

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Thursday, April 12, 2018
2 p.m., Hovey 401D

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Diane Dean, Kevin Edwards, Doris Houston, Rachel Shively

Members not present: Michael Byrns, Joe Goodman, Sheryl Jenkins, Sarah Smelser

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; “SFSC” refers to school faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT Policies of Illinois State University; “CAST” refers to the College of Applied Science and Technology at Illinois State University; “CAS” refers to the College of Arts and Sciences at Illinois State University; “Mennonite” refers to Mennonite College of Nursing at Illinois State University; and “ad hoc equity review committee” refers to the Ad Hoc Committee for ASPT Equity Review established by the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate at 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 the agenda

Doris Houston moved approval of the agenda as distributed prior to the meeting. Angela Bonnell seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

III. Approval of minutes from the March 22, 2018 meeting

Rachel Shively moved approval of the minutes from the March 22, 2018 URC meeting as distributed to committee members prior to the meeting. Kevin Edwards seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, with four committee members voting in the affirmative and one committee member abstaining (Houston).

IV. Review of CFSC standards

Mennonite College of Nursing standards (see attached)

Shively reported, providing her comments regarding the Mennonite CFSC standards and also citing issues identified by her committee colleague Joe Goodman. She said the Mennonite CFSC standards are more similar to DFSC guidelines (than other CFSC standards reviewed by URC). She noted that, as with other CFSC standards reviewed by URC, some dates in the Mennonite standards need to be revised.

Shively asked about the appropriateness of a sentence in the third paragraph on page two of the document that states, “An individual who does not qualify for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure shall ordinarily not be considered for tenure.” Through the ensuing committee discussion of Shively’s question, the committee decided that the sentence is acceptable as it is. Sam Catanzaro explained that the vote to promote and

the vote to tenure are two distinct actions. He said an individual could be hired by the University with the rank of Associate Professor but not with tenure. Houston said she learned of such a case involving an individual who was hired into a faculty position already having a number of publications. The department chairperson recommended hiring the individual with tenure and the rank of Associate Professor. The individual ultimately was hired with the rank of Associate Professor but had to wait two years to apply for tenure. Catanzaro also noted the possibility of a faculty member being promoted early without being granted tenure. He said the College of Fine Arts has used this practice to reward faculty members who excelled early in their careers in the college but who were not yet eligible for tenure because there were no provisions for early tenure.

It was noted that the Mennonite CFSC standards do not describe the CFSC. Committee members agreed that such a description is needed to set forth the number of members on the CFSC, eligibility for serving on the CFSC, and terms of service. Committee members agreed to ask Mennonite to add that description, revise any dates cited in the document that need updating, and submit the revised standards to URC for further review.

Dean quickly scanned ASPT standards already reviewed by URC this spring, noting that the College of Education also needs a description of its CFSC membership. She asked Bruce Stoffel to so notify the college about the need for that addition. Catanzaro cautioned that it will not be sufficient for the College of Education to reference the ASPT Policies section regarding CFSC membership (IV.A.1), because that section allows most colleges, including the College of Education, to decide the number of members on its CFSC from a range set forth in the section.

Arrange review of standards submitted by the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Applied Science and Technology (see attached)

Houston and Shively volunteered to review CAST CFSC standards, and Bonnell and Dean volunteered to review CAS CFSC standards. Houston said it would be helpful in reviewing the standards to have a Word version of them. Stoffel said he would email a Word version of the CAST standards to Houston and Shively and a Word version of the CAS standards to Bonnell and Dean.

V. Update re ASPT disciplinary policies: Steps toward implementation

Dean reported that the Caucus completed its review and approval of the disciplinary articles at its March 7, 2018 meeting. She reported that the articles are now being reviewed by Susan Kalter (Caucus chairperson), Catanzaro, and legal counsel to address any concerns legal counsel may have regarding them. Catanzaro said the group has identified several wordings changes it intends to recommend to the Caucus to clarify passages. Only two changes, Catanzaro noted, might be considered substantive by some Caucus members. He reported that Kalter intends to present the proposed revisions to the Caucus in September 2018. He added that President Larry Dietz is waiting for final Caucus action on proposed revisions before approving the articles.

Dean reported having met with Kalter and Catanzaro since the last URC meeting to strategize implementation of the disciplinary articles before and after their January 1, 2019 effective date. Among the issues discussed, Dean said, is the need for Mennonite faculty and Milner Library faculty to each decide whether their college will propose modifications to the disciplinary articles to accommodate the unique organizational structure of their college. Dean said any such modifications are to be submitted to the Caucus through URC. She said she has agreed to contact each college to offer her help and the help of Kalter and Catanzaro with their faculty discussions regarding the disciplinary articles. She said each college will be asked to submit any proposed changes by August 31, 2018.

Dean reported that Catanzaro plans to print a revised ASPT Policies book that incorporates the disciplinary articles, for distribution to faculty by January 2019. Dean noted that if the matter of changes to the articles to accommodate Mennonite or Milner Library has not been resolved by the time the revised book goes to print, any changes subsequently made to the ASPT Policies related to Mennonite or Milner Library will be published as an addendum to the new book. Dean stressed that no one involved in the process should feel rushed to make decisions just to meet a printing deadline.

