UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Thursday, April 23, 2015
3 p.m., Hovey 209

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Rick Boser, Phil Chidester, Joe Goodman, Sheryl Jenkins, David Rubin, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting)

Members not present: Diane Dean, Doris Houston, Bill O'Donnell

Others present: John Baur (Interim Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies), Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

I.   Call to order

        Chairperson Sheryl Jenkins called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

II.   Approval of minutes from the April 9, 2015 meeting

        Sam Catanzaro asked that the following changes be made to the minutes as distributed prior to the meeting:

        From: Boser asked if anyone on campus currently holds the rank of Instructor. Catanzaro responded that no tenure-line faculty member currently holds that rank. He added that there are non-tenure track faculty members with the title Instructional Assistant. Dropping the Instructor rank from the ASPT system should eliminate any confusion between Instructional Assistant and Instructor.

        To: Boser asked if anyone on campus currently holds the rank of Instructor. Catanzaro responded that no tenure-line faculty member currently holds that rank. He added that there are non-tenure track faculty members with the title Instructional Assistant Professor. Dropping the Instructor rank from the ASPT system should eliminate any confusion between Instructional Assistant Professor and Instructor.

        Joe Goodman moved, Rick Boser seconded approval of minutes from the April 9, 2015 meeting as distributed prior to the meeting but with the changes requested by Catanzaro. The motion carried on voice vote.

III.   Memorandum from the University Research Council regarding ASPT policies revisions

        Catanzaro introduced John Baur, Interim Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies and chairperson of the University Research Council. Baur has joined the meeting to answer questions committee members may have regarding a memorandum from the University Research Council to the University Review Committee setting forth council recommendations for ASPT revisions (see attached).

        Baur described how the memorandum came to be. Over a year ago there was discussion at University Research Council meetings regarding perceived lack of recognition of grant writing and grant procurement activities by faculty members across the University. That discussion continued this spring. The council first considered seeking an Academic Senate resolution

regarding the matter but has since decided to address the concern by recommending changes to ASPT policies during the five-year ASPT policies review process. The council found that, in some units, DFSC/SFSC standards are reviewed and revised often but in other units they are not. Accordingly, the council has recommended that ASPT policies be revised to require departments and schools to review their standards at some regular frequency. The council has decided to let URC decide the frequency if it believes the recommendation has merit.

Regarding recommended changes to Appendix 2 of ASPT policies, Baur noted that the council recognizes editorship as a creative or scholarly endeavor while realizing that some units recognize editorship as a service contribution. He noted that the council recommends removing reference to writing grants, because it feels that recognition should be given to grant-related activity only if a grant proposal has actually been submitted. The council has also recommended adding language regarding recognition of faculty members for leading scholarship involving others when the effort contributes to others' successes.

Phil Chidester asked if Appendix 2 is intended to list what units might recognize as creative or scholarly contributions or to list what units must recognize. Catanzaro responded that the list is intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive, with each unit deciding what to recognize as creative or scholarly contributions and how based on their unique circumstances.

Catanzaro clarified that the University Research Council is suggesting in its recommendation that changes to Appendix 2 with respect to scholarly and creative productivity are to be paralleled by similar changes to sections of the appendix regarding teaching and service. David Rubin asked how often work on grants cuts across teaching, service, and research. Baur responded that, in about one-third to one-half of the instances he has encountered, at least two of the three evaluation components have been involved.

Chidester asked if it would be appropriate to have CFSCs be responsible for making sure review of DFSC/SFSC standards happens, since DFSC/SFSC standards are subject to CFSC review. Catanzaro replied that URC could recommend adding wording to the ASPT document to provide for such CFSC oversight.

Goodman asked if departments in the College of Business can just submit to the CFSC what they have submitted in connection with specialized accreditation. Catanzaro responded that departments may do so if what the department has submitted to the accreditor is consistent with ASPT policies.

