

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Illinois State University

Thursday, March 22, 2018

2 p.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Diane Dean, Kevin Edwards, Joe Goodman, Sheryl Jenkins, Rachel Shively, Sarah Smelser

Members not present: Michael Byrns, Doris Houston

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

Note: In these minutes “URC” refers to the University Review Committee at Illinois State University; “Caucus” refers to the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate at Illinois State University; “ASPT” refers to appointment, salary, promotion, and tenure policies of Illinois State University; “ASPT Policies” refers to *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies* effective January 1, 2017, Illinois State University; “CFSC” refers to college faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT Policies of Illinois State University; “DFSC” refers to department faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT Policies of Illinois State University; and “SFSC” refers to school faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT Policies of Illinois State University. Any references in these minutes to “DFSC” refer to both DFSC and SFSC, and any references to “department” refer to both department and school.

I. Call to order

Chairperson Diane Dean called the meeting to order at 2 p.m. A quorum was present.

II. Approval of minutes from the March 1, 2018 meeting

Dean requested changes to the last two sentences on the first page of the draft minutes disseminated prior to the meeting, under III. Interpretation of DFSC ASPT matters.

From: A fourth issue is that salary allocation procedures purportedly are not being communicated to SED faculty members as required by ASPT Policies; instead the department reportedly has disseminated the rank order of salary increments granted by the DFSC. A fifth issue is whether an assistant chairperson is eligible to serve on the DFSC.

To: A fourth issue is that salary allocation procedures purportedly are not being communicated to SED faculty members as required by ASPT Policies; instead the department reportedly has disseminated the rank order of salary increments granted by the DFSC (a violation of confidentiality) without an explanation of how the rankings were determined. Dean added a fifth issue unrelated to the inquiry, namely whether an assistant chairperson is eligible to serve on the DFSC.

Joe Goodman moved approval of the minutes from the March 1, 2018 URC meeting as disseminated prior to the meeting but with the changes requested by Dean. Sheryl Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

III. Updates

ASPT disciplinary policies: Status and next steps

Dean reported that the disciplinary articles were finalized by the Caucus at its last meeting (March 7, 2018). Dean said URC should be proud of the role it has played in their adoption.

Sam Catanzaro reported that he has been meeting with legal counsel and Caucus chairperson Susan Kalter to carefully review the disciplinary articles for final wording changes. He said the changes will not likely be substantive. Catanzaro explained that the Caucus has approved each disciplinary article separately, adding that once the review with legal counsel has been completed, the Caucus will consider approving the final version of the articles as a package through a single motion. That will likely occur in fall 2018, in time for the articles to take effect January 1, 2019, he said.

Dean reported that she is scheduled to meet with Catanzaro and Kalter to discuss actions needed prior to January 1, 2019, to implement the articles. One action, Dean said, is training ASPT committee members regarding the new disciplinary policies and procedures. Dean asked Sarah Smelser to attend the meeting in her capacity as URC vice-chairperson, if she is able to do so.

Bruce Stoffel noted that CFSCs will need to revise their college standards to incorporate the disciplinary articles, adding that revised college standards will need to be reviewed and approved by URC prior to their January 1, 2019 effective date. Catanzaro said, that for most colleges, changes to CFSC standards will likely be brief, to acknowledge and refer to the new disciplinary articles and to designate the method the college will use to replace CFSC members recused from deliberations in a disciplinary case. Catanzaro added that changes needed to DFSC and SFSC guidelines (which will be subject to review and approval by CFSCs) are likely to be brief as well. Stoffel also noted that Mennonite College of Nursing faculty members and Milner Library faculty members still need to review the disciplinary articles and propose modifications they feel are needed to reflect aspects of the ASPT system unique to their colleges. He reported that Kalter has asked those two colleges to submit their proposed modifications to the Caucus via URC. Angela Bonnell reported that Milner Library faculty members have already begun their discussions of the disciplinary articles.

Ad hoc equity review committee

Dean disseminated and reviewed a summary of draft recommendations to URC (see attached) being finalized by the ad hoc equity review committee. The recommendations set forth the content of equity review at Illinois State and a five-year cycle for the review. Dean explained that the equity review committee is finalizing its recommendations by vetting the wording of the recommendations and by verifying whether data cited in the recommendations can be made available to URC and the CFSCs. Dean said she expects URC to receive the final recommendations from the equity review committee in the next week and will share them with URC members as soon as she receives them.