Dean said another part of the implementation plan is for colleges and departments to make changes to their ASPT standards and guidelines to accommodate and align with the new disciplinary articles. She said URC will need to review and approve any changes made by the colleges to their ASPT standards, while the colleges will need to review any changes made by their departments and schools to their ASPT guidelines. She said Catanzaro is preparing a summary of issues colleges, departments, and schools will need to consider as they review their standards and guidelines for alignment with the new disciplinary articles. Along with that summary, Dean noted, Catanzaro will send the disciplinary articles passed by the Caucus earlier in spring 2018, noting in his message to the units that the Caucus may still make minor changes to the articles in fall 2018. Dean said Catanzaro will send URC a copy of the message he sends to the units. Dean asked if URC wants to do anything to ensure that CFSC reviews of department and school ASPT guidelines occur. Catanzaro suggested that the summary he sends to the colleges, departments, and schools could include a request that CFSCs confirm to URC that they have reviewed ASPT guidelines of their units. Committee members agreed with Catanzaro's suggestion.

Dean said she, Kalter, and Catanzaro have decided to invite colleges to submit their draft CFSC policy revisions to URC in fall 2018 before the colleges vote on them. This would be an optional review, Dean said, intended to prevent colleges from having to poll their faculty multiple times in fall 2018 regarding their CFSC standards. Dean said colleges that want this optional URC review will be asked to submit their draft standards to URC by September 21, 2018 and that URC will, in turn, provide comments to the colleges by October 12, 2018. She added that all colleges, whether submitting their standards for optional URC review, will be asked to complete their faculty vote on their revised standards by November 9, 2018 and to submit them to URC for review and approval. If URC requests any changes that necessitate a subsequent vote by faculty members, those colleges will be asked to have their voting finalized by December 14, 2018.

Dean asked if Catanzaro anticipates department and schools needing to make changes to their ASPT guidelines. Catanzaro responded that departments and schools will most likely just need to reference the disciplinary articles, not remove any provisions from their guidelines. He added that since departments and schools are now being asked to review comporment, they may want to reconsider their recusal policy, perhaps to provide more explicit guidance about situations in which faculty members may want to recuse themselves. Catanzaro said he plans for his summary to include issues units may not be required to address but might want to address. Bonnell noted that URC had talked about other provisions of ASPT policies (i.e., other than the disciplinary articles) that need to be changed as a result of the addition of the disciplinary articles. She asked if any of those additional changes will need to be considered by units. Dean said those related changes will be cited in Catanzaro's summary.

Dean said another aspect of disciplinary articles implementation is training for ASPT committees. Dean said Catanzaro offers ASPT training every year, but this coming year he plans to provide more training sessions. Dean said she, Kalter, and Catanzaro have decided to directly invite each CFSC, DFSC, and SFSC member to ASPT training this coming year rather than rely on chairpersons of those committees to pass word to their members regarding the training. Other training issues discussed, Dean said, include the location and time of the training to best accommodate faculty members' schedules. Topics covered by the training in the coming year, Dean said, will include topics covered by Catanzaro in the past but also the disciplinary articles and equity review. She reported that Catanzaro is surveying ASPT committee members regarding any other topics they would like covered in the sessions. Another new feature of the training, Dean said, is participation by Kalter in her capacity as Caucus chairperson and by a representative of URC (its chairperson, vice-chairperson, or a representative selected by the committee). The intent, she explained, is not to get involved in the training Catanzaro has been providing, rather to impress upon faculty members that development of the disciplinary articles has been driven by faculty requests not by university administration. Dean said it would be appropriate for any URC member and any member of the Faculty Review Committee to attend the sessions as well.

VI. Continued discussion of ad hoc equity review committee recommendations

Dean announced that the results from the recent polling of URC members regarding their availability for a two-hour meeting on April 19 or 26 to discuss equity review were mixed. She asked if committee members would instead be willing to attend two one-hour meetings, held on April 19 and April 26. She suggested inviting Kalter to attend the April 19 session in her capacity as chairperson of the Ad Hoc Committee for ASPT Equity Review

to discuss the ad hoc committee recommendations. At the April 26 meeting, Dean continued, URC members could then discuss the ad hoc equity review committee recommendations among themselves. There were no objections from URC members present. Dean noted that the final URC meeting of the academic year, scheduled for May 3, could then be dedicated to taking stock of committee work completed in 2017-2018, initiatives that will be carried forward to 2018-2019, and new initiatives for 2018-2019.

Dean distributed two documents related to the ad hoc equity review committee: the committee charge and committee recommendations to URC (see attached). Dean asked URC members to review the documents prior to the April 19 URC meeting.

Dean clarified that the URC role in the equity review issue at this time is to review the recommendations made to it by the ad hoc equity review committee and to send its own comments and recommendations to the Caucus regarding the guidelines. Once the Caucus has approved equity review guidelines, URC will be responsible for general oversight of the equity review process, for receiving and reviewing data reports prepared by other parties, and for developing and recommending equity distribution plans to the Caucus, if deemed necessary and appropriate by the committee, in response to equity review findings.

Houston noted that there are many faculty members at the University looking forward to learning more about the equity review initiative. She said it may be helpful for URC members to update faculty in their own colleges and departments regarding both equity review and the disciplinary articles. She said she has done so in her unit. Shively asked Houston if URC members should update faculty members in their units soon or if they should wait until the equity review guidelines are finalized. Houston responded that since the guidelines have not yet been finalized, there is time in the process for feedback from faculty members.