Boser asked Baur about the magnitude of the problem of units not regularly reviewing their ASPT standards. Baur responded that the five-member committee charged by the council to study the issue found wide variation across units. Chidester posited that review of department/school standards may be motivated in many units by the unit having a faculty member close to submitting a tenure application. Chidester added that it would be better to establish a regular process of reviewing standards than to be reactive. Baur noted that the intent of the council recommendation is not necessarily to have units change their standards but to review them regularly, even if the result is an agreement among faculty members that no changes are needed.

Boser asked why the council has recommended removing reference to writing grant applications and instead has focused on submitting grant applications. As a University Research Council member having been involved in council discussions of ASPT policies, Rubin reported that there was agreement among council members that submitting the application is the more

important and relevant action. Angela Bonnell said she would have thought the opposite, that someone could be recognized for submitting a grant application she/he did not write. Catanzaro noted that such an instance should raise questions regarding ethical conduct.

Baur then left the meeting.

Jenkins stated that recommendations from the council regarding changes to Appendix 2 could be helpful. Regarding the recommendation for mandated review of DFSC/SFSC standards, Jenkins expressed concern about timing of such review. Aligning review of DFSC/SFSC standards with review of ASPT policies and CFSC standards would be more efficient, she suggested.

Bonnell reported that Milner Library DFSC guidelines mandate an annual meeting of faculty to talk about potential changes to the guidelines. The discussion is held at the conclusion of each faculty evaluation cycle. She noted that having such discussions so often can be confusing, but they provide all faculty members opportunities to express their concerns. Boser noted that his unit has a similar discussion each year, but the discussion does not always result in guideline changes.

Jenkins asked committee members if they support the recommendation for regular review of DFSC/SFSC standards by faculty. The consensus of those present was to incorporate the recommendation into the ASPT revisions.

Discussion then ensued regarding the frequency with which units might be asked to review their ASPT standards. Suggestions offered by committee members included at least every five years, every two or three years, at least every three years, and at least every three years or at the fifth-year review of DFSC/SFSC standards to comply with ASPT changes, whichever comes first. Boser recommended combining the additional passage recommended by the council with wording already in the document, then wordsmithing the combined passage to read as follows.

> Following appropriate faculty input, each DFSC/SFSC shall develop Department/School policies and procedures for appointment, reappointment, performance evaluation, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews. These policies and procedures shall be approved by the majority vote of the eligible Department/School faculty prior to January 1 of the year in which the policies and procedures take effect. Department/School ASPT policies and procedures shall be reviewed at least every three years and approved by the majority vote of the eligible Department/School faculty. Copies of these policies and procedures shall be distributed to each Department/School faculty member. These policies and procedures are left to the discretion of each Department/School but they shall be submitted to the appropriate CFSC, which will approve them for conformity to College standards and University policies and procedures (see IV.B.1).

Jenkins asked members to review this proposed passage when the minutes are released and to come to the next meeting prepared to discuss it.

Committee members then discussed changes to Appendix 2 recommended by the University Research Council.

Goodman asked about categorizing patents and licenses as scholarly work. Rubin responded that doing so is appropriate because patents and licenses are types of publications. Catanzaro noted that, similarly, a textbook that generates income counts toward teaching, service, and/or research. In such matters, each DFSC/SFSC is to exercise discretion as to the quality of the contribution and the circumstances.

Commenting on item six of council recommendation two, Bonnell noted that Milner Library faculty likes the term "invited" when referring to presentations and papers. Jenkins noted that, for Mennonite College of Nursing faculty, "invited" presentations are not considered as high quality as "peer-reviewed" presentations. Bonnell asked about implications of adding the term "invited" to item six. Catanzaro responded that each department/school would still have to decide how it would value "invited" presentations. The DFSC/SFSC would need to review circumstances of each case to determine if the invitation was based primarily on merits of the work or on personal circumstances, he added.

