

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 2, 2016
1 p.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Rick Boser, Joe Goodman, Doris Houston, Sheryl Jenkins, Andy Rummel, David Rubin, and Sam Catanzaro (non-voting)

Members not present: Diane Dean and Christopher Horvath

Others present: Susan Kalter (Chairperson, Academic Senate/Faculty Caucus), Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

I. Call to order

Chairperson Doris Houston called the meeting to order at 1 p.m.

II. Approval of minutes

Approval of minutes from the February 3, 2016 meeting and minutes from the February 16, 2016 meeting was deferred until the March 15, 2016 meeting.

III. Remarks by Susan Kalter, Chairperson, Academic Senate/Faculty Caucus

Houston welcomed Susan Kalter to the meeting. Houston asked Kalter to update URC regarding the Faculty Caucus (“Caucus”) review of the ASPT document and to provide her insights regarding the role URC plays in the ASPT process in relation to the Caucus.

Kalter reported that the Caucus is scheduled to vote this evening to create an ad hoc committee on equity review and is also scheduled to continue its discussion of the proposed disciplinary articles. She noted that Section II.D is the only part of Article II not yet approved by the Caucus. She reported that the newest version of Section II.D, drafted by Kalter and Houston, states that URC is to oversee equity review. Kalter said that, depending what the Caucus decides this evening regarding the ad hoc committee, the Caucus may need to wait until fall semester to approve that section. David Rubin said he prefers that a revised Section II.D be included in the version of the ASPT document approved by the Caucus this spring or fall, adding that the issue of equity review otherwise might not be addressed. Kalter agreed.

Rubin asked if Shane McCreery (Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity, Equity, and Access) is scheduled to meet again with URC regarding equity. Houston responded that, to her knowledge, a second meeting with McCreery has not been scheduled. She said she will follow up with McCreery.

Catanzaro noted that the Caucus could approve Section II.D this fall, which would allow time to include the section in the version of the ASPT document scheduled to take effect January 1, 2017. But, he added, it would be better for the Caucus to approve that section this spring, because he hopes to have the new ASPT document printed in time to distribute it to new faculty members and academic units this summer. He noted that units will need time this fall to incorporate ASPT policy changes into their department/school ASPT policies before the new ASPT document takes effect. Kalter agreed that Caucus approving Section II.D this spring is preferable. She said that the Caucus is on target to get that done. She also noted that Article XIII is the most complicated part of the ASPT document yet to be approved by the Caucus. She added that, most definitely, the proposed new disciplinary articles will not be approved by the Caucus this spring.

Houston asked Kalter to speak to how she and the Caucus view the work of URC in ASPT policy discussions. Houston noted that, earlier in the document review process, URC members felt that broader

ASPT issues were beyond the purview of URC. However, more recently URC has organized working groups to research them.

Kalter noted that anything in the ASPT document is within the scope of URC. She explained that URC is not an arm of the Caucus but is a standing external committee of the Academic Senate. The Senate "Blue Book" describes relationships between the Senate and internal and external committees. According to the "Blue Book" description for URC, the committee is charged with making ASPT policy recommendations to the Caucus. Being a larger body than URC, the Caucus may have concerns or perspectives not considered by URC. If the Caucus has significant concerns about any URC recommendation, the concerns are sent to URC for further discussion. The decision regarding any URC recommendation is ultimately made by the Caucus, Kalter said.

Kalter clarified that there may be ASPT issues, such as salary increments, about which URC cannot make recommendations without assistance. Kalter explained that URC may request guidance and advice from other parties, such as from administrative staff. Regarding salary increments, Kalter noted that the Caucus has heard concerns regarding salary compression for many years. She asked URC to consider whether anything can be done during the promotion process to ameliorate the problem.

Houston thanked Kalter for meeting with the committee. Kalter then left the meeting.

IV. Discussion of ASPT suggestions and requests from Faculty Caucus

Note: ASPT item numbers below refer to numbers in *Status of ASPT Document Changes dated March 2, 2016* (see attached).