VII. Next meeting

See VI above.

VIII. Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

College Standards Supplemental to University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation, Mennonite College of Nursing at Illinois State University (as approved by URC November 8, 2011)

Illinois State University College of Applied Science and Technology College Faculty Status Committee Standards for Appointment, Salary, Promotion, Tenure, Effective January 1, 2017 (as approved by the College of Applied Science and Technology CFSC on February 22, 2018)

Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Standards, College of Arts and Sciences, January 2019 (as approved by the College of Arts and Sciences CFSC, April 6, 2018)

Ad Hoc Committee for ASPT Equity Review committee charge (n.d.); Memorandum to University Review Committee from Ad Hoc Committee for ASPT Equity Review re recommendations for review and approval (n.d.)

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 Menonite 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.

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
COLLEGE FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE STANDARDS
FOR APPOINTMENT, SALARY, PROMOTION, TENURE
Effective January 1, 2017

Overview

The CFSC for the College of Applied Science and Technology (the College) provides herein a statement of standards that further interpret University ASPT Policies. The Department Faculty Status Committees (DFSCs) and School Faculty Status Committees (SFSCs) in the College have, by majority vote, accepted these standards. The standards are subject to on-going revision and interpretation by the CFSC as inquiries and cases come before the Committee. The CFSC, DFSCs, and SFSCs will follow the guidelines as described in the *Faculty ASPT Policies, January 1, 2017*.

Composition of CFSC

The six elected members of the CFSC must be tenured and hold the minimum rank of Associate Professor. At least three elected members of the CFSC must hold the rank of Professor.

Recusal Policy

The members of the CFSC accept the obligation to render opinions that are derived from the evidence submitted to the committee and that are fair, without prejudice, and based on the appropriate and applicable rules as described in the Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and tenure Policies, effective January 1, 2017. Members of the committee may be present during, and participate in, deliberations in cases where faculty members from the same department or school may be under review, but must recuse themselves from rendering an opinion by voting as to the merit of any case where a faculty from the same department or school is under consideration for tenure or promotion. This recusal policy applies to any and all appeals that may come forward by a member of the faculty.

General Statement on Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College. Documentation submitted for evaluation should provide multiple indicators of teaching quality; one of these must be student reactions to teaching performance. For illustrative examples of teaching activities and evaluation factors that may be used, see pages 60-62 of the *Faculty ASPT Policies, January 1, 2017*.

General Statement on Scholarship

Scholarship is a fundamental responsibility for tenure and promotion considerations. Reviews of scholarly and creative productivity by the CFSC, DFSCs, and SFSCs are broadly defined to recognize scholarship that includes discovery, integration, application and outreach. Evaluation materials should document a scholarly approach to the development, performance and communication of these activities. For illustrative examples of scholarly activities that may be recognized see pages 62-63 of the *Faculty ASPT Policies, January 1, 2017*.

General Statement on Service

Faculty are expected to provide service to their departments, the College, and the University as well as to their professional organizations and practitioners. The applied nature of programs in the College provides multiple opportunities for faculty members to engage in service activities. Service in which faculty members apply their unique expertise to improve professional practice or to enrich community life is highly valued. For illustrative examples of service activities that may be pursued see pages 63-64 of the *Faculty ASPT Policies, January 1, 2017*.

Granting of Tenure

Probationary tenure-track faculty members are responsible for demonstrating that the granting of tenure is warranted through their performance during the probationary period. An annual Performance Review and Department Chair/School Director oversight, through ongoing supervision and communication, will guide probationary faculty members.

To be granted tenure, faculty must document high-quality professional contributions, throughout the probationary period, in all three areas of performance review. Their work should demonstrate a positive impact on teaching, scholarship, and service in their department and discipline. Faculty must show evidence of developing a focused area of scholarly expertise and demonstrate the ability to function as a contributing colleague within the culture of their Department or School College and University. An individual who cannot qualify for promotion to Associate Professor at the time of tenure shall ordinarily not be recommended for tenure.

Promotion In Rank

Associate Professor. Except in unusual circumstances, promotion to this rank will not be granted prior to recommendation for tenure. Earning this rank requires a level of accomplishment that is expected to take most entry-level faculty members six years to achieve.

Specifically, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires a high level of competence as a teacher. Successful candidates for promotion to Associate Professor will document an ability to teach courses important to the department's mission. They will have a record of high quality teaching. They will have contributed to curriculum development in their department, demonstrated good mentoring of students in and out of the classroom, and/or demonstrated an ability to help students apply theory to practice. Successful candidates for Associate Professor must document scholarly accomplishments that include, among other scholarly and creative activities, peer reviewed publications and a developing, focused area of scholarship. These accomplishments must establish a level of expertise recognized at least at the regional level by their colleagues in higher education and/or industry. Successful candidates for Associate Professor must document significant departmental service and active involvement in College, University and discipline based service activities. Documentation of high quality teaching and scholarly productivity is more critical to being promoted to Associate Professor than service.