Rubin asked if the council intends a difference between the terms "peer-reviewed" and "peer-refereed" as used in item six. Catanzaro responded that some disciplines distinguish between the two, with "peer-reviewed" implying anonymity and "peer-refereed" not. Chidester noted that in reviewing proposals for conference presentations and papers, some conferences review abstracts while others review complete papers. Rubin noted that the DFSC/SFSC is responsible for considering such factors.

Chidester suggested adding the term "invited" to item 6 since the list in Appendix 2 is considered illustrative only, with the understanding that each unit would be responsible for deciding how to value each invited presentation based on its unique circumstances.

IV.   Discussion of ASPT Subgroup 2 findings and recommendations

Subgroup member Rubin asked that the discussion be deferred until the next URC meeting, since Doris Houston (the other member of the subgroup) is not able to attend this meeting. Committee members agreed.

V.   New business

There was none.

VI.   Adjournment

Jenkins asked committee members to review documents for the May 7 committee meeting in advance of the meeting, since there will be numerous items on the agenda and only an hour to transact all business.

Boser moved, Chidester seconded that the meeting be adjourned. Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Diane Dean, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

Memorandum dated April 16, 2015, from the University Research Council to the University Review Committee regarding Recommendations for Revisions to Illinois State University Appointment, Salary and Tenure Policies

URC equity review policy considerations, URC Equity Review Policy Workgroup (n.d.)

April 16, 2015

To: University Review Committee

From: University Research Council

Re: Recommendations for Revisions to Illinois State University Appointment, Salary,
Promotion and Tenure Policies

The University Research Council respectfully asks that you consider the following
recommendations in your deliberations on revisions to the ISU ASPT Policies (2011), particularly
in relation to

- ASPT policy V.B.1 DFSC/SFSC Development of Departmental/School Policies and
Procedures - a recommendation to ensure departments and schools review and vote on
their ASPT guidelines annually; and
- Appendix 2, University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Recommendation 1:
That ASPT policy V.B.1. be revised as follows

DFSC/SFSC Development of Departmental/School Policies and Procedures:

Following appropriate faculty input, each DFSC/SFSC shall develop Department/School policies
and procedures for appointment, reappointment, performance-evaluation, promotion, tenure,
and post-tenure reviews. These policies and procedures shall be approved by the majority vote
of the eligible Department/School faculty prior to January 1 of the year in which the policies
and procedures take effect. Copies of these policies and procedures shall be distributed to each
Department/School faculty member. These policies and procedures are left to the discretion of
each Department/School but they shall be submitted to the appropriate CFSC, which will
approve them for their conformity to College standards and University policies and procedures
(see IV.B.1).

Recommended Addition:
Department/School ASPT policies and procedures shall be reviewed regularly* and approved by
the majority vote of the eligible Department/School faculty. Copies of these policies and
procedures shall be distributed to each Department/School faculty member prior to the vote
and a reasonable opportunity made available for revision as needed. Any resulting revisions
shall undergo a vote by the faculty members in accordance with Department/School
procedures. Revised ASPT policy and procedures shall be submitted to the appropriate CFSC,

which will review them for their conformity to College standards and University policies and procedures (see IV.B.1).

*The University Research Council recommends annually or biannually.

Recommendation 2:
That the language used in Appendix 2 to describe factors to evaluate scholarly and creative productivity shall be broadened to encompass the greater range of efforts on our campus that contribute to scholarship and creative productivity. We have made some specific suggestions for your consideration

1. Authorship or co-authorship of ~~peer-reviewed~~ published materials that undergo peer review, refereeing, or jurying as appropriate for the discipline. Examples of such ~~as~~materials include journal articles, abstracts, monographs, books, book chapters, ~~cases~~case studies, artistic works, software, or other professional and technical documents;

2. Authorship or co-authorship of published materials such as editorially reviewed books, articles, abstracts, translations, software, ~~cases~~case studies, artistic works or other professional and technical documents;