Catanzaro explained that the draft equity review plan being compiled by the ad hoc equity review committee provides that URC will receive and review data each year and will pass that data to the CFSCs for their review. For each faculty member, he said, the difference between the value calculated for each metric and the expected value of the metric will be calculated and reasons for those differences will be investigated. Catanzaro noted that the larger the difference the more salient the investigation becomes. Catanzaro said there can be no valid equity review without consideration of faculty performance and its impact on the metrics, noting that CFSCs will be charged with reviewing the data in the context of performance evaluations. Rachel Shively asked about a situation in which a faculty member's metrics are near the mean values but the faculty member should have a higher salary. She noted that a lower-than-expected salary may be due to lack of funds for faculty raises in some years. Catanzaro said that is the type of situation CFSCs will need to investigate. Jenkins asked if URC will receive data for all faculty members or just for faculty members for whom differences from expected values have been calculated. Catanzaro responded that URC will receive all data.

Goodman asked if an external party will be retained by the University to compile and analyze the data. Catanzaro and Dean responded that data compilation and analyses will be done by the Office of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis at the University. Dean noted that some data will come to URC in raw form and some will be analyzed for the committee. Jenkins asked if the equity review process will be burdensome for the colleges. Dean said most data will be provided to the colleges, although the colleges will be asked to collect more data related to their faculty than they have in the past.

Goodman asked Catanzaro if the equity review committee is looking at mixed type data. Goodman noted that there are power models that can be used to conduct the analyses. Catanzaro responded that the analyses will not

likely be that sophisticated. Goodman asked how the equity review committee is defining race for purposes of the review. Catanzaro responded that the definition used by the Office of Human Resources at the University will be used. Shively asked if faculty members are permitted to self-identify their race. Goodman explained that faculty members are only permitted to choose from the categories provided to them.

Shively said she understands that the Provost's office has an equity fund. She asked if that fund is pertinent to equity review. Catanzaro explained that the equity fund relates to the ASPT policy of holding back 10 percent of salary increment funds for distribution by the Provost. The policy does not specify how that 10 percent is to be used. Catanzaro explained that, in practice, the Provost usually passes the 10 percent to the colleges and allows each college to decide how to use its portion of the funds. There is no policy, Catanzaro clarified, that requires the Provost to allocate the funds to the colleges or to allocate them proportionally. Catanzaro said that as the equity review system matures, equity review results could factor into the Provost's decision regarding how to allocate the 10 percent set-aside.

Dean said an issue yet to be decided is whether results of equity review analyses will be shared with faculty. She said this will not likely be an issue if the analyses indicate that inequities do not exist, but she is unsure what should be done if inequities are found. Goodman said this will certainly be an issue to be addressed, because there will be outlier data.

Dean said she is glad URC members are raising these questions, since URC will be responsible for implementing whatever equity review plan the Caucus approves. She explained that URC has some latitude to suggest changes to the recommendations made by the ad hoc committee. She noted that if URC members feel there are better ways to conduct the analyses, URC can suggest them to the Caucus for its consideration. Dean recommended that URC schedule another committee meeting before the end of the spring semester, solely for in-depth discussion of the equity review recommendations once they have been received by URC. She suggested a two-hour meeting. She asked Stoffel to poll committee members regarding their availability.

Policy inquiry from Department of Special Education faculty member

Dean said Catanzaro had offered to work with her on a written response to the Special Education faculty member's inquiries, but before they could draft a response the faculty member contacted her by telephone. Dean said she communicated verbally to the faculty member regarding the URC discussion of the matter (at its March 1, 2018 meeting). Dean said she intends to follow up with the faculty member in writing.

IV. Review of CFSC standards

ASPT standards of the College of Business (see attached)

Smelser and Bonnell reported. Smelser said the changes she suggests are primarily cosmetic. They include updating some references (such as the reference at the bottom of page 2 to "pages 46-50"), changing the word "evaluation" in the last sentence on page 2 to "reactions to teaching performance," changing the reference to "ratings" in the second line on page 3 to "responses," clarifying the reference to IV.3 in point 5 on page 2, changing the singular possessive "member's" in point 4 on page 2 to the plural possessive, and rewriting the beginning of Section II so it is a complete sentence. Bonnell reported having those same suggestions and some others, including removing extra spaces in the Teaching paragraph of Section III, correcting the reference to "Departmental Faculty Status Committee" in the first sentence of Section V (to "Department Faculty Status Committee"), changing references to "scholarly work" and "research" on page 3 of the document to "scholarly and creative works," and using boldface font for the Section VII heading. Dean suggested that URC return the document to the College of Business with a request that those changes be made. URC members agreed.