Professor. This is the highest rank faculty may earn and it is not attained solely by time as an Associate Professor. Successful candidates must demonstrate teaching, research, and service accomplishments that exceed minimal criteria for satisfactory annual performance. Successful candidates for this rank will provide evidence of continuing high quality teaching and significant participation in their Department/School teaching mission, which may include involving students

in their area of scholarship, influencing curriculum development in their department, and/or mentoring junior faculty. Successful candidates for Professor will document their expertise and scholarship are important to society or to the work of other scholars and/or the practices and policies of their professional area. Successful candidates for Professor will document that their provision of service is meaningful and has had a demonstrable impact to their Department or School, College, University, professional organizations and/or society. Promotion to this rank requires sustained accomplishments across all three areas of performance review over a significant period of time. Successful candidates for Professor must be truly outstanding in at least one area of performance review.

Candidates submitting materials for promotion to Professor are encouraged to include written evaluations from peer evaluators external to ISU who are qualified to comment on contributions to the discipline. The strongest evidence of performance in the area of scholarship and creative activity comes from one's peers within the discipline. Generally, those who can best judge the quality of such work are those who have similar academic interests and work outside of this University. On the other hand, the best evaluations of the quality of a faculty member's teaching and service are peers within the academic department.

Salary Incrementation

Department/School policies must maintain the ability to make significantly different awards for differential performance.

Departments/Schools may not develop policies that circumvent the need to make salary incrementation awards to faculty members based on performance in the three areas of performance review.

Procedures

Faculty members are responsible for submitting their documentation for performance, promotion or tenure evaluation. They must submit their documentation in the CFSC required formats and must include all files requested and all teaching performance data that is required by the College. DFSC/SFSC reports on each candidate for tenure and promotion are to be submitted on the form provided by the CFSC and should be accompanied by the files requested.

Review of DFSC/SFSC Policies and Procedures

The CFSC is responsible for reviewing and approving the criteria developed by each DFSC/SFSC. At a minimum, these criteria must implement the ASPT Policies as well as the CFSC Standards.

Approved by the CFSC April 4, 2005

Approved by the College DFSCs and SFSCs April 14, 2005

Approved by the URC August 30, 2005

Approved by the CFSC November 13, 2009

Approved by the CFSC October 21, 2011

Approved by the CFSC February 22, 2018

FACULTY APPOINTMENT, SALARY, PROMOTION, AND TENURE (ASPT) STANDARDS

College of Arts and Sciences

January 2019

The College of Arts and Sciences is committed to a system of faculty evaluation and compensation that promotes the highest quality professional work by faculty. The College standards are meant to encourage departments/schools to set high expectations for faculty performance and to offer appropriate rewards to faculty based upon their accomplishments in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service that genuinely advance the mission of the department/school, College, and the University.

The most important principle of effective faculty evaluation is peer review. The strongest evidence of performance in the area of scholarship and creative activity comes from one's peers within the discipline. Generally, the best judges of the quality of such work are those who have similar academic interests and whose judgments influence dissemination in appropriate scholarly or creative venues. The best evaluators of the quality of a faculty member's teaching and service are peers within the academic department.

CFSC POLICIES

The College Faculty Status Committee (CFSC) shall be composed of the Dean of the College, who is an ex officio voting member and six members of the College faculty who represent the three groups (Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Social Sciences, Humanities). Each group has two members elected for two-year staggered terms. No Department/School can have more than one representative. All members of the committee must hold tenure. College Council members shall not be eligible to serve. No faculty member may serve more than two consecutive terms. Faculty members may serve on only one ASPT committee at a time (URC, FRC, CFSC, D/SFSC).

CFSC members may participate in, be present at, and vote in ASPT deliberations (including appeals) involving individuals from their own departments/schools. However, requests to have a CFSC member recused (regardless of Departmental/School affiliation of the member) can be made by the applicant or by the Chair/Director/DFSC/SFSC of the Department/School. Persons making such a request must provide the Dean a brief written explanation. These requests will be considered by the Dean and the CFSC on a case-by-case basis. A CFSC member may recuse herself/himself at any time but should not provide an explanation for his or her recusal. Individuals may not serve on CFSC the year they are being considered for Tenure, Promotion, Distinguished or University Professor.

PROMOTION AND TENURE

Evaluation of the professional performance of faculty cannot be reduced to simple numeric standards. D/SFSCs and the CFSC must make judgments about the overall quality of a candidate's performance in accordance with the unit's "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" standards as these committees make

recommendation on promotion and tenure. Given these assumptions, the following standards should apply in considering all applications for promotion and tenure within the College:

To qualify for promotion and tenure, a faculty member must exhibit sustained and consistent high quality performance in all faculty roles.

