommended? Beck - in CAS it is a full packet. It is sort of like a practice run through with low stakes. This is also a question of a standardized format (CAS is standardized, other colleges have varying degrees of standardization).

Edwards asked whether the formatting issue be in the language here or left to the colleges? Catanzaro replied that he thinks that the it should be left to the departments or colleges. The group may want to include a sentence along those lines.

Oresky noted that the group didn't include that because we thought it is obvious, but we don't object to including it.

Goodman agreed with Oresky that we should allow the college to interpret it as they choose.

***External review letters for tenure.***

**PROMOTION, EXTERNAL REVIEWS**

*Require external review of scholarly/creative contributions for promotion (see IX.D). Use CAS as a model.*

Section(s): VIII.E, IX.D

*Suggested language:*

*Peer review should be limited to assessment of scholarship.*

*Letters should be “one factor” in evaluation*

*External reviewers must be informed as to standards and teaching loads for the candidate’s department*

*The method for selecting external reviewers must be established and written within the school/department.*

*Change IX D3.*

*Each Department/School will require that peer evaluators external to Illinois State University review the credentials for each faculty member who is a candidate for tenure in regard to Scholarly and Creative Productivity.*

*This requirement must be stated in the departmental/school policies and procedures document.*

*Department/School guidelines must expressly describe:*

*a) Whether or under what conditions written evaluations will be considered without a waiver of confidentiality by the evaluator.*

*b) The method that will be used to select external reviewers.*

*Departments/Schools shall provide to the evaluators Department/School, College, and University mission Statements and a written description of the candidate's assignment of efforts and activities for the entire timespan being evaluated. The written evaluations of external evaluators shall be available to the DFSC/SFSC, CFSC, FRC, Provost and President as part of their deliberations on tenure. However, those written evaluations shall not be made available to the candidate for tenure unless the evaluator has given prior written permission, pursuant to 820 ILCS 40/10.*

The question was ask about whether this is this just for new incoming faculty (can existing hires be grandfathered into the existing system? Allowing a grace period for this as well).

Oresky - summarizing our concerns -it is unclear how an external individual can comment on a candidate's teaching. A suggestion was that the letters are only with regards to scholarship and creative activities. Also wanted it to be clear that a poor letter wasn't the only factor for making the decision. A further question was asked as to whether there are there legal issues if the letters from the letters are completely confidential.

Shively stated that state law requires the signing of a waiver for disclosure. To what extent do the candidates have the right to know the content of the letters and how it factored into the tenure decision?

Catanzaro - it is a good practice to remind the external evaluators not to vote with respect to the tenure decision. Rather they should focus on the quality and impact of the work and allow the internal committee to do the decision making.

Shively asked to what extent do we want to specify this in the language? Catanzaro replied that new things tend to lead to anxiety, making it explicit may reduce the potential ambiguity and anxiety (making it clear to the external reviewers that our own institutional guidelines underlying the decision may differ from that at their institution).

Shively asked questions about the number of reviewers, who they are, whether candidate can select them are currently up to departments. Should we make this explicit in the language. Catanzaro replied yes, that's the way it is in CAS, I think that we should ask colleges to make these things explicit in their guidelines as well.

Oresky asked how much of this a requirement to make this part of ASPT vs.

recommendations? Catanzaro replied that these are good points. Note that whatever the colleges come up with, that language comes back to this committee.

Goodman predicts that one area of push back (at least from COB) is funding for conference travel.

Candidates will want to have their face-to-face contact with their letter writers. As a result, many are opting not to attend due to lack of funding. (Potential pushback from the COB is funding of research, specifically conference travel. Our conference prices our growing exponentially and unreasonable. For example, the Academy of Management is \$300 to register and rooms are typically \$200+ per night. Our travel funding was \$1200 and many are just choosing to skip.). Sam - we need to look into alternatives to travel to get those F2F contacts.

Subgroup 3 (Beck, Dean, Goodman): see attached document draft from subgroup 3 - Didn't get a chance to discuss - ran out of time.

Shively, asks that the group members send me everything so that it can be compiled into a summary for the year.

#### Adjournment

Goodman moved that the meeting be adjourned. Dean seconded. Meeting adjourned at 2:02.