

**UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
Illinois State University

Thursday, April 19, 2018  
3 p.m., Hovey 102

**MINUTES**

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

Members not present: Angela Bonnell, 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; “SFSC” refers to school faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT Policies of Illinois State University; “PRPA” refers to the Office of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis 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 3:05 p.m. A quorum was present.

II. Recommendations to URC from the Ad Hoc Committee for ASPT Equity Review:  
Conversation with committee chairperson Dr. Susan Kalter

Dean introduced the primary topic of the meeting, recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Committee for ASPT Equity Review to URC, in advance of committee chairperson Susan Kalter joining the meeting to discuss the recommendations. Dean noted that she, Doris Houston, and Sam Catanzaro served on the committee and can also provide insights regarding committee recommendations.

Dean said this meeting is an opportunity for Kalter to review the report compiled by the ad hoc equity review committee (see attached) with URC members and for URC members to ask questions of Kalter regarding the report. Dean said that at the next URC meeting URC members will consider the information provided by Kalter and discuss the recommendations among themselves. Dean explained that the role of URC vis-à-vis equity review at this time is to review the committee report, formulate comments and recommendations to the Caucus regarding the report, and submit them to the Caucus for its consideration. She explained that once the Caucus approves an equity review plan, URC will be responsible for implementing it. For that reason, she said, URC members have to make sure they are comfortable with the plan and the ability of URC to implement it. URC will work with other entities to do so, Dean said, explaining that URC will be responsible for oversight of the implementation process. Dean stressed that she does not want URC members to feel pressured to submit recommendations to the Caucus this spring. She explained that planning for data gathering can still begin this spring even if approval of the equity review recommendations by the Caucus does not occur until fall. She reported that she is arranging a meeting with Kalter, Catanzaro, and the director of the Office of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis to discuss how data will be compiled. Catanzaro suggested asking Kalter if the Caucus could finalize the disciplinary articles before it considers the equity review recommendations, given the work that will need to be done in fall 2018 to prepare for implementation of the disciplinary articles. Dean agreed.

Dean noted that one issue the ad hoc committee did not discuss was equity review distribution plans, even though the final committee report references such plans. She noted that the only guidance regarding this matter is in the ad hoc equity review committee charge, which states that development of appropriate equity re-distribution plans is the responsibility of URC, which is to recommend such plans to the Caucus and the President for their approval. She cited salary inequities as one circumstance in which an equity distribution plan may be needed. She said if the salary study conducted in the first year of the five-year study cycle concludes that inequities exist, URC will work with the academic units in which the inequities are identified to understand the reasons for them. But aside from that review, the ad hoc equity review committee report does not provide URC guidance as to how inequities are to be addressed.

Catanzaro said that although he missed some meetings of the ad hoc equity review committee, he too does not recall any conversations and did not read anything in meeting materials regarding equity distribution plans. He explained that ASPT policies provide for decisions by ASPT committees regarding how salary increment funds are to be distributed. If inequities are found to exist in a department, Catanzaro asked, where will the funds come from to address them; should URC ask departments to expend all of their annual salary increment pools (provided for in ASPT Policies and allocated by the Provost) to address the inequities?

Rachel Shively asked if analyses across categories like gender are to involve comparisons across the University or just within units of the University. Catanzaro explained that data for the entire University are included in the salary database but there is a control variable for rank. He cautioned that URC should carefully select control variables so the model does not collapse under its own weight. He explained that one of his roles is to help persons involved with equity review understand how equity review works, if not statistically then conceptually.

Kalter joined the meeting at 3:20 p.m. Persons present introduced themselves. Dean updated Kalter regarding the committee discussion of the equity review report thus far. She noted that one request of URC members is for the Caucus to finalize the disciplinary articles before the Caucus finalizes the equity review plan. Kalter said that is her intent.

Kalter then reviewed the proposed scope of equity review during each year of the five-year equity review cycle. The ad hoc equity review committee divided review activities across five years, she said, so equity review would be more manageable. She noted that the schedule of equity review studies is based in part on what other universities have done.

Kalter first discussed the salary study scheduled for the first year of the five-year cycle. She reported that the ad hoc equity review committee had lengthy discussions regarding this component. One issue discussed is whether data regarding disability status could be collected. Another, she said, is country of origin; because that information will not be available for the analysis, the committee had to settle for data regarding continent of origin, which may not be particularly meaningful for the analysis. Kalter explained that URC should feel free to recommend any other factors URC might find useful, noting that it might not be possible for PRPA to provide some types of data due to confidentiality concerns. Kalter then reviewed controls recommended by the ad hoc equity review committee for the salary study, noting that most other universities conducting equity review used such controls. She also noted that there are different types of models that can be run to analyze the salary data. She concluded her overview of the salary study by noting that URC will need to work with CFSCs once salary data have been compiled to determine how those data relate to performance evaluation outcomes.

Kalter then discussed the second year study, which, she said is intended to probe the quantitative dynamics of the tenure and promotion processes. She noted that qualitative analysis is not part of the methodology. Among the questions to be studied in the second year of the cycle are how many faculty members leave the University during the tenure or promotion processes, why faculty members leave before their probationary period has elapsed, and whether there is disproportionate representation among those who leave.

Kalter continued with an overview of the study proposed for the third year of the cycle. She explained that the ad hoc equity review committee had considered studying the dynamics of two post-tenure-decision levels: what happens from the time of tenure to the time of promotion to Professor and what happens from the time of promotion to Professor to retirement; the equity review committee instead decided to collapse those two levels into one.

The proposed year four study, Kalter explained, involves two simpler studies: one involves studying data provided by the Provost regarding unsatisfactory performance ratings, particularly studying the data by equal opportunity categories to search for patterns of disproportionality; the second study examines data provided by chairpersons and directors regarding resignations and counteroffers. Among the questions to be addressed, she said, are who asks for counteroffers, who receives them, and whether counteroffers are successful in retaining faculty members. Other questions to be probed, Kalter said, are what happens to faculty members who do not ask for a counteroffer, what percentage of salary does the counteroffer constitute, and whether the University is losing faculty members because they prefer to work in larger cities or at other Research II universities.

Kalter ended her overview of the five-year cycle with a description of the report proposed for the fifth year of the cycle. She said the fifth-year report is intended to document what is going on with the disciplinary articles once they are in place. She explained that the study will document the number of sanctions, suspensions, and dismissal cases and their outcomes. She