1. Each candidate for promotion or tenure must present evidence of high quality achievements in teaching. Evidence of high quality teaching must include a statement that addresses the candidate's teaching philosophy and goals, as well as examples of course materials (e.g., syllabi, selected assignments). It is the responsibility of the Chair/Director to provide a summary of systematically gathered student reactions to teaching performance, with results placed in the context of departmental norms.
2. Each candidate for promotion or tenure must present high-quality scholarly or creative works. These works may have appeared in any medium, but the scholarly or creative works will have been subject to external peer review appropriate to the discipline. Successful scholarly or creative records normally also include additional evidence of scholarly productivity demonstrated by activities such as conference papers, performances, invited addresses or funded external grants. Evidence of high quality scholarly or creative works should include a statement that addresses how the work contributes to the discipline and plans for future work.
3. Each candidate for promotion or tenure must present evidence of service activities that advance the mission of the department, college, university, discipline, or community.
4. The scholarship or creative work of each candidate for promotion or tenure will be evaluated by at least three and no more than six scholars from his or her discipline and external to Illinois State University. The external reviewers should be at or above the rank that the candidate is seeking and should not be former mentors, former students, spouses or significant others, co-authors, or co-investigators on grants. Guidelines for conducting the review will be developed by each Department/School and added to the Department/School's ASPT document.
5. The College regards the customary six-year probationary period in rank as an opportunity to observe a candidate's sustained performance in teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service before awarding promotion and tenure. Early promotion and tenure is unusual in the College and shall occur only when the candidate has exhibited an extraordinary scholarly record, an exceptional record of teaching performance, and appropriate service.
6. Each candidate for tenure will undergo a mid-probationary tenure review conducted by the D/SFSC in the candidate's third or fourth year in order to assess the candidate's progress toward tenure.

Written departmental assignments for faculty may emphasize one of the faculty roles over others for purposes of evaluation. However, all candidates for promotion and tenure must have a record that includes peer-reviewed scholarly or creative works, and strong teaching.

To ensure uniformity in the presentation of information on candidates for promotion or tenure, all D/SFSCs shall utilize the College format for documentation of promotion and tenure cases.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Departmental/School guidelines for the annual performance review of faculty should reflect the strategic directions and values of the Department/School. These guidelines should be designed to recognize faculty contributions in both short-term and long-term performance.

Faculty's overall annual performance will be evaluated in accordance with "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" standards developed by each Department/School's Faculty Status Committee (D/SFSC). Departments/Schools may choose to provide separate assessments of faculty performance in each evaluation category (teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service) as either "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory," but must provide an overall assessment of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." In addition, a separate interim appraisal of the faculty member's progress towards tenure and/or promotion must be included (see VII.E., p.23 in the University ASPT policies).

Annual performance review of faculty should be consistent with the annual assignment letters provided to each faculty member by the Chair/Director. Assignment letters should include information on the faculty member's teaching load for the year, the amount of time assigned to scholarly and creative activities, and any other assignments expected to utilize significant portions of a faculty member's time.

SALARY REVIEW

Annual salary review should be directed toward ensuring that faculty salaries are consistent with performance and contributions to the department, in both the short term and the long term. The Chair/Director serves as chair of the D/SFSC and is responsible with presenting to the D/SFSC a set of recommendations regarding the distribution of salary increment funds. The D/SFSC is responsible for input and final approval of salary recommendations.

The College Standards were approved by a majority vote of the Departments/Schools, March 27, 2018.

The College Standards were approved by the CFSC, April 6, 2018.

The College Standards were approved by the University Review Committee, [enter date].

AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR ASPT EQUITY REVIEW

Membership: Three (3) Faculty (as defined in ASPT policy), elected by the Faculty Caucus
Member, Faculty Caucus, elected by the Faculty Caucus
Member, University Review Committee, elected by the URC
Chairperson, Faculty Caucus, or designee
Chairperson, University Review Committee, or designee
Ex Officio, non-voting: Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity, Ethics, and Access
Ex Officio, non-voting: Assistant Vice President for Academic Administration
Ex Officio, non-voting: representative from the Office of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis

Functions: The committee will:

1. Elect a faculty chairperson and a secretary.
2. Create a scope, framework, schedule, repeatable cycle, and office(s) and/or departments of lead responsibility whereby internal equity information would be reported to the URC.
 - a. In determining scope, the committee will define the types of equity that can reasonably be studied
 - b. In determining scope, the committee will define the areas of ASPT jurisdiction regarding which equity can reasonably be studied, whether or not short-term adjustment may be possible
3. Forward recommendations for review and approval by the URC (who will then forward the original or revised recommendations to the Faculty Caucus for review and approval).
4. Other tasks as assigned by the University Review Committee.

Reporting: To the University Review Committee and the Faculty Caucus.

Executive Committee recommendations regarding ASPT equity reviews:

The Executive Committee makes the following recommendations to the Faculty Caucus regarding the equity review called for in ASPT policy, Article II.D.

1. We recommend the formation of a Senate “task force” (ad hoc mixed committee) to create a scope, framework, schedule, and office(s) and/or departments of lead responsibility whereby internal equity information would be reported to the URC.
2. Ideally, this *temporary* Senate external committee would create a schedule that divides the work of studying equity into manageable annual reports, each focusing on a distinct matter or matters over a five-year repeatable cycle.
3. In determining scope, the committee would need to define two main areas:
 - a. The types of equity that can reasonably be studied: e.g. gender equity, equity with respect to race/ethnicity; equity with regard to disability status; equity with regard to country of origin,

equity with regard to sexual orientation, equity with regard to marital status, climate with regard to religion, climate with regard to military/non-military affiliation, age-ism, compression/inversion, etc.

