

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, January 19, 2016  
10 a.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Diane Dean, Joe Goodman, Christopher Horvath, Doris Houston, Sheryl Jenkins, David Rubin, and Sam Catanzaro (non-voting)

Members not present: Rick Boser

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

I. Call to order

Chairperson Doris Houston called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

II. Welcome to new member Andy Rummel

Houston welcomed new member Andy Rummel, who has been elected to represent the College of Fine Arts on the committee.

III. Approval of minutes from the December 8, 2015 meeting

Christopher Horvath moved, Joe Goodman seconded approval of minutes from the December 8, 2015 meeting as distributed prior to the meeting. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

IV. Overview of committee work for spring 2016

Meeting schedule

Bruce Stoffel solicited comments and suggestions from committee members regarding the committee meeting schedule for spring 2016, which was disseminated prior to the meeting. There were none.

ASPT review

Houston and Catanzaro updated committee members about Faculty Caucus review of revisions to the ASPT document recommended by URC at the beginning of the academic year. Houston and Catanzaro reported that the Caucus may defer a few issues for resolution after the Caucus has approved the new version of the ASPT document, which needs to be done by the end of March. The deferred issues would then be considered by both URC and the Caucus in the coming year. Bonnell said she has been fascinated by the number of comments made by Caucus members regarding the ASPT document. She reported that there have been instances in which concern by one or more Caucus members about a single word in a passage resulted in Faculty Caucus Chairperson Susan Kalter requesting additional review of the passage by URC. Houston explained that Kalter's approach to Caucus suggestions and requests has been, and will continue to be, to ask for additional URC review if just one person makes a suggestion or request and no other Caucus member objects. Houston continued her update by orienting committee members to the ASPT document status report (attached), noting that the Caucus may make additional requests of URC this spring.

Use of email to expedite committee work

Houston asked committee members whether they would be willing to use email communication between committee meetings to decide ASPT document suggestions or requests from the Caucus that are editorial

in nature. Committee members agreed that email may be used to decide editorial suggestions and requests from the Caucus but not substantive issues and then to do so following a consent-agenda process. A list of suggestions and requests will be emailed to committee members. Any member may then request that any item on the list be discussed at a URC meeting. If no such requests have been communicated regarding an item on the list, the item will be considered resolved, with URC agreeing to the suggestion or request.

#### Formation of working groups to expedite committee work

Houston suggested that the committee form working groups to research three substantive issues the Caucus is likely to defer until after Caucus approval of ASPT document changes this spring: how salary increments should be defined (item 10 on the status report), the role of student reactions to teaching performance in faculty evaluations (item 11 on the status report), and the performance evaluation process (item 41 on the status report). Committee members concurred and volunteered to serve as follows:

Salary increments (item 10): Goodman (chairperson), Rubin

Student reactions to teaching performance (item 11): Horvath (chairperson), Rummel

Performance evaluation process (item 41): Bonnell (chairperson), Jenkins

Houston said, because she will be representing URC at Caucus meetings this spring, she prefers not to join a working group. Dean said, unless her involvement in a working group is needed, she too prefers not to join a group because she also plans to attend Caucus meetings this spring in her role as URC vice-chairperson.

Horvath suggested that Houston notify committee members not present about the opportunities to volunteer for a working group.

Houston asked working groups to proceed with their work in the manner of their choice, to come to URC meetings this spring prepared to provide a brief update regarding their progress, and to give a final report to the full committee at its April 27 meeting.

#### V. Continued discussion of ASPT suggestions and requests from Faculty Caucus

##### Item 3 (re Article I.E)

Horvath moved to accept the change to Article I.E suggested by Caucus members (replacing the word “possible” with the word “reasonable” in the passage). Goodman seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

##### Item 5 (re Article VIII)

Catanzaro explained that URC has already decided part of the Caucus suggestion, by agreeing to insert as a new Article VIII.C wording from Article IV.C.2. However, Caucus members also asked URC to consider adding the same wording to Article XIII (new Article XVI). Catanzaro said he suggests not doing so because IV.C.2 does not relate to appeals (the subject of XIII). He added that if URC thinks wording from IV.C.2 should be added to XIII, it would be most logical to add it to XIII.F or XIII.G.