Item 25

Catanzaro explained Section XIII.E.3 and how it came to be included with the ASPT recommendations proposed by URC. He explained that he drafted the section based on his experience with the kind of situation addressed by the section. He said he developed the procedure described in the section in consultation with the URC chairperson at the time and also with the unit head.

Bruce Stoffel noted that URC members, at the February 16, 2016 URC meeting, seemed to be leaning toward rejecting the Caucus suggestion regarding Section XIII.E.3, if it is the case that any information added to a promotion or tenure dossier is available for review by any party to the application process. Catanzaro said that is clearly the case.

Joe Goodman clarified that the candidate always has the option to file an ethical grievance. He added that any missteps in the process are subject to appeal. Catanzaro concurred. He noted that the candidate could appeal to the Faculty Review Committee if the candidate believes there has been a violation of procedural protocol and may file with the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee (AFEGC) if the candidate believes there has been an ethical violation.

Goodman moved to leave Section XIII.E.3 as URC had recommended it to the Caucus in August 2015, with the rationale that a candidate for tenure or promotion has the option to appeal if the candidate believes a good faith effort has not been made by a party to the process. Boser seconded the motion. The motion was approved on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Item 29

Houston asked Catanzaro if the flow chart illustrating the University ASPT Calendar (Appendix 1 of the ASPT document) can be done in time for the March 23, 2016 Caucus meeting. Catanzaro said, to determine if that is possible, he first needs to consult with Greta Janis (in the Office of the Provost) regarding her work schedule.

Item 42

Goodman noted that Appendix 2 (guidelines and criteria for faculty evaluation) sets forth guidelines and criteria units may choose to incorporate into their own ASPT guidelines, but units are not required to do so. Catanzaro agreed but noted there may be an expectation among some parties that a criterion appearing in the ASPT document should be considered by the department/school ASPT committee. Catanzaro reported having consulted John Baur (Interim Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies) about this matter. Baur feels it would be acceptable to cite refereeing or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts in both illustrative criteria for scholarship and illustrative criteria for service. Rubin said he has seen such activity credited toward both evaluation categories.

Sheryl Jenkins moved, Rubin seconded accepting the Caucus suggestion that “referring or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts” be included in illustrative criteria for both scholarship and service. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Item 43

Goodman moved to reject the Caucus suggestion that a statement be added to the text preceding Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity to clarify that the order of the list is not meant to imply relative value, the rationale for said rejection being that the introduction of Appendix 2 states that activities cited in the appendix are illustrative rather than prescriptive and that departments/school are expected to adapt the guidelines to their own unique situations. Andy Rummel seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Item 44

Goodman moved to reject the Caucus suggestion that an entry be added to the list of Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity that reads “Other activities as determined by the department/school,” the rationale for said rejection being that the introduction to Appendix 2 states that activities cited in the appendix are illustrative rather than prescriptive and that departments/school are expected to adapt the guidelines to their own unique situations. Rubin seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

V. Communication from working groups

Working group on student reactions to teaching performance

Rummel reported that fellow working group member, Christopher Horvath, is compiling information collected by Rummel and Horvath and will report at a future URC meeting.

Working group on salary increments

Goodman distributed an updated report regarding salary increment policies at comparison institutions (see attached). He provided the following information regarding content of the report. University of North Carolina (UNC) schools are in a battle with the state legislature as to how raises should be handled. The current policy in the UNC system is for the board overseeing each school in the system to make decisions regarding raises, if funds are available, but that policy is under discussion. The legislature is also investigating faculty teaching loads. Portland State University includes in its union contract a provision intended to address compression and inversion, through percentage increases in salary based on longevity. West Virginia University has a similar policy, which provides for the possibility of a 10 percent salary increase at five-year intervals after full professorship has been attained. Kansas State University provides for a fixed increment of \$11,075 for faculty members promoted from assistant to associate professor and the same amount for faculty members promoted from associate to full professor. Wichita State University also provides for fixed increments, \$3,000 and \$5,000.