- b. The areas of ASPT jurisdiction regarding which equity can reasonably be studied and adjusted: e.g. salary; appointment, non-reappointment, achievement of tenure, tenure denial, achievement of first promotion, retention & attrition/resignation at the junior level; achievement of second promotion, mid-level post-tenure review, retention & attrition/resignation at the mid-level; distribution of assignments within departments, workload issues; performance evaluation criteria & processes; retention and attrition/pre-retirement resignation at the senior level.
 - c. The committee might also need to look at:
 - i. What conversations are happening nationally
 - ii. What else is happening locally at ISU that may need consideration
4. Selection of membership on the ad hoc committee:
- a. Three faculty members from an at-large pool of all faculty covered by ASPT policy: The Senate office will send out to FAC-L a call for faculty volunteers with skills related to equity review studies who can best help build the scope, framework, annual schedule and five-year cycle, and identify the administrative experts and department-sourced data needed to complete the annual reports. This call for faculty volunteers will require the submission of a one-page CV and a statement of qualifications. (We would ask volunteers to describe their skill set/qualifications as they see fit to define it rather than giving any list of skills needed. The Caucus would receive those and vote for members it deems best fitted to the tasks.)
 - b. Ex-officio members of the committee will be: the Senate chairperson (voting), the URC chairperson (voting), the OEOEA director (non-voting), the Assistant/Associate Vice President for Academic Administration (non-voting), a PRPA representative (non-voting).
 - c. One additional faculty Senator and one additional URC member will serve as voting members.
5. We recommend that receipt of reports and general oversight of conducting of the equity reviews as well as development of appropriate equity re-distribution plans in response to reports/findings remain the responsibility of URC, with periodic reports to the Faculty Caucus and approval of proposed equity re-distribution plans by Caucus and the President, as in current policy.
6. We recommend that the ad hoc mixed committee either be disbanded once the scope, framework, schedule, and offices have been determined or filled only once every five years to review the previously established scope, etc. for possible adjustments as needed.
7. The initial recommendations of the committee will be reviewed and approved by the URC and forwarded to the Faculty Caucus for review and approval; subsequent revisions shall follow the same process.

To: University Review Committee

From: Ad Hoc Committee for ASPT Equity Review

Re: Recommendations for review and approval

Dear members of the University Review Committee,

In Spring 2016, the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate approved the formation of an ad hoc committee for ASPT Equity Review. The charge of this committee was to “create a scope, framework, schedule, repeatable cycle, and office(s) and/or departments of lead responsibility whereby internal equity information would be reported to the URC” according to ASPT policy II.D. Seating of the committee was delayed for one year while a search for a new Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access was conducted and the new director brought onboard at ISU. The committee met in Fall 2017 and Spring 2018. Below we briefly summarize our specific recommendations to the URC regarding ASPT policy II.D. and related aspects of equity among faculty; recommendations as to our charge regarding ASPT policy II.D. are expanded upon in the “Proposed Scope of Each Year’s Equity Study” that follows this cover memo.

Brief policy history note

Since the formation of the ad hoc committee, research into the archives of the University’s shared governance system has confirmed that Article II.D originated in part and possibly in large part due to concerns regarding equity as it relates to affirmative action. These concerns regarding equal opportunity and access were also the main focus of the 2017-18 ad hoc committee’s work.

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

Details of this repeatable cycle and schedule may be found on the subsequent pages.

We recommend that by the end of each five-year cycle, the URC scrutinize and reassess the specific elements within the cycle with an eye toward adjusting processes, eliminating portions of the study that appear not fruitful, and/or calling for another ad hoc committee to adjust the schedule and its contents.

ASPT policy gives the URC the authority to conduct equity reviews, which by their nature involve the handling of sensitive information. The ad hoc committee discussed and reaffirmed the sense that the URC is authorized to receive this information because they are specifically charged to carry out II.D and they are held to a standard of confidentiality by ASPT policy, being expected to deliberate about the information in closed session when warranted. In addition, we agreed that for all recommendations within the “Proposed scope of each year’s equity study” that entail the use of various sensitive categories, controls, and intersections, Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis will need to consult with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access, with Legal Counsel, and with the URC regarding how to protect individual identities in association with confidentially disclosed information from being revealed to URC, CFSC, or DFSC members or the faculty at large who are not authorized by ASPT policy or by law to have access to them.

Consideration of equity outside the policy history and framework

Given that the Spring 2016 Faculty Caucus also expressed concerns regarding equity not specifically related to equal opportunity and access as defined in Policy 1.1 Equal Opportunity / Non-Discrimination, the committee would like to make specific remark regarding its discussions of internal compression and inversion (often thought of as the *totality* of internal equity rather than just a portion) as well as competitiveness of salaries and promotional increments in the national and international academic arena (sometimes thought of as external equity).

The committee chose not to include these two priority items within the scope of the equity studies to be performed under ASPT Article II.D. Again, these items relate to 1) competitiveness and retention success in faculty salaries and 2) internal compression and inversion not related to OEOA considerations. The committee strongly feels that these two items require the *ongoing* attention of the URC and the administration, either yearly or every other year. As an institution, we lack competitiveness in faculty salaries at the associate and full professor levels, and likely at the advanced assistant level. We are therefore at a disadvantage when attempting to employ a full range of retention strategies. Given the cost of faculty searches as documented in the URC’s recent white paper on performance increments that resulted in an adjustment in January 2018, we encourage that a high priority of the administration should be to keep starting assistant professor salaries at or above the median for comparator institutions and to adjust associate and full professor salaries gradually so that they rise to a level at or above the median for comparator institutions. This would include attention to overall annual salary increases by the administration. It would also require that the URC give attention to ASPT Article XII.A.5 (January 1, 2017 version) more frequently than during the five-year comprehensive revisions of ASPT policy.