Horvath suggested that, since XIII.F and XIII.G are about Faculty Review Committee involvement in an appeal and IV.C.2 does not relate to the appeals process, it might be better to insert wording from IV.C.2 earlier in XIII, perhaps between XIII.B and XIII.C, if it is added to XIII at all. He expressed concern that, if the wording is placed in XIII, a faculty member reading the passage there might assume that a negative DFSC/SFSC recommendation may be forwarded to the CFSC only if the faculty member intends to appeal the DFSC/SFSC decision, which is not the case.

Dean suggested that if the wording in IV.C.2 is inserted in XIII, it should be its own section. Houston said she prefers to add the wording to XIII, that there would be no harm in doing so, but the wording

would fit better earlier in XIII rather than at XIII.F or XIII.G. Bonnell said the wording does not fit XIII unless the article title is revised.

Houston asked committee members to re-read XIII before the next URC meeting and come prepared with a recommendation regarding Item 5 on the status report.

VI. Other business

Horvath volunteered to serve as acting secretary for the Tuesday committee meetings secretary Rick Boser will be unable to attend this spring.

VII. Adjournment

Dean moved, Bonnell seconded that the meeting adjourn. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 11:03 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Christopher Horvath, Acting Secretary  
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachment: *Status of ASPT Document Changes as of January 15, 2016*

# STATUS OF ASPT DOCUMENT CHANGES

As of January 15, 2016

## SUGGESTIONS AND REQUESTS BY FACULTY CAUCUS

Blue denotes an EDITORIAL item yet to be decided by URC

Green denotes a SUBSTANTIVE item yet to be decided by URC

Gray denotes an item that has been decided by URC

Gray with green border denotes an item that will be addressed off-cycle

*Page numbers in the Reference field of entries in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee to the Faculty Caucus in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document (effective January 1, 2012).*

*Article numbers in the Reference field of entries in this report refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document (effective January 1, 2012) rather than to article numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee to the Faculty Caucus in August 2015.*

**1** **Article:** Overview  
**Page:** 5  
**Section:** Overview, Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty

**Date of suggestion/request:** October 7, 2015  
**Suggestion/request:** Revise to reflect current practice

**URC response:** Agreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** October 20, 2015; November 3, 2015; November 17, 2015

**URC action:** Initially URC decided to refer the issue to Mennonite College of Nursing for a recommendation back to URC; at its November 3, 2015 meeting, URC decided to invite members of the Mennonite DFSC and CFSC to the December 1, 2015 URC meeting to discuss this matter; following the November 3, 2015 URC meeting, URC member Sheryl Jenkins (the Mennonite representative on URC) met with Mennonite tenure track faculty members to discuss this issue and to invite them to a URC meeting so they could provide feedback directly to URC; Mennonite tenure track faculty members decided instead to submit their suggestions to URC via Sheryl; Sheryl drafted proposed ASPT document changes related to this matter and disseminated them to Mennonite tenure track faculty members for comment prior to the November 17, 2015 URC meeting; based on comments received from Mennonite tenure track faculty members and on discussion of this issue by URC members, URC approved the following motions on November 17, 2015.

- 1) To strike the passage titled "Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty" from page 5
- 2) To remove IV.A.3 from page 13
- 3) To add the following sentence at the end of V.A.1 on page 18: "For MCN, the dean's designee (who must be tenured) will serve as chair of the DFSC."

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:** The two sections suggested for deletion (motions 1 and 2 above) had been placed in the current ASPT document to address issues that arose because Mennonite did not have a sufficient number of tenure track faculty members to meet its ASPT committee obligations. Because that is no longer the situation at Mennonite and is not likely to be the situation at Mennonite in the foreseeable future, URC members concur with Mennonite tenure track faculty members that the passages should be deleted. With deletion of those passages, the composition of the Mennonite CFSC and DFSC would be governed by the same ASPT document provisions that govern the composition of the CFSC and DFSC/SFSC in other units. The suggested addition to V.A.1 is intended to address Mennonite not having a department chair who would otherwise serve as chair of the DFSC.

2 Article: I  
Page: 8  
Section: I.E

Date of suggestion/request: October 7, 2015

Suggestion/request: Consider replacing "obtain" with "consider"

**URC response: Agreed**

Date(s) of URC review: October 20, 2015

URC action: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.