Houston asked if the working group is investigating fiscal implications of salary increment options. Catanzaro suggested that fiscal analysis can be done either by the Office of the Provost or Finance and Planning once committee members have decided which options it would like to pursue. Rick Boser said it has been a long time since the University last increased salary increments tied to promotion. Catanzaro said he thinks the last increase occurred when John Presley was provost. Catanzaro said he would investigate this.

Working group on performance evaluation

Bonnell distributed a survey of faculty members regarding time spent preparing annual evaluation documents, with results noted on the survey instrument (see attached). She reported that working group members have administered the survey to faculty members in their respective units.

Boser reported that faculty members in his department do not view the current performance evaluation system used in his department as problematic. He opined that whether performance evaluation is considered problematic likely depends on the department culture. Bonnell said that Digital Measures (software used by faculty in some units to report their work) seems to be more of an issue for faculty members responding to the survey. She also reported that policies and procedures for submitting annual evaluation documents vary drastically across campus units, based on her review of department and school ASPT guidelines posted on the Office of the Provost website.

Boser stated that departments and schools are free to set their own performance evaluation policies but then must deal with problems that result from them. He asked if there is anything else the working group needs to do regarding this issue. Houston said that the final step is to submit a recommendation to the Caucus. Committee members then discussed the content and length of the summary report. Houston suggested that it might be helpful for the working group to illustrate the range of reporting requirements and expectations across departments and schools. Working group members pointed out that compiling such a range of requirements and expectations would require a lot of additional research by the working group. Catanzaro suggested that, because so much of performance evaluation relates to the culture of the unit and that culture might not be codified, it might not be possible to illustrate the full range of actual performance evaluation activities. Bonnell agreed, citing an instance in which performance evaluation instructions used by one unit are not part of formal performance evaluation policies of that unit posted online.

VI. Other business

There was none.

VII. Adjournment

Boser moved, Bonnell seconded that the meeting adjourn. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 2:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rick Boser, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

Status of ASPT Document Changes as of March 2, 2016 (in two sections)

Working File, Last Updated (March 2, 2016), from Joe Goodman on behalf of the working group on salary increments

URC Survey: Time spent by faculty to prepare and submit their DFSC/SFSC documents, February 19, 2016, from Angela Bonnell on behalf of the working group on performance evaluation

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

STATUS OF ASPT DOCUMENT CHANGES

March 2, 2016

SECTION 1 OF 3: PENDING BEFORE URC

25	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 62 SECTION: Reference: XIII.E.3</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Should the phrase “at the discretion of the dean/chair/director” be changed to “at the discretion of the committee”?</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: February 16, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION:</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016; at its February 16, 2016 meeting, URC discussed the suggestion at length. No motion was made, and, thus, no vote was taken. It was the general sense of the committee that if language exists in the ASPT document that would allow all parties to the ASPT process access to the newly-submitted information (referred to in the section), XIII.E.3 should not be changed. Further, if such language does not exist, the ASPT document should be revised to include such language but XIII.E.3 should not be changed. Catanzaro agreed to research the matter and report back to URC.</p>
29	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 73 SECTION: Appendix 1 (beginning on p. 73)</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Add a flow chart to this appendix to graphically illustrate the timelines. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: February 16, 2016 STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016 NOTES: This change was suggested by URC Chairperson Doris Houston and supported by numerous Faculty Caucus members who commented; the chart is to be created by Catanzaro and Janis (Office of the Provost)</p>
42	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 83 SECTION: Appendix 2, Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider including the second clause of item five in the Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Service Activities on page 85: Refereeing or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016 NOTES: This suggestion was submitted in response to the request sent to members of the university community for comments regarding the August 2015 draft ASPT document. Senator Kalter suggests that URC consider consulting with the University Research Council regarding this suggestion.</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 1 OF 3: PENDING BEFORE URC