More detailed comparison to each discipline’s medians at comparator institutions should occur at least once every five years; these should either be provided to department by the administration, or vice versa where publicly and easily available to department chairs.

We would also emphasize that internal compression and national comparator adjustments should not be distributed only to those faculty already receiving salary increments based upon placement in the *highest* merit categories, but be distributed across *all* merit categories in appropriate proportions, particularly given the impact of a recent series of years of low to no raise increments.

To emphasize, we strongly encourage the URC and the administration to continue to monitor the competitiveness of our promotional increments and to adjust these increments routinely rather than once every five years (or even less frequently). When doing so, we recommend that attention be paid to avoiding

unintended compression and inversion impacts, particularly upon full professors both recently promoted and holding many years in rank. This will be especially important for departments with a significant proportion of full professors where built-in ASPT salary increments for equity are less likely to cover the need for case-by-case adjustment.

Consideration of faculty equity outside of the ASPT system

The ad hoc committee also discussed whether non-tenure-line faculty salaries or other factors should be included in any equity study. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill included such faculty in their salary study. Given that we believe there to be differences in the gender and racial/ethnic makeup of our non-tenure-line faculty compared to our tenure-line faculty (for example, fewer international faculty, fewer faculty of color, and/or more women), the committee felt that these salaries and demographics may deserve study. However, we determined such study beyond the scope of the ad hoc committee and the URC given that this faculty does not fall under the jurisdiction of ASPT policy. We look forward to the Faculty Caucus considering the issue, including how salaries and other factors for non-tenure-line faculty and other instructors may impact ASPT faculty.

Proactive approaches to equity in equal opportunity and access

Finally, we bring it to the attention of the URC that the URC can help D/SFSCs mitigate against unconscious bias in the performance review processes and other ASPT processes without waiting for the results of these equity studies under ASPT II.D. The existing literature on human resources recruitment and retention, faculty recruitment and retention, and recruitment and retention of faculty in specific disciplines, as well as the findings and recommendations from other institutions surveyed by the ad hoc committee (University of California, Berkeley; UNC-Chapel Hill; University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; University of Michigan) could be of assistance.

The committee discussed at some length as well the distribution of supportive goods within departments, within colleges, and among colleges. While we ultimately determined that such goods (graduate assistant support; release time; course load; service load; recruitment into internal departmental administrative roles; “quiet” support such as requests for seed support from Foundation funds; distribution of assignments and/or workloads within departments such as number of graduate students and/or teacher candidates supervised, etc.) did not fall directly within ASPT jurisdiction, they could have a significant impact upon salary distribution and promotional success. We encourage the URC to discuss whether it might be able to issue guidance, recommend changes to the collection templates for annual faculty productivity reports, and/or encourage the promulgation of policy by departments regarding fair and equitable distribution of such goods. Uniform data collection regarding such distributions would be difficult, but local and college level analyses could be fruitful in identifying structural inequities. We call the committee’s attention specifically to the University of California, Berkeley’s report, pages 57-61.

The URC can help to set a tone of attention to equity through possible policy changes as well as through recommendations and/or mandates regarding evaluative procedures for D/SFSCs and CFSCs.

Proposed scope of each year's equity study
Based on ASPT equity ad hoc committee's discussions

Year one:

Salary, with each faculty member's monthly salary adjusted into an annual standard for ease of analysis and layperson comprehension, broken out by the following 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 from each 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 and 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)

Type:

- a. snapshot in time rather than longitudinal
- b. two key sub-models:
 - i. controlled for experience, field and rank
 - ii. same without controlling for rank
- c. total population model (for example, large, high-paid colleges that throw our data off can be excluded in a not-total-population model)
- d. white-male model with possible sub-models (for example, compared to all-women and compared to all-faculty-of-color) as determined by URC and PRPA

Following receipt of the raw and intersectional data by URC, URC will need to work with CFSCs to combine the results of the multiple regression analyses with assessment of individual faculty performance. This is not a URC-level endeavor, but a CFSC-level endeavor, with CFSCs reporting back to the URC regarding findings and corrective steps if identified.

A few studies from other universities that the ad hoc committee examined show the percent distribution of male/female, race/ethnic identity across departments. The Academic Planning Committee and PRPA already currently track this type of data in a different way through Academic Program Profiles and the APC encourages diversification plans; however, seeing concentrations comparatively on one graph may be informative to considerations of how work environment may be affecting outcomes.

Year two

Quantitative analysis of conditions or dynamics from appointment through tenure; longitudinal; no controls for departmental affiliation in year two, judgment of URC and the administration in years seven and beyond

The Provost's office and PRPA, and OEOA if necessary, will work together to provide the URC with data related to successful tenure cases and promotions to associate professor, time-to-tenure-and-promotion, non-reappointments, tenure denials, and resignations/retirements prior to tenure-and-promotion.

UID scope: All persons appointed without tenure between the earliest year reasonably available and the current or previous year during which the data is being collected, whether still at ISU or not. A minimum of one decade of appointments should be represented during the year two study, fifteen years during year seven, and twenty years in subsequent cycle years

Once the raw data regarding how many persons were appointed without tenure over the study period has been collected, it will be broken out by overall percent within the subcategories of each of these categories: gender, race/ethnicity, disability status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. For gender, disability status, military/non-military, and age, these categories and subcategories will be defined here at minimum as "at the time of hire" and "at the time of the study or last year tracked if non-reappointed/tenure denied/resigned/retired."