Status: URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

Notes: The revised passage reads "All committees and officials within the faculty status system process will make every possible effort to consider the most reliable evidence available for use in their deliberations."

3 Article: I  
Page: 8  
Section: I.E.

Date of suggestion/request: October 7, 2015

Suggestion/request: Consider replacing "possible" with "reasonable"

URC response:

Date(s) of URC review:

URC action:

Status:

Notes:

4 Article: V  
Page: 19  
Section: V.B.1

Date of suggestion/request: October 7, 2015

Suggestion/request: Consider requiring department/school review of department/school ASPT documents at least every five years rather than at least every three years.

**URC response: Disagreed**

Date(s) of URC review: October 20, 2015; November 3, 2015; December 1, 2015

URC action: At its December 1, 2015 meeting, URC approved a motion to make the following changes to the passage initially recommended to Faculty Caucus in August 2015.

Revised V.B.1 (with track changes)

V.B.1

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. Any changes resulting from such reviews will be subject to vote of the eligible Department/School faculty, with approval requiring a majority of those voting. If no changes are made, no vote is necessary. ~~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). The

DFSC/SFSC shall report annually to the CFSC whether they reviewed their Department/School policies (See V.D.3)

New V.D.3

The DFSC/SFSC shall report annually to the CFSC whether they reviewed their Department/School policies. Any changes must be approved by the CFSC (see IV.B.1 and V.B.1).

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:** After lengthy discussion, URC has decided to retain its recommendation to Faculty Caucus for review of department/school policies and procedures at least every three years. Committee members feel that planning a review midway between the five-year reviews necessitated by changes to the university-wide ASPT document would not create an undue burden on departments/schools. URC notes that numerous departments/schools already discuss their ASPT policies and procedures annually. Committee members note that, while this ASPT document change would require DFSCs and SFSCs to review their policies and procedures at least every three years, faculty in those units may reasonably decide that no changes are necessary and, therefore, no vote of faculty would be needed.

**5 Article: VIII**  
**Page: 28**  
**Section: VIII**

**Date of suggestion/request:** October 21, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Consider inserting a new Article VIII.C based on IV.C.2: "In all situations involving a positive DFSC/SFSC recommendation for promotion, the CFSC shall review the promotion application of the individual involved and either endorse the DFSC/SFSC's recommendation or reach an alternate recommendation. 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 member requests, in writing, to the Department/School Chairperson/Director, additional review."

**See also new Article XVI (current Article XIII) for possible addition of the same or similar passage there.**

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:** November 3, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion to add the following as new Article VIII.C (with existing Article VIII.C renumbered Article VIII.D, existing Article VIII.D renumbered Article VIII.E, and so on):

"In all situations involving a positive DFSC/SFSC recommendation for promotion, the CFSC shall review the promotion application of the individual involved and either endorse the DFSC/SFSC's recommendation or reach an alternate recommendation. 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 member requests, in writing, to the Department/School Chairperson/Director, additional review. See also Article IV.C.2."

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:**

**6** **Article:** IX  
**Page:** 32  
**Section:** IX.B.2

**Date of suggestion/request:** October 21, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Consider adding the following passage from Article IX.B.3 to Article IX.B.2:  
“A stop-the-clock period will not count toward tenure or against the length of the probationary period.”

**URC response:** Disagreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** November 3, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion not to add said sentence from Article IX.B.3 to Article IX.B.2, because those two articles address different issues.

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:**

**7** **Article:** IX  
**Page:** 32  
**Section:** IX.B.2

**Date of suggestion/request:** October 21, 2015; January 15, 2016

**Suggestion/request:** Consider modifying the beginning of this passage as follows:

From: The probationary period at Illinois State University may not exceed six years. This period may be reduced by full-time service as a faculty member at other institutions of higher learning ...

To: The probationary period at Illinois State University may not exceed six years. This probationary period may be interrupted by stop-the-clock extensions (see IX.B.3). This period may also be reduced by full-time service as a faculty member at other institutions of higher learning ...