Arrange review of Mennonite College of Nursing standards (see attached)

Goodman and Shively offered to review college standards received from Mennonite College of Nursing and then report their findings at the next URC meeting.

Stoffel reported that college standards have yet to be received from the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Applied Science and Technology. He said he recently learned from Associate Dean Marla Reese-Weber that the College of Arts and Sciences is completing changes to its standards and plans to submit a revised version to URC by the end of April. Stoffel reported that Dean Todd McLoda had reported in January that the College of Applied Science and Technology was making minor changes to its standards and would submit a revised version to URC this spring. Dean asked Stoffel to follow up with Dean McLoda regarding when URC might expect to receive the revised standards.

V. Continued discussion of service assignments

Because the time allotted for the meeting had nearly expired, Dean tabled discussion of service assignments.

VI. Other

Dean said URC is doing many things to keep on top of changes that need to be made to ASPT documents. She noted that Doris Houston had suggested supplementing the URC response to the Special Education faculty member's inquiry with a more global response to all units. She suggested that URC also think about compiling a checklist of things colleges should be doing (with regard to their ASPT standards and guidelines). She asked Catanzaro and Stoffel to think about what should be included on such a checklist.

VII. Adjournment

Shively moved that the meeting adjourn. Kevin Edwards seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sheryl Jenkins, Secretary

Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

Brief Summary of recommendations, handout prepared by Dr. Diane Dean, nd.

College of Business Faculty Status Committee Standards, College of Business, Effective January 1, 2012 (as approved by URC November 29, 2011).

Menonite College of Nursing at Illinois State University, College Standards Supplemental to University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation, Drafted 4/8/05, Effective January 1, 2006, Revised December 2010, Approved by URC January 19, 2011, Mandatory Revisions November 2011, Approved by URC November 8, 2011, Effective January 1, 2012.

Brief summary of recommendations

The committee is recommending the following schedule for conducting reviews of equity in relation to equal opportunity and access within the ASPT system over repeatable five-year periods:

- 1) Years 1, 6, 11, etc.: Comprehensive collection of salary data for further analysis by URC and/or CFSCs in comparison to college information regarding performance
- 2) Years 2, 7, 12, etc.: Quantitative analysis of conditions prior to tenure and first promotion
- 3) Years 3, 8, 13, etc.: Quantitative analysis of conditions following tenure and first promotion
- 4) Years 4, 9, 14, etc.: Two separate studies, the first regarding unsatisfactory ratings in performance evaluations and the second regarding dynamics of counteroffers/resignations
- 5) Years 5, 10, 15, etc.: Analysis of activity in the newly adopted ASPT disciplinary system

Categories related to equal opportunity and access:

1. Gender
2. Race/ethnicity
3. Disability status, if possible
4. U.S. citizenship status versus citizenship status in all other countries (possibly by continent of origin if not U.S)
5. Military/non-military, if possible
6. Age
7. Intersections of the above as determined by the URC and PRPA, once the raw data is received

Controls:

1. highest earned degree
2. years since appointment on tenure-line at ISU
3. rank
4. years in rank (both with & without this control; as well as intersection of rank by years-in-rank)
5. departmental affiliation by department of rank
6. past administrative appointment or not (chairs/deans/Provost office & deans offices AP roles)

College of Business
College of Business Faculty Status Committee Standards
Effective January 1, 2012

I. Guiding Philosophy

The process of evaluating contributions of faculty should be a positive and motivating endeavor, and not rely on formulaic models or discrete evaluation categories. This process should encourage faculty to contribute to achieving the mission of the department, college, and university.

II. College of Business Mission

To be a highly respected college of business that develops professionals with the personal dedication, ethics and lifelong learning capabilities needed to succeed professionally and to serve society. We work as a diverse community promoting excellence in learning, teaching, scholarship, and service.

III. Goals to Accomplish Our Mission

It is through our teaching, intellectual contributions, and service that we achieve our mission. As an institution emphasizing excellence in teaching, the College of Business seeks to recruit, develop, and support motivated faculty who are active teacher-scholars in their fields.