The URC will also be provided with the overall percentage of the total appointed who have been tenured/promoted. Within the subset of those tenured/promoted, percentages will be provided according to gender, race/ethnicity, disability status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. Time to tenure-and-promotion will also be provided, both overall and broken out according to gender, etc.

The URC will be provided with the overall percentage of the total appointed who have been non-reappointed. Within non-reappointments, percentages will be provided according to gender, race/ethnicity, disability, status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. Time to non-reappointment will also be provided, both overall and broken out according to gender, etc.

The URC will be provided with the overall percentage of the total appointed who were denied tenure upon applying for it. Within non-reappointments due to tenure denial, percentages will be provided according to gender, race/ethnicity, disability, status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. Time to tenure denial will also be provided, both overall and broken out according to gender, etc.

The URC will be provided finally with the overall percent of the total appointed who resigned/retired prior to tenure/first promotion. Within those resignations/retirements, percentages will be provided according to gender, race/ethnicity, disability, status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. Time to resignation/retirement will also be provided, both overall and broken out according to gender, etc.

Year three

Quantitative analysis of conditions or dynamics from tenure through resignation/retirement; longitudinal

The Provost's office and PRPA, and OEOA if necessary, will work together to provide the URC with data related to successful promotions to full professor, time-to-promotion to full professor, resignations/retirements prior to promotion to full professor, and time-to-resignation/retirement prior to promotion to full professor.

UID scope: All persons tenured or hired with tenure between the earliest year reasonably available and the current or previous year during which the data is being collected, whether still at ISU or not. A minimum of one decade of hiring should be represented during the year three study, fifteen years during year eight, and twenty years in subsequent cycle years.

Once the raw data regarding how many persons were tenured or hired with tenure over the study period has been collected, it will be broken out by overall percent within the subcategories of each of these categories: gender, race/ethnicity, disability status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. For gender, disability status, military/non-military, and age, these categories and subcategories will be defined here at minimum as "at the time of tenuring/appointment with tenure" and "at the time of the study or last year tracked if resigned/retired."

The URC will also be provided with the overall percent of the total who have been promoted to full professor and/or appointed at full professor at or after the year of eligibility. Within the subset of those promoted to full professor, percentages will be provided according to gender, race/ethnicity, disability, status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age. The time to promotion to full, both overall and broken out according to gender, race/ethnicity, etc will also be provided. For those eligible to be promoted who have not yet been promoted but remain employed at ISU, the overall and broken down percentages will be provided along with the number of years since tenure/appointment with tenure.

In addition, the overall percent of the total who resigned/retired prior to second promotion and the time between tenure/appointment with tenure and resignation will be provided. Within this subset of resignations/retirements prior to promotion to full professor, the percentages according to gender, race/ethnicity, disability, status, country of origin, military/non-military, and age will be provided.

Year four

Two simple studies will be performed:

- 1) The Provost's office will provide data on the percentage of faculty members receiving unsatisfactory ratings from DFSCs as compared to the total ASPT faculty, and will further break this data out by gender, race/ethnicity, etc. (according to our year one scope). It will compare this broken-out data to the total ISU tenure-line population to see if there are patterns of disproportionality such as would be analogous to studies in K-12 education that have found that the race/ethnicity and gender of students suspended is disproportionately African American males. If year nine data yields no remarkable results, this study might not need to be repeated in year fourteen, year nineteen, etc. The intention of this study will be to examine the success/failure of our system of rewards, including merit-based salary increments, formative feedback, and other factors intended to encourage successful faculty productivity outcomes.
- 2) Starting in FY19, the Provost's office will ask chairs/directors to provide data regarding all persons who leave a faculty role for positions outside of the University, with or without a request for a counteroffer, and regarding the percentage of any counteroffer in relation to current salary for all faculty who received a counteroffer, coded by whether they stayed at ISU or were not retained. This data will be collected and in year four will be provided to the URC. It will be broken down by department and by gender, race/ethnicity, etc. (according to our year one scope). These two break downs need not be intersected if to do so would reveal confidential personnel information. Records of institutions to whom we have lost faculty may also be of interest in formulating optimum retention strategies for ISU. The intention of this study will be to examine the success/failure of our efforts to retain faculty and the ability of ISU to offer competitive salaries.

Year five

Study of sanctions/suspension/dismissal outcomes

The Provost's office will provide the overall percentage of faculty members sanctioned/suspended/dismissed (in the aggregate, with dismissals not separated from suspensions, suspensions not separated from sanctions) as compared to the total ASPT faculty.

It will also provide data regarding how the persons discipline break down by gender, race/ethnicity, etc., according to our year one scope.

Intersections here (e.g. white male, black female, disabled older-than-peers faculty member) will be provided.

These statistics will be reported confidentially to the URC in the aggregate, not broken down by college or department, in order to protect the identities of disciplined faculty. According to proposed Article XII.A.7, confidential reports of disciplinary actions will also be submitted annually by the Provost to the URC. However, such annual reports may or may not include data related to equal opportunity and access considerations, so may not related directly to these year-five studies.