3. Development or co-development of software applications or intellectual property that is licensed or patented;

~~3.~~4. Production and presentation of radio and television works, films and videos related to the scholarly or creative discipline;

~~4.~~5. Serving as a journal editor or editorial board member; refereeing or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts;

~~5.~~6. Peer-reviewed/refereed presentations and papers delivered at local, regional, national and international meetings;

~~6.~~7. Performances, exhibitions, and other creative activities locally, regionally, nationally and internationally;

~~7.~~8. Managing or serving as a consultant for exhibitions ~~and~~, performances and other scholarly creative activities;

~~8.~~9. Obtaining competitive external or internal grants related to scholarly and creative productivity;

~~9.~~10. ~~Writing and~~ Submitting proposals for competitive grants, internal or external, or other resource development activities related to scholarly and creative productivity;

~~10.~~11. ~~Writing and~~ Submitting required grant and contract reports;

~~11.~~12. Receiving internal or external awards obtained for scholarly or creative productivity;

~~12.~~13. Providing evidence that scholarly or creative works have been submitted for review;

14. Documenting scholarly or creative works in progress;

15. Demonstrating leadership of teams conducting scholarly or creative work, especially where that leadership contributes to the success of other faculty, students or staff.

Recommendation 3:
That the factors to evaluate teaching and service productivity should include greater range of grant and other resource development activity to reflect the broad range of efforts on our campus that contribute to teaching and service productivity. We recommend that the University Review Committee adopt language, similar to that in Recommendation 2, for the evaluation of teaching and the evaluation of service.

URC equity review policy considerations:

Current language (ASPT policy II.D.)

"The URC may conduct a University-wide equity review. In this case, the URC shall develop an appropriate equity distribution plan. This plan must be approved by the faculty members of the Academic Senate prior to its implementation. The Office for Diversity and Affirmative Action shall determine the criteria for affirmative action equity review in consultation with the URC."

Suggested Language (ASPT policy II.D.)

"The URC shall conduct a university-wide equity review every 6-8 years and develop an appropriate equity distribution plan. The Office of Equal Opportunity, Equity and Access shall be responsible for the affirmative action portion of these equity reviews.

Prior to implementation of a university wide equity review, the URC shall develop and distribute written policies, procedures and guidelines. These guidelines will serve as a framework for the implementation of the equity review and subsequent equity distribution plans. The Academic Senate shall convene an ad hoc committee which will serve in an advisory capacity to the Senate and URC as it develops and/or amends policies, procedures and guidelines for the equity review process. All equity review policies, procedures and distribution plans shall be approved by the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate prior to implementation.

Suggested internal units to include in the Senate ad hoc committee:

-URC (ASPT policies)

-OEOEA (hiring reviews)

-Planning, Research and Policy Analysis (PRPA) (stats /data related to: salary increases; faculty/staff/student retention; tenure-granting and -denial, promotion, etc.

-University Senate (parameters of the policy; development of metrics for equity review)

-Payroll (salary information)

-Program Review (Departmental programs that impact hiring, tenure, promotion, faculty support, student learning outcomes, distribution of resources, etc.)

URC Equity Review Policy Workgroup (Houston,D)

-University curriculum committee (curricular audits)

-CTLT (teaching support for diverse TT faculty from underrepresented groups; inclusiveness of curriculum; review/assessment of teaching evaluations

- Graduate Programs

Questions for Consideration

1) How will a URC equity audit differ from and/or complement the current OEOEA affirmative action requirements?

OEOEA Role: Implementation of equal employment opportunity and the Affirmative Action Program:

A. Directing or conducting in-depth analyses of the establishment's total employment process to

determine whether and where impediments to equal employment opportunity exist.

B. Developing and implementing action oriented programs designed to correct problem areas

identified.

C. Designing and executing auditing systems to ensure implementation of the Affirmative

Action Program as follows:

a. Measure the effectiveness of the University's program

b. Indicate need for remedial action

c. Determine the degree to which the University's goals and objectives have been

attained.