Teaching: We pursue teaching excellence through a student-centered focus, developing and enhancing students' continuous learning skills by educating them in business theory and its application to business practice. We achieve this student-centered focus by actively involving students, creating a small-class atmosphere, maintaining access to instructors, encouraging innovative methodologies, and by continuously improving our curricula.

Intellectual Contributions: In addition to basic research, the College values applied research and instructional development as intellectual contributions that help students see the relevancy of theory to business practice.

Service: By our service, the faculty and staff are role models for students through contributions to the university, the community and their profession. Faculty and staff represent the college through involvement in university committees and our professional service enhances the visibility and reputation of our college.

Accreditation: The College of Business is accredited by AACSB International; the Accounting program is separately accredited. The college is committed to maintaining these important accreditations. Accordingly, DFSC policies should articulate expectations for performance that will enable the college to continue to maintain these accreditations.

IV. CFSC: Membership, Elections, Terms, and Procedures

1. The CFSC shall be composed of one tenured faculty member from each of the four departments and the Dean of the College of Business.

2. The Dean of the college shall be an ex-officio voting member and Chairperson of the CFSC. At the beginning of each fall semester a vice-chairperson shall be elected from among its members.
3. A minimum of two candidates from each of the four departments shall be nominated by faculty who hold tenured or probationary (tenure-track) appointments. Election of nominees shall be at large by the college's tenured and probationary (tenure-track) faculty.
4. CFSC member's terms are two years. Terms of the members from each of the four departments are staggered. Therefore, two departmental members are elected each year.
5. Mid-term vacancies shall be filled by election as specified in IV.3. The newly-elected member shall serve to the end of the uncompleted term.
6. No faculty member may serve for more than two consecutive full terms on the CFSC. Those elected to fill partial terms may serve up to two additional full terms.
7. Elections to determine membership on the CFSC shall normally be held before April 15. Terms of office normally commence with the start of the fall semester.
8. Official records of the CFSC shall be kept in the Office of the Dean.

V. Goals of the Evaluation Process

The Departmental Faculty Status Committee (DFSC) mission, goals, policies, and procedures should clearly communicate departmental performance expectations including the expectation that all faculty maintain a level of intellectual contributions sufficient to be viewed as Academically Qualified by AACSB International. The evaluation of faculty should be explicitly linked to those expectations and should allow for flexibility. It should be based on the individual faculty member's short-term and long-term career goals and accomplishments in relationship to the department, college, and University mission.

If appropriate, the annual evaluations should provide developmental feedback. For probationary (tenure-track) faculty or those working toward promotion, the annual evaluation must explicitly address the faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion, and communicate areas in which development or improvement is needed.

The evaluation process should recognize intermediate outcomes in addition to completed outcomes. The approach used by the department to evaluate and reward multi-year contributions should be clearly explained. Departments should provide stability and consistency in the interpretation and application of standards. The chairperson is important in achieving this goal, since she or he is the collective memory of the DFSC. As a starting point in the evaluative process, the chair may take the lead by preparing, for consideration by other DFSC members, salary, promotion, tenure, and retention recommendations for each departmental faculty member.

The evaluation of faculty contributions and accomplishments should emphasize quality in addition to quantity. Furthermore, multiple measures of quality should be used. (For examples of such measures, see pages 46-50 of the *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies*.) For teaching, students should have the opportunity to provide an evaluation for each class,

including summer courses. However, in evaluating teaching, each department shall consider additional measures of quality, thus avoiding an over-reliance on student ratings. For intellectual contributions, this should include careful reading of scholarly work to evaluate quality, contributions to the field, and the extensiveness of the project. In the evaluation of service, departments should focus on the significance and quality of, and time required by, a faculty member's university and professional service.

VI. Promotion and Tenure

In order to qualify for promotion or tenure, a faculty member must exhibit and document sustained and consistent high quality performance in all faculty roles. The documentation should include a concise narrative interpreting the materials presented in the candidate's portfolio of teaching, research and service accomplishments and goals. The portfolio should also include the candidate's philosophy on and contributions made in teaching, research and service.

VII. Recusal Policy

As determined by departmental voting during fall 2011, the college adopts the following recusal policy pertaining to the CFSC: CFSC members shall neither participate in nor vote at ASPT deliberations (including appeals) involving individuals from their own department/school.