43	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 83 SECTION: Appendix 2, Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider adding a statement to the text preceding the list clarifying that the order of the list is not meant to imply the relative value of each factor. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016 NOTES: If such a statement is added to page 83, should a similar statement be added to the text preceding the list of teaching factors and the list of service factors, also in Appendix 2?</p>
44	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 84 SECTION: Appendix 2, Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider adding the following to the list on pages 83-84: 16. Other activities as determined by the department/school. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016 NOTES: If this is added to the list on pages 83-84, should the same be added to the list of teaching factors and the list of service factors, also in Appendix 2?</p>
45	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 83 SECTION: Appendix 2, Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider reversing the order of items 9 and 10 in the list of factors on page 83, placing “submitting grant proposals” before “obtaining grants.” DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016 NOTES:</p>
46	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 84 SECTION: Appendix 2, Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Considering inserting the word “substantive” to item 15 on page 84, so the item reads: “Demonstrating <i>substantive</i> leadership of teams conducting scholarly or creative work, especially where that leadership contributes to the success of other faculty, students, or staff.” DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016 NOTES:</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 1 OF 3: PENDING BEFORE URC

47	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 4 PAGE: 87 SECTION: Note below the flow chart</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider adding to the list in parentheses in the notation at the bottom of the page reference to chairs/directors and deans, since they may write minority reports that become part of the promotion and tenure file. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016 NOTES:</p>
48	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 4 PAGE: 87 SECTION: Box with the text, "Option to review by FRC a negative recommendation"</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: January 27, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Add a notation indicating recommendations that can be appealed to FRC, perhaps by adding language in Comment SC53 to the box or perhaps by use of an asterisk in the box and a note at the bottom of the page or perhaps by adding to the box the appropriate section numbers from the text (as has been done with flow charts in proposed new appendices). DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: URC ACTION: STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016 NOTES:</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 1 OF 3: PENDING BEFORE URC

10	<p>WORKING GROUP Joe Goodman (CH) and David Rubin</p> <p>ARTICLE: XII PAGE: 56 SECTION: XII.A.5</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider defining salary increments by percentages rather than by dollar amounts. Or consider increasing the dollar amounts of the raises since they have not likely been changed in many years.</p> <p>URC ACTION:</p> <p>STATUS: The working group provided a progress report to URC on February 3, 2016 and February 16, 2016. The group is researching salary increment policies of comparator institutions. The group is scheduled to present its final report to URC on April 27, 2016</p> <p>NOTES: This item may be considered by Caucus off-cycle.</p>
11	<p>WORKING GROUP Christopher Horvath (CH) and Andy Rummel</p> <p>ARTICLE: XII PAGE: 57 SECTION: XII.B.2 and others throughout the document</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>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.</p> <p>URC ACTION:</p> <p>STATUS: The working group reported at the February 3, 2016 and February 16, 2016 URC meetings that the group is making progress. The working group is scheduled to present its final report to URC on April 27, 2016.</p> <p>NOTES: This item may be considered by Caucus off-cycle.</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 1 OF 3: PENDING BEFORE URC

41	<p>WORKING GROUP Angela Bonnell (CH), Rick Boser, and Sheryl Jenkins</p> <p>ARTICLE: Articles V, VII, and related articles PAGE: 20, 26, and others SECTION: V.C, VII, and related sections</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015</p> <p>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.</p> <p>URC ACTION:</p> <p>STATUS: The working group reported its progress at the February 3, 2016 and February 16, 2016 URC meetings. The group is researching performance evaluation policies at other institutions and is researching performance evaluation policies in departments/schools at ISU. The working group is scheduled to present its final report to URC on April 27, 2016.</p> <p>NOTES: This item may be considered by Caucus off-cycle.</p>
49	<p>WORKING GROUP Charge to be determined</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

14	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 59 SECTION: XIII and others throughout the document</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>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).</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: December 8, 2015</p> <p>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.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p> <p>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.</p>
-----------	--

5-A	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 59 SECTION: XIII.A</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>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.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: December 8, 2015</p> <p>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 affected after a formal meeting has been requested."</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
------------	--