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:**

**8** **Article:** X  
**Page:** 40  
**Section:** X.D

**Date of suggestion/request:** October 21, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Reconsider the parenthetical passage. Consider removing it. Consider keeping it. Consider keeping it but adding qualifying language to the effect that a department might not be able to provide resources, that resources are available to other faculty members (e.g., faculty members who have not been deemed deficient), and that other types of support are potentially available to assist the faculty member (i.e., types of support not already listed in the parentheses)

**URC response:** Disagreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** November 17, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion to retain X.D as URC had recommended it to Faculty Caucus, i.e., to not remove the parenthetical clause.

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:** Including examples of resources that might be made available by a unit is beneficial to both the faculty member and to the unit. For the faculty member, having such a list helps the faculty member understand the types of resources that could be made available to her/him and the types of resources the faculty might request from the unit. For the unit, having such a list helps the unit understand the types of resources it should be offering to the faculty member and might help the unit project the cost of remediating a deficiency.

**9** **Article:** XII  
**Page:** 56  
**Section:** XII.A.4

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Change “the Academic Senate” to “the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate.”

**URC response:** Agreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** November 17, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:**



**10 Article: XII**  
**Page: 56**  
**Section: XII.A.5**

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Consider defining salary increments by percentages rather than by dollar amounts.

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:** December 1, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion to refer the question whether Article XII.A.5 should be modified to define raises by percentages rather than by dollar amounts back to Faculty Caucus for discussion and analysis.

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:** URC discussed this matter at length at its December 1, 2015 meeting. The sense of the committee is that more time is needed to adequately discuss and analysis the suggestion than is available to URC at this time. Among the concerns/suggestions of individual URC members expressed during the committee discussion: 1)the suggestion merits discussion by multiple groups rather than just by URC, 2) Faculty Caucus should consider requesting assistance from administration in analyzing the financial implications of the suggested change and the status quo, 3) as an alternative to the suggestion, consideration should be given to increasing the dollar amounts of the raises since they have not likely been changed in many years, and 4) Faculty Caucus might consider asking URC to address this issue as a possible mid-five-year-cycle ASPT revision, when more time is available for adequate discussion of the matter.

**11 Article: XII**  
**Page: 57**  
**Section: XII.B.2 and others throughout the document**

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Should the term “student reactions” still be used, or should the phrase be replaced with “student evaluations” or some other term? Consider AAUP guidance. Look to recent research regarding use of student evaluations in evaluating a faculty member’s teaching. Consider adding a requirement that multiple methods of teaching evaluation be weighed equally.

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:** December 1, 2015; December 8, 2015

**URC action:**

**Status:** Under review by URC

**Notes:** At its December 1, 2015 meeting, committee members agreed to pursue a modest amount of additional information-gathering regarding the issue before making a recommendation to Faculty Caucus. Additional information-gathering may include requesting a presentation by the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology regarding best practices in teaching evaluation, consulting AAUP publications regarding the matter, studying policies and practices at other institutions, and reviewing recent research regarding the evaluation of teaching performance. The concern articulated by multiple URC members is that more time may be needed for URC to adequately discuss the questions raised by Faculty Caucus members than is available to URC at this time. At the December 8, 2015 URC meeting, Chairperson Houston deferred discussion of the matter until spring 2016. Houston indicated that she would contact Claire Lamonica, director of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology, to invite her to a spring 2016 URC meeting.

**12 Article:** XII  
**Page:** 58  
**Section:** XII.B.5

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Consider including in the written notification to the faculty member recommended (but not required) suggestions for addressing weaknesses. "This letter shall provide an assessment of the faculty member's strengths and suggestions toward addressing weaknesses and ..."

**URC response:** Disagreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** December 8, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion to not modify XII.B.5 to require written notifications to faculty members regarding ASPT decisions to include recommended (but not required) suggestions for addressing weaknesses.

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:** It was consensus of URC members voting on the motion at the December 8, 2015 URC meeting that providing written suggestions is best practice but should not be required, that the manner in which ASPT committees have addressed weaknesses has not been a problem.

**13 Article:** XII  
**Page:** 58  
**Section:** XII.B

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Remove extraneous period after XII.B.9.

**URC response:** Agreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** November 17, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:**

**14 Article:** XIII  
**Page:** 59  
**Section:** XIII and others throughout the document

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Should we stipulate in our policies that letters of decision by an ASPT body must include directions to the faculty member for appeal, or do we not add that to our policies (but continue to recommend that bodies do so as best practice).