Approved by the CFSC: November 10, 2011

Approved by the URC: November 29, 2011

MENNONITE COLLEGE OF NURSING AT ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
College Standards Supplemental to University Guidelines and
Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Drafted 4/8/05, Effective January 1, 2006,

Revised December 2010, Approved by URC January 19, 2011, Mandatory Revisions November 2011,

Approved by URC November 8, 2011

Effective January 1, 2012

Mission

Mennonite College of Nursing at Illinois State University creates a dynamic community of learning to develop exceptionally prepared nurses who will lead to improve health outcomes locally and globally. We promote excellence in teaching, research, service and practice with a focus on the vulnerable and underserved. We are committed to being purposeful, open, just, caring, disciplined and celebrative.

Introduction

This document outlines Mennonite College of Nursing standards for appointment, salary, promotion and tenure. The information contained within these policies is supplementary to the *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*. Tenure track faculty are expected to review and consider both documents to fully appreciate and understand the ASPT process.

Mennonite College of Nursing is committed to a faculty evaluation system that promotes the highest standards of achievement within the discipline and at the same time is conducted in an atmosphere that promotes collegiality. The college is determined that the evaluation process will nurture faculty development and promote their success within the university and the discipline. The college is committed to rewarding faculty as they advance the college mission.

Standards for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

Appointment

Appointment to a tenure track position is predicated on an individual's ability to achieve promotion to associate professor and/or be granted tenure by the end of the probationary period. Individuals seeking appointment to assistant professor must demonstrate potential for significant achievement in teaching, scholarship and service.

On occasion, initial appointments may be at the associate or full professor level. These individuals will have already demonstrated comparable achievement of this rank at other institutions in congruence with the expectations of Mennonite College of Nursing and Illinois State University.

Appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor may be made in the case of individuals who have:

- Recently received the doctorate and have no teaching experience, or
- Candidacy status for the doctoral degree, with or without teaching experience (Note: Reappointment is contingent upon completion of the doctoral degree within a period of time specified at the time of hire).
- Under rare circumstances variations from these requirements for appointment to assistant professor may be approved.

Promotion

A faculty member applying for promotion in rank in Mennonite College of Nursing must provide evidence of a sustained record of success in teaching, scholarship and service with an emphasis on the teaching and scholarship.

All individuals seeking promotion should be effective teachers as demonstrated by student evaluations, peer-review and self-evaluation. Faculty must also provide evidence of scholarship. Such evidence must include

peer-reviewed publications or reviewed creative activity or performances. Faculty may also include presentations, abstracts, and grant awards as evidence of scholarship. Faculty scholarship should demonstrate sustained effort and expertise in a focused area of study that contributes to the discipline of nursing and furthers the mission of the college. Service to the university, discipline and community is an important component of faculty responsibility, but alone is insufficient for promotion.

Tenure

The probationary period provides tenure track faculty the opportunity to document their productivity and achievement in teaching, scholarship and service. Annual performance evaluations provide individualized critical appraisal that will guide the probationary tenure track faculty in improving the quality of their contributions to the college mission.

To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member must hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor or be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor when tenure is recommended. An individual who does not qualify for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure shall ordinarily not be considered for tenure. Granting of tenure is also predicated on the potential for ongoing meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship and service.

Post-tenure Reviews

Post-tenure reviews are primarily for the purpose of enabling faculty members to shape their continuing careers with Mennonite College of Nursing and Illinois State University and to ensure that the faculty activities are meeting the mission of the college. Tenured faculty members shall receive a post-tenure review every five years following the granting of tenure.

Standards for Performance Evaluation and Salary Increments

Annual performance evaluations serve as one mechanism to reward each faculty member for their contribution to the mission of the college. Salary funds shall be distributed as performance-evaluated increments to faculty based on established policies for salary adjustments. Performance-evaluated increments shall recognize equity, and short-term and long-term contributions made by faculty members. Such increments shall be payable to raise-eligible faculty members who receive satisfactory performance ratings. Performance-evaluated increments ordinarily will not be distributed equally to all raise-eligible faculty members.

Establishment of the College Faculty Status Committee

The Illinois State University Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure guidelines provide for the establishment of the College Faculty Status Committee (CFSC). The MCN CFSC is responsible for ensuring that the college guidelines are carried out, serving as the final authority in annual review and as the first appeal body for promotion and tenure decisions. By virtue of the MCN organizational structure, CFSC members participate in, are present at, and vote in ASPT deliberations (including appeals) involving individuals within MCN. Approval of CFSC guidelines is by majority vote of all tenure track faculty.