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

5-B	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 59</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: October 21, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider inserting the following passage from IV.C.2 in Article XIII: "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."</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 19, 2016; February 3, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to NOT add the passage from IV.C.2 to Article XIII</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016.</p> <p>NOTES: In approving the motion, URC members indicated that they like the idea of repeating the passage in the ASPT document and noted that the passage appears in Section IV.C.2 and Section V.A. URC members noted that the passage would not fit well with Article XIII because the subject of the passage differs from the subject of Article XIII (appeals).</p>
------------	---

16	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 59 SECTION: XIII.A</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Replace "except as noted" with reference to Appendices 1 and 8.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: November 17, 2015</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
-----------	---

17	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 60 SECTION: XIII.B.3</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider flipping c and d (so the deadlines set forth in a-d are in chronological order).</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: November 17, 2015</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
-----------	---

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

18	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 60 SECTION: XIII.B.3.c</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>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.”</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: November 17, 2015</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 2, 2016</p>
19	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 60 SECTION: XIII.B.3.d</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change “CFSC/SFSC” to “CFSC.”</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: November 17, 2015</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
20	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 61 SECTION: XIII.D.2</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>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.”</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: February 3, 2015</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to NOT modify XIII.D.2 i.e., NOT to clarify whether bodies can disallow all witnesses, NOT to clarify whether new information may be brought forth or if the hearing is restricted to discussing evidence that may have been ignored or misinterpreted, and NOT to clarify the word “perspective.”</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p> <p>NOTES: The rationale for URC not modifying XIII.D.2 is to allow ASPT committees flexibility in determining, on a case-by-case basis, the nature and proceedings of formal meetings and appeal hearings.</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

21	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 61-62 SECTION: XIII.E</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change “CFSC/DFSC/SFSC” to “CFSC or DFSC/SFSC.”</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: November 17, 2015</p> <p>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”.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p> <p>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.</p>
-----------	--

22	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 61 SECTION: XIII.E</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>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 ...”</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: February 16, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to replace the existing heading with the following heading: “Meeting Procedures Prior to Appealing a Negative Tenure or Promotion Recommendation Submitted by a Dean, Chair/Director</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016”</p>
-----------	---

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

23	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 61-62 SECTION: XIII.E.1</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>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 ..."</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: February 16, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to revise XIII.E.1 to begin: "In accordance with IV.C.4 and V.C.4, communications of the CFSC and DFSC/SFSC recommendations, as well as Dean and Chair/Director reports, should include a rationale for those recommendations. Thus, the faculty member should be able to address the concerns ..."</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p> <p>NOTES: If the URC recommendation is accepted by Caucus, the complete XIII.E.1 would read as follows:</p> <p>"In accordance with IV.C.4 and V.C.4, communications of the CFSC and DFSC/SFSC recommendations, as well as Dean and Chair/Director reports, should include a rationale for those recommendations. Thus, the faculty member should be able to address the concerns raised in that recommendation and speak to factors or materials that have been ignored or misinterpreted."</p>
-----------	---

24	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 61-63 SECTION: XIII.E.1 through XIII.E.6</p> <p>DATE OF FACULTY CAUCUS SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>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.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF ADDITIONAL URC REVIEW: November 17, 2015</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to not accept the suggestion from Faculty Caucus members.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p> <p>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.</p>
-----------	--

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

26	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 62 SECTION: XIII.E.4</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Add “to be” before the word “available” on line 2.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: November 17, 2015</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to accept the suggested change.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
-----------	--

27	<p>Article: XIII Page: 70 Section: XIII.K.4</p> <p>Date of suggestion/request: November 4, 2015</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Date(s) of URC review: February 16, 2016</p> <p>URC action: URC approved a motion to not change the five-day deadline referred to in XIII.K.4.</p> <p>Status: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
-----------	---

28	<p>ARTICLE: XIII PAGE: 70 SECTION: XIII.K.5</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Remove the word “its” on the last line.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: November 17, 2015</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to accept the suggested change.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
-----------	---