**URC response:** Agreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** December 8, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion to add the following sentence to the end of XII.B.5: "The letter shall also inform the faculty member of the right to appeal the ASPT decision and shall cite the pertinent article of the ASPT document that describes the appeals process." The motion passed with three ayes, one nay, and one abstention.

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:** The rationale articulated by the URC member making the motion was to provide consistency regarding provision of information to faculty members regarding opportunities to appeal ASPT decisions. Reasons expressed by URC members for not supporting the suggested change: concern about the length and clarity of decision letters and concern that the ASPT committee writing the letter might error in reciting the appropriate appeals passage or in its reference to the appropriate appeals passage. URC discussed where in the ASPT document the suggested passage should be added. The URC member making the motion selected XII.B.5, the passage regarding DFSC/SFSC notification regarding performance evaluation and recommended change in rank and/or tenure status.

**15 Article:** XIII  
**Page:** 59  
**Section:** XIII.A

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Consider wording and sentence order of the first paragraph. Maybe change "An informal resolution may be effected ..." to "An informal resolution may also be effected ..." Maybe move the sentence beginning "An information resolution ..." to the end of the paragraph. Maybe both.

**URC response:** Agreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** December 8, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion to revise the first paragraph of XIII.A to read as follows: "Illinois State University encourages the fair and equitable resolution of appeals. Informal resolution of issues is encouraged at the DFSC/SFSC and CFSC levels prior to formal meetings and/or appeals. In contrast to formal meetings as defined in XVI.B, informal resolution of issues can be accomplished through communications that address questions and concerns through provision of information or clarification. An informal resolution may also be effected after a formal meeting has been requested."

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:**

**16 Article:** XIII  
**Page:** 59  
**Section:** XIII.A

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Replace “except as noted” with reference to Appendices 1 and 8.

**URC response:** Agreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** November 17, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:**

**17 Article:** XIII  
**Page:** 60  
**Section:** XIII.B.3

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Consider flipping c and d (so the deadlines set forth in a-d are in chronological order).

**URC response:** Agreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** November 17, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:**

**18 Article:** XIII  
**Page:** 60  
**Section:** XIII.B.3.c

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Add a comma after “and/or plan” and the word “to” before “communicate.” “Formal meetings to discuss cumulative post-tenure reviews and/or remediation plans with the DFSC/SFSC must be scheduled to allow the DFSC/SFSC sufficient time to finalize its review and/or plan, and to communicate it to the faculty member and the appropriate Dean by the March 8 deadline.”

**URC response:** Agreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** November 17, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:**

**19 Article:** XIII  
**Page:** 60  
**Section:** XIII.B.3.d

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015  
**Suggestion/request:** Change “CFSC/SFSC” to “CFSC.”

**URC response:** Agreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** November 17, 2015  
**URC action:** URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**Notes:**

**20 Article:** XIII  
**Page:** 61  
**Section:** XIII.D.2

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015  
**Suggestion/request:** Clarify whether bodies can disallow all witnesses (i.e., allow no witnesses). Clarify whether new information may be brought forth or if the hearing is restricted to discussing evidence that may have been ignored or misinterpreted. Clarify the word “perspective.”

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**  
**URC action:**  
**Status:**  
**Notes:**

**21 Article:** XIII  
**Page:** 61-62  
**Section:** XIII.E

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015  
**Suggestion/request:** Change “CFSC/DFSC/SFSC” to “CFSC or DFSC/SFSC.”

**URC response:** Agreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** November 17, 2015  
**URC action:** URC approved a motion to replace references to “CFSC/DFSC/SFSC” in XIII.E and throughout the ASPT document with references to “DFSC/SFSC or CFSC”.  
**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus  
**Notes:** URC suggests that committees within the reference be ordered by administrative level, from lower to higher, and that the syntax be applied consistently throughout the ASPT document.

**22 Article:** XIII  
**Page:** 61  
**Section:** XIII.E

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Rewrite the heading to “make it more accessible.” Change “making” to “which made.”  
Reword the clause “to an appeal of a dean or chair/director report ...”

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:** Two options are proposed.

