

Approved

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Friday, December 2, 2022

10:30 a.m.

Location: Hovey 401D

Members present: Craig Gatto (non-voting), Chad Buckley, Yung-Ching Chung, Kevin Edwards, Randall Reid, Erin Reitz, Julie Schumacher, Susan Sprecher

Absent: Tom Buller

Kevin began by asking whether there are any revisions needed to the meeting notes for October 28th. Julie noted the misspelling of Craig's last name, and Sue indicated this would be corrected. Julie made the motion to accept the minutes (with the correction) and Chad seconded it. Vote was: 6 yes and 1 abstain.

The first issue discussed was a discrepancy found in the ASPT (purple book) on the number of years of credit allowed to bring in.

From Craig's email (11/10):

ASPT book has what appears to be a dichotomy (at least to me).

Compare VIII.F.1.b to IX.B.2. The former suggests someone can come in and be awarded two years of credit from former work, whereas the latter suggests that can be up to three years.

More specifically, p. 25 (F.1.b) states: *A candidate may bring in up to two years of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor at the college or university level in consideration for promotion to Associate Professor.* However, on p. 27 (B2), it states, *"A newly-appointed faculty member with prior full-time service may be credited with up to three years of service and shall be notified in writing how many years of probationary service credit is being given and how long..."*

As noted by Craig, the operating procedure has been up to three years. It was discussed what to do about this inconsistency, and whether we would need to wait for another 5 years (when the policies are reviewed again) to make this change. Our URC decided we should vote on it and suggest that the Academic Senate put it forward as a friendly amendment as a typographical error and make the change now. It was a unanimous agreement among the URC that the two years on p. 25 was a typographical error (and should be replaced with "A candidate may bring up to three years of full-time service..."). This recommendation will be made to the Senate, but it will be up to the Senate to decide what ultimately to do.

The second issue discussed was (as summarized in Craig's email from 11/10):

Senator Blum is wondering if the department/school ASPT documents should contain information and "rules" regarding how loads are calculated. This information is now coming from the Chair/director in the annual letter; there is no language in the ASPT

document that department/school faculty should have discussed and approved general guidelines for load calculation at some point when discussing their departmental ASPT document.

Questions or comments that were raised by our committee on this issue included:

- Is this really an issue for the ASPT policies, which is focused on criteria for tenure and promotion?
- Determining and articulating “rules” would be challenging as Chairs have a lot of information that they use to determine assignments (e.g., the amount of service someone is doing).
- A discussion occurred about the directive to Chairs in the summer that addressed the discrepancy between assignment letters and evaluations.
- As explained by Craig, there was a need to codify service, as in some departments, service was not in their assignment letters. For example, a faculty member could be told that their assignment was 75% teaching and 25% research. In such a circumstance, if a faculty member chose not to do service and then was punished for it in their evaluation, they could legitimately say that it was not in their assignment letter to do service.
- The idea of having a standard faculty assignment be 60% teaching/30% research/10% service is that:
 - Each course for an academic year would be 10% (assuming a 3/3 load), but with exceptions such as:
 - Large courses in many departments count as double credit
 - If there is a course release, then the 10% released from teaching is picked up somewhere else (more service or more research).
 - Overload pay (for teaching extra) would not change the assignment.
- We discussed that there needs to be flexibility and there is not a “one size fits all”.
- Kevin found some language in the ASPT policies that seems to emphasize this flexibility.
 - P. 21: *“Faculty assignments should embody the principles of consistency and flexibility.” ... “Appropriate effort should be made to achieve flexibility in faculty assignments so that the changing needs of the University are recognized... “Faculty assignments may differ from person to person in a given year...”*
- It was concluded that this really doesn’t belong in the ASPT policy book and that we should not tell departments that it needs to be rigid. It can be up to the department what they want to include in department ASPT documents.
- Craig noted that the Provost was trying to reduce arbitrariness and believed there needed to be documentation of what is expected.
- Relatedly, some departments were doing a simple satisfactory/unsatisfactory in their evaluations, which is against what is supposed to happen. 80% of pay raises is supposed to be merit pay. A downstream outcome is how could such a department argue for any of the funding from the 10% raise pool that the Provost keeps, as the argument for that extra raise pool as it is also supposed to be for meritorious reasons. If everyone is satisfactory, how can an argument be made?
- It was concluded that an email would go back to Martha explaining that we had concluded that this is a departmental issue and that there is nothing the URC should do. Kevin would compose the email and run it by Craig and collectively send it.