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

30	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 74 SECTION: Appendix 1.B., "Prior to December 15"</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015</p> <p>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.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda, January 26, 2016.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
31	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 74-75 SECTION: Appendix 1.B, "March 10"</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change the reference to "DFSC" (third line from the top on p. 75) to "DFSC/SFSC".</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda, January 26, 2016.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
32	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 74 SECTION: Appendix 1.B, "Prior to December 15" (p. 74) and elsewhere throughout the document</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Check for consistent use of "article" versus "section".</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC agreed with the suggestion via consent agenda, January 26, 2016.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

33	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 76 SECTION: Appendix 1.C, "February 25"</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change the reference on the last line, from "five" to "5" for consistency.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 26, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
-----------	---

34	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 76 SECTION: Appendix 1.C, "February 25"</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change the reference on line four from "The Chair" to "The chair".</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 26, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda, January 26, 2016.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
-----------	--

35	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 76 SECTION: Appendix 1.C, "February 25"</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015</p> <p>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.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: February 16, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC passed a motion to retain this passage as it had previously been recommended to Caucus by URC.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
-----------	--

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

36	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 77 SECTION: Appendix 1.E, "April 15"</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change this entry from passive to active voice.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda, January 26, 2016.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
-----------	---

37	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 1 PAGE: 77 SECTION: Appendix 1.E, "May 1", "The fifth-year review of College Standards ..."</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change this entry from passive to active voice.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda, January 26, 2016.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
-----------	--

38	<p>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 ..."</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Reinsert the reference to "Promotion and Tenure" to clarify what is to be reported.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda, January 26, 2016.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for Caucus consideration, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
-----------	--

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 2 OF 3: DECIDED BY URC / PENDING BEFORE CAUCUS

39	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 79 SECTION: Appendix 2, University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation, first paragraph</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015</p> <p>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.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 21-26-2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved the change via consent agenda, January 26, 2016.</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
-----------	---

40	<p>ARTICLE: Appendix 2 PAGE: 79 SECTION: Appendix 2, University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation, first paragraph</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: December 9, 2015</p> <p>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.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: February 16, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC passed a motion to retain this passage as had previously been recommended to Caucus by URC (i.e., to not revise the passage to mention 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).</p> <p>STATUS: Scheduled for consideration by Caucus, as an action item, on March 23, 2016</p>
-----------	---

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 3 OF 3: DECIDED BY FACULTY CAUCUS

1	<p>ARTICLE: Overview PAGE: 5 SECTION: Overview, Provisions for Mennonite College of Nursing Faculty</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: October 7, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Revise to reflect current practice 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.</p> <p>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."</p> <p>CAUCUS ACTION: Caucus incorporated the URC recommendation in the revised Overview, approved by Caucus January 20, 2016.</p>
2	<p>ARTICLE: I PAGE: 8 SECTION: I.E</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: October 7, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider replacing "obtain" with "consider" DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: October 20, 2015 URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change. CAUCUS ACTION: Caucus incorporated the URC recommendation in revised Article, approved by Caucus January 20, 2016.</p>
3	<p>ARTICLE: I PAGE: 8 SECTION: I.E.</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: October 7, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider replacing "possible" with "reasonable" DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: January 19, 2016 URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change. CAUCUS ACTION: Caucus incorporated the URC recommendation in revised Article I, approved by Caucus January 20, 2016.</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 3 OF 3: DECIDED BY FACULTY CAUCUS

4	<p>ARTICLE: V PAGE: 19 SECTION: V.B.1</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: October 7, 2015</p> <p>SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider requiring department/school review of department/school ASPT documents at least every five years rather than at least every three years.</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: October 20, 2015; November 3, 2015; December 1, 2015</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. <u>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.</u> 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). <u>The DFSC/SFSC shall report annually to the CFSC whether they reviewed their Department/School policies (See V.D.3)</u></p> <p>New V.D.3 <u>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).</u></p> <p>CAUCUS ACTION: Caucus approved revised Article V at its February 17, 2016. The article as approved does not incorporate changes recommended by URC.</p>
----------	---