Option 1:

E. Procedures for Meetings ~~with Dean or Chair/Director~~ Preliminary to an Appeal of a Dean or Chair/Director Report ~~Making~~ which made a Negative Tenure or Promotion Recommendation

Option 2:

E. Meeting Procedures Prior to Appealing a Negative Tenure or Promotion Recommendation Submitted by a Dean, Chair/Director

**23 Article:** XIII  
**Page:** 61-62  
**Section:** XIII.E.1

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Rewrite this passage to clarify that the rationale for the negative recommendation is to be given to the faculty member (e.g., “The faculty member should be informed ...”). Add the word “may” before “have been ignored or misinterpreted.” Use active voice. For example, “The official who issues the report should deliver the recommendation so the faculty member is made aware of the rationale ...”

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:** Revision drafted by Catanzaro, with track changes.

1. The faculty member should ~~know~~ be informed of the rationale for the negative recommendation to be able to address the concerns raised in that recommendation and speak to factors or materials that have been ignored or misinterpreted. (See IV.C.4 and V.C.4).

**24 Article:** XIII  
**Page:** 61-63  
**Section:** XIII.E.1 through XIII.E.6

**Date of Faculty Caucus suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Faculty Caucus suggestion/request:** Consider rearranging the items in XIII.E to help faculty members understand their options and to help them be strategic. Consider flipping XIII.E.2 and XIII.E.3.

**URC response:** Disagreed

**Date(s) of additional URC review:** November 17, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion not to accept the suggestion from Faculty Caucus members.

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:** URC members feel that referring first to a meeting with the full DFSC/SFSC or CFSC (XIII.E.2) is preferable because that action is more likely to result in a complete and favorable hearing from the perspective of the faculty member than would meeting one-on-one with the Chair/Director or Dean. URC members feel that the order of these two items is important, as it may suggest that the first approach listed (meeting with the full DFSC/SFSC or CFSC) is the preferred approach from the perspective of the faculty member. URC members point out that, regardless of the order of XIII.E.2 and XIII.E.3, faculty members have a choice between the two approaches.

**25 Article:** XIII  
**Page:** 62  
**Section: Reference:** XIII.E.3

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Should the phrase “at the discretion of the dean/chair/director” be changed to “at the discretion of the committee”?

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:**

**26 Article:** XIII  
**Page:** 62  
**Section:** XIII.E.4

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Add “to be” before the word “available” on line 2.

**URC response:** Agreed

**Date(s) of URC review:** November 17, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion to accept the suggested change.

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:**

**27 Article: XIII**  
**Page: 70**  
**Section: XIII.K.4**

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Rethink the five-day deadline for a faculty member to file a complaint with AFEGC. Is that time too short from the perspective of the faculty member? If URC decides to recommend a longer period, the period should not be too long so as to needlessly lengthen the entire process.

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:**

**28 Article: XIII**  
**Page: 70**  
**Section: XIII.K.5**

**Date of suggestion/request:** November 4, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Remove the word "its" on the last line.

**URC response: Agreed**

**Date(s) of URC review:** November 17, 2015

**URC action:** URC approved a motion to accept the suggested change.

**Status:** URC action to be reported to Faculty Caucus

**Notes:**

**29 Article: Appendix 1**  
**Page: 73**  
**Section: Appendix 1 (beginning on p. 73)**

**Date of suggestion/request:** December 9, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Add a flow chart to this appendix to graphically illustrate the timelines.

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:** This change was suggested by URC Chairperson Doris Houston and supported by numerous Faculty Caucus members who commented.



**30 Article:** Appendix 1  
**Page:** 74  
**Section:** Appendix 1.B., "Prior to December 15"

**Date of suggestion/request:** December 9, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Change the reference to "Section XV.D" at the end of the entry to "Section XVI.D" but only if the article numbering is changed throughout the document to accommodate new sections.

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:**

**31 Article:** Appendix 1  
**Page:** 74-75  
**Section:** Appendix 1.B., "March 10"

**Date of suggestion/request:** December 9, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Change the reference to "DFSC" (third line from the top on p. 75) to "DFSC/SFSC".

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:**

**32 Article:** Appendix 1  
**Page:** 74  
**Section:** Appendix 1.B., "Prior to December 15" (p. 74) and elsewhere throughout the document

**Date of suggestion/request:** December 9, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Check for consistent use of "article" versus "section".