The URC then had some discussion as it relates to the composition of the CFSC/DFSC in the Mennonite School of Nursing. They had voted on a change in their document. They are changing language from the maximum of 1 non-tenured track member to a maximum of 2 non-tenure track members (because there are so few tenure-track members available to be on the evaluation committees). We then had a brief discussion of what occurs when the committee consists of only 3 elected members and one has to recuse for some reason, and other related issues. We were reminded that p. 14 of the policy book refers to many exceptions, including for the Mennonite College of Nursing and Milner Library. For example, see V.A.4.

Then, Kevin read parts from an email received from Martha Horst, and it is as follows:

From: Horst, Martha <mchorst@ilstu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2022 2:00 PM
To: Gatto, Craig <cgatto@ilstu.edu>
Subject: possible ASPT revisions

Dear Craig,

In section VIII. C of the ASPT, it states that “negative DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion shall not be forwarded beyond the Department/School to the CFSC unless the faculty member requests, in writing, to the Department/School Chairperson/Director, additional review. Also, in IV.C 2 it states that “a faculty member may withdraw an application for promotion at any time during the review process prior to review by the President. Negative DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion shall not be forwarded beyond the Department/School to the CFSC unless the faculty requests, in writing, to the Department/School Chairperson/Director, additional review.”

These steps should be included in the appendices on and page 80 and the flow chart in appendix 4 on page 90. On page 80, it states that the DFSC/SFSC recommendations “must be reported to the CFSC.” Although it does not list that the CFSC is not required to review these recommendations, it should if that is the process. The next line on page 90 states that the “CFSC must notify candidates of intended recommendations...” One would assume that the recommendations are coming from a review, but per VIII C, that review is not required.

The flow chart in appendix 4 should also indicate that the case may stop after the DFSC/SFSC review if the faculty does not request a review in writing.

Given all of that, the URC should also consider whether or not this optional review by the CFSC could be the best way to handle things. A tenure-line faculty going up for early tenure may not want to “offend” a DFSC/SFSC by asking for a CFSC review – even if there were some problems with the reasoning the DFSC/SFSC offered for their decision not to grant early tenure. Particularly for an early tenure case, the faculty will have to be cautious not to challenge the very people who will review the case for tenure in no more than a year. I would request that the URC consider making the CFSC review of all tenure applications mandatory. I do not know how many there are per year. That would be something to investigate and consider. It still may be wise to allow the faculty member to withdraw the application after that point (i.e. not require that it move forward to the Provost and the President).

Also, on page 29 in IX.B. 4 it states that "Department/Schools are encouraged to recommend early tenure only in unusual circumstances..." I think it should clarify somewhere in this section that Departments/Schools should define criteria for "unusual circumstances." IX.B.5 states that "Departments/Schools will provide all faculty members With the criteria for tenure." I request that the URC also add language in here that states that "Department/Schools will also provide faculty members with criteria for what constitutes unusual circumstances for recommendation of early tenure."

Thank you for forwarding these future ASPT items to the URC for discussion.

*All the best,
Martha Horst
Chair, Academic Senate*

We discussed briefly this issue and the material on p. 10 of the policy book which states (C.2) that

"Negative DFSC/SFSC recommendations for promotion shall not be forwarded beyond the Department/School to the CFSC unless the faculty member request in writing, to the Department/School Chairperson/Director additional review."

Kevin mentioned that perhaps this should be fleshed out more.

Craig mentioned another issue in the policy book that might be worth discussing. P. 28 (B.4), says:

"The decision concerning tenure must be made at least twelve months before the expiration of the probationary period."

As noted by Craig, May is when people get the final word, and then their probationary period ends in August. Kevin noted that it may just be an issue of the definition of "probationary" and that for those who do not get tenured, their probationary period just gets extended. However, he suggested that it should be rephrased.

Finally, it was discussed briefly that Martha suggested (at the end of her email above) that it be clarified by departments what would be the unusual circumstances that would qualify someone for early tenure. Some of our comments in this regard included: Perhaps written strict criteria for unusual circumstances would not make sense because it would need to be taken on a case by case basis. It would need to be someone who is performing higher than anyone else in the same time period; way above normal. But, still is a department-level decision and the wording would be in comparison to peers in that discipline. It is an issue we can discuss again in the future.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.