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 3 OF 3: DECIDED BY FACULTY CAUCUS

5-A	<p>ARTICLE: VIII PAGE: 28</p> <p>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.” DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: November 3, 2015 URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to make the change and to renumber existing Article VIII.C as Article VIII.D, existing Article VIII.D as Article VIII.E, and so on. CAUCUS ACTION: Caucus incorporated URC recommendation in revised Article VIII, approved by Caucus January 27, 2016 NOTES: See also 5B</p>
6	<p>ARTICLE: IX PAGE: 32 SECTION: IX.B.2</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: October 21, 2015</p> <p>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.”</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: November 3, 2015</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to not add said sentence from Article IX.B.3 to Article IX.B.2, because those two articles address different issues.</p> <p>CAUCUS ACTION: Caucus approved revised Article IX at its February 17, 2016 meeting. The revised article does not include the sentence as had been suggested by Caucus members. However, concerns of Caucus members were addressed by changes to the beginning of IX.B.2. See also 7.</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 3 OF 3: DECIDED BY FACULTY CAUCUS

7	<p>ARTICLE: IX PAGE: 32 SECTION: IX.B.2</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: October 21, 2015; January 15, 2016 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Consider modifying the beginning of this passage as follows:</p> <p>From:</p> <p>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 ...</p> <p>To:</p> <p>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 ...</p> <p>DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: February 3, 2016</p> <p>URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to recommend replacing the first two sentences of Section IX.B.2 (of the ASPT document as recommended by URC to Faculty Caucus in August 2015) as follows:</p> <p>From:</p> <p>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 ...</p> <p>To:</p> <p>The probationary period at Illinois State University may not exceed six years. This probationary period may be interrupted by stop-the-clock provisions (see IX.B.3). This period may be reduced by full-time service as a faculty member at other institutions of higher learning ...</p> <p>STATUS: Caucus incorporated the URC recommendation in revised Article IX, approved by Caucus February 17, 2016.</p>
8	<p>ARTICLE: X PAGE: 40 SECTION: X.D</p> <p>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)</p> <p>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. CAUCUS ACTION: Caucus incorporated URC recommendation in revised Article X, approved by Caucus January 27, 2016</p>

Page numbers in this report refer to page numbers in the version of the ASPT document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015 rather than to page numbers in the current ASPT document.

Article numbers refer to article numbers in the current version of the ASPT document rather than to article numbers in the version of the document recommended by the University Review Committee in August 2015.

SECTION 3 OF 3: DECIDED BY FACULTY CAUCUS

9	<p>ARTICLE: XII PAGE: 56 SECTION: XII.A.4</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Change “the Academic Senate” to “the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate.” DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: November 17, 2015 URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change. CAUCUS ACTION: Caucus incorporated URC recommendation in revised Article XII, approved by Caucus January 27, 2016</p>
12	<p>ARTICLE: XII PAGE: 58 SECTION: XII.B.5</p> <p>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 ...” 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. It was consensus of URC members 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. CAUCUS ACTION: Caucus incorporated URC recommendation in revised Article XII, approved by Caucus January 27, 2016</p>
13	<p>ARTICLE: XII PAGE: 58 SECTION: XII.B</p> <p>DATE OF SUGGESTION/REQUEST: November 4, 2015 SUGGESTION/REQUEST: Remove extraneous period after XII.B.9. DATE(S) OF URC REVIEW: November 17, 2015 URC ACTION: URC approved a motion to make the suggested change. CAUCUS ACTION: Caucus incorporated URC recommendation in revised Article XII, approved by Caucus January 27, 2016</p>

Working File
 Last updated (March 2, 2016)