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:**

**33 Article:** Appendix 1  
**Page:** 76  
**Section:** Appendix 1.C, "February 25"

**Date of suggestion/request:** December 9, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Change the reference on the last line, from "five" to "5" for consistency.

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:**

**34 Article:** Appendix 1  
**Page:** 76  
**Section:** Appendix 1.C, "February 25"

**Date of suggestion/request:** December 9, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Change the reference on line four from "The Chair" to "The chair".

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:**

**35 Article:** Appendix 1  
**Page:** 76  
**Section:** Appendix 1.C, "February 25"

**Date of suggestion/request:** December 9, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Discuss the appropriateness of the CFSC chairperson acknowledging a written notice of intent to appeal a performance evaluation within five business days of its receipt. The concern raised by multiple Caucus members was the possibility, given this timing, that a faculty member could receive acknowledgement after the March 1 deadline for filing the appeal with the CFSC.

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:**

**36 Article:** Appendix 1  
**Page:** 77  
**Section:** Appendix 1.E, "April 15"

**Date of suggestion/request:** December 9, 2015  
**Suggestion/request:** Change this entry from passive to active voice.

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**  
**URC action:**  
**Status:**  
**Notes:**

**37 Article:** Appendix 1  
**Page:** 77  
**Section:** Appendix 1.E, "May 1", "The fifth-year review of College Standards ..."

**Date of suggestion/request:** December 9, 2015  
**Suggestion/request:** Change this entry from passive to active voice.

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**  
**URC action:**  
**Status:**  
**Notes:**

**38 Article:** Appendix 1  
**Page:** 77  
**Section:** Appendix 1.E, "May 1", "Each CFSC shall submit an annual report to its College Council and the URC ..."

**Date of suggestion/request:** December 9, 2015  
**Suggestion/request:** Reinsert the reference to "Promotion and Tenure" to clarify what is to be reported.

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**  
**URC action:**  
**Status:**  
**Notes:**

**39 Article:** Appendix 2

**Page:** 79

**Section:** Appendix 2, University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation, first paragraph

**Date of suggestion/request:** December 9, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Remove the word “specific” from the last sentence of the paragraph. There was confusion among some Caucus members as to its meaning in this context. It was consensus of those Caucus members commenting that it would be easier to remove the word rather than try to agree on an alternative.

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:**

**40 Article:** Appendix 2

**Page:** 79

**Section:** Appendix 2, University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation, first paragraph

**Date of suggestion/request:** December 9, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Add to this paragraph mention of the role CFSCs have in ensuring that all departments/schools include in their DFSC/SFSC documents both standards of excellence and guidance to faculty members for achieving excellence (e.g., including examples). A concern was raised by one Caucus member that the DFSC in his/her department does not have such standards. Other Caucus members expressed concern about the situation and supported the Caucus member’s request that such an addition to the paragraph be considered.

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:**

**41 Article:** Articles V and VII  
**Page:** 20, 26  
**Section:** V.C, VII, and related sections

**Date of suggestion/request:** December 9, 2015

**Suggestion/request:** Discuss how often performance evaluations must be conducted by a DFSC/SFSC and the content and extent of materials submitted by faculty members with their performance evaluation documents. Several caucus members expressed concern that the current performance evaluation system is overly burdensome for faculty members, that too much time is being spent by faculty members preparing their performance evaluation documents. One suggestion was to conduct performance evaluations every other year rather than every year. Another suggestion was to conduct performance evaluations annually for probationary faculty but every other year for tenured faculty. Diane Dean pointed out that performance evaluations inform annual salary increment decisions, so not having an annual evaluation may be problematic in distributing salary increments. Another option suggested was to continue to conduct performance evaluations every year but to reduce the extent of documentation being submitted by faculty members. It seemed to be the consensus of those Caucus members commenting during the meeting (there were several) that it might be timely for URC to revisit how performance evaluations are conducted, since the current system has been in place for several years without discussion or change.

**URC response:**

**Date(s) of URC review:**

**URC action:**

**Status:**

**Notes:** Susan Kalter pointed out that this issue is not one that URC could likely complete within the time allotted for preparation of the 2017 edition of the ASPT document but might be reviewed "off-cycle."