OEOEA Reporting: 2014 Executive summary reports that data is available related to:

-   ANNUAL PLACEMENT (minority and female) GOALS by Job groups for departments with 10 or more employees
-   Candidate selection rates for minorities and females
-   Job movement rates of minorities and females as compared with non-minorities and males
-   Compensation analysis is performed and includes an appropriate review of all compensation components

Recommendation:

-Invite OEOEA representative to a URC meeting to discuss the frequency and scope of current affirmation reporting as it relates to a "university wide equity review"

2) How do other universities define and implement a "university wide equity review"?

Based on a *preliminary review* of "equity plans and reports" from other institutions, the definition, scope and targeted populations included in equity reviews vary widely. More narrowly defined reviews focus on *salary and gender equity* (see Washington University). Some institutions appear to incorporate elements of an "equity review" into an assessment of salary differences/inequities related to: 1) rank, 2) gender; 3) years of service; 4) years as a professional; 5) years in rank; 6) ethnicity; 7) job census group; 8) labor market comparisons (Indiana University). At Penn State, "best practice guidelines" and assessment metrics were first researched and developed with input from University faculty and staff. Based on these guidelines, comprehensive equity "self-assessments" were conducted in the areas of hiring, retention, support, mentoring, administration, advancement; admissions – targeting faculty/staff/students.

Notably, UIUC appears to assess equity in hiring and salary separately for APs and Faculty. AP equity and hiring differences were assessed in 2008 through a "Task force on the status of Academic Professionals". Among faculty, UIUC implemented a " Faculty Equity Regression Study" in two parts, assessing the following: 1) Whether there is a <u>systematic, campus-wide bias</u> based on gender or race / ethnicity, and 2) the extent to which individual faculty members have <u>suppressed salaries</u> which are lower than would be expected given their rank, discipline, time in the workforce. While this review does appear to address potential internal "within group" differences in based on gender and race, it does not address other equity variables such as lgbtq status, ability status, national origin, etc. Further, it is not clear from this preliminary review how often this kind of assessment is conducted.

Western Illinois University (WIU) has a policy in place to conduct "faculty equity reviews" based on <u>salary data compared to peer institutions</u> and based on the market. This model does not appear to address potential internal "within group" differences in based on gender, race, lgbtq status, ability status, national origin, etc. Further, it is not clear from this preliminary review how often this kind of assessment is conducted.

3) Do universal best practice guidelines currently exist for defining and conducting a university wide equity review?

<u>Pending:</u> I have submitted a request with the AAUP to determine if such policies and guidelines exist. A request will also be made to the Illinois Department of Higher Education .

4) Which populations/variables should be considered in developing an equity review policy?

-An equity review may include one, several, or ALL of the following variables:

- Ability status
- national origin

- lgbtq status
- race/ethnicity
- gender/gender identity
- TT/NTT/AP staff ranking
- Religion

5) What is the appropriate scope of a URC equity review policy?

-An equity review may be conducted in relation to the following:

-tenure/promotion

-salary

-teaching assignments-course load

-teaching evaluation

-faculty development/distribution of college/departmental resources

-recruitment rates (faculty/staff/students)

-retention rates

-awards (e.g. URG, teaching awards, travel awards, etc)

-administrative and service expectations and evaluation

6) Once our research is completed and policies are developed, what is the policy review and approval process?

- – New policy should be reviewed and discussed with cross campus collaborators.
- – The Office of Equal Opportunity, Equity and Access to assist the URC in determining criteria for the affirmative action portion of these equity reviews.
- – Office of Program Review to determine extent to which a new policy interfaces with departmental/college level practices and policies.
- – Plan to be approved by the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate prior to its implementation.

Department:

UID	Gender	Race - Ethnicity Categories	Employment Date	Rank	Years in Rank	Salary	Performance Over Time Year at ISU	Raise %