Table 1: IBHE Comparison Institutions used in Non-Salary Studies

Comparison Institutions	Enrollment	Assistant to Associate	Associate to Full
1. Ball State University	21,196	\$4000	\$6000
2. Bowling Green State University	16,912	\$5500	\$9000
3. Central Michigan University	27,069	\$6250	\$7250
4. Miami University (Ohio)	18,456	\$6000	\$9000
5. Old Dominion University	24,932	\$4000	\$8000
6. Portland State University	28,241	\$2169 ^{4, 2}	
7. UNC-Charlotte	26,571		
8. UNC-Greensboro	18,502		
9. Western Michigan University	23,914	\$4500	\$6500
10. Wichita State University	14,495	\$3000 ³	\$5000 ³

Table 2: Non-comparison Institutions with Percentage Based Advancement Raises

Comparison Institutions	Enrollment	Assistant to Associate	Associate to Full
1. UT-Chattanooga	10,781	10% of Current Salary	10% of Current Salary
2. Virginia Military Institute	1,700	5% or \$3000	5% or \$3000
3. Kansas State University	24,766	\$11,075	\$11,075
4. West Virginia University	29,175	10% of Current Salary	10% of Current Salary & 5 year review for 10% ↑

End Notes

1. Portland State University has union representation. The 9-month rate is the minimum increase for rank reassignment. Faculty with a 12-month contract receive a minimum of \$2,640.

2. Portland State University provides for an "Academic Professional Compression Increase." Faculty receive a one-time salary increase based on years of service at the University.

- a. Three years of service or more, but less than six years of service: 2%
- b. Six years of service or more, but less than nine years of service: 3%
- c. nine years of service or more: 4%

3. Data reflects 1999 rates.

URC Survey: Time spent by faculty to prepare and submit their DFSC/SFSC documents

February 19, 2016

Background: The ISU Faculty Caucus is considering/discussing the time spent by faculty to prepare and submit their DFSC/SFSC documents and if there should be a more standardized approach that may be more equitable across departments/schools. For example, should departments/schools conduct a paperwork audit periodically to see if the requirements are reasonable and provide quality data? (Something like the Office of Budget Management telling us it should take no more than 4-hours to complete our taxes.) To this end, the University Review Committee (URC) is also tasked with investigating the issue.

DFSC Performance Review Preparation Survey

Response totals in parenthesis. Comments bulleted below responses. N = 12

1. How much time do you spend preparing your annual merit performance evaluation documents:

< 4-hours (3) < 8-hours (6) > 16-hours (3) > 24-hours (0)

Comments: NONE

2. For tenured faculty members, do you spend less time preparing materials post-tenure than when pre-tenure?

If so, how much less time do you spend now that you are tenured? _____ hours.

Yes (2) About the same (2) No (1) N/A (7)

Comments:

- Only two faculty indicated the number of less hours as 2 hours, 8 hours.
- Yes, but the process changed – now “Activity Insight”

3. How would you rate the amount of time it takes to prepare and submit your annual merit performance evaluation documents:

About right? (10) Too long? (1) Overly burdensome? (0)

Comments:

- The electronic system should make things easier not more difficult. I wish we would improve it, but it sounds like the administrators really like it.
- I can't say I'm a huge fan of the Activity Insight, but the time commitment isn't terribly burdensome.
- I don't find the process to be overly long in time required to complete. I see it as a necessity to documenting our activities.

4. Additional comments on this topic not provided above?

- Need to keep track and update self information continuously through the year.
- DFSC needs to see your record, but I'm not sure "Digital Measures" does this. I really have no idea what DFSC reads of the material in that program. Are publications viewable via Digital Measures? Digital Measures does appear to be a good move to consolidate data.
- I am not satisfied with reports generated by activity insight. It doesn't include all the input data. I think there should be only one standard report and not several different types... which is confusing.
- I am comfortable with the process. I like Digital Measures.
- Inefficiency of activity insight. Extra is needed because of its lack of flexibility.
- I think I spend too much time due to digital measures.
- The review process can be simplified by providing i.e. summary of accomplishments. The annual review report (auto-generated) seems to be not very organized accordingly. This can make the review process not very efficient.
- The formatting of the summary report is my biggest complaint about Activity Insight. It's difficult to find things in the summary/annual report, and the formatting doesn't look nice.

Thanks for your assistance and participation in this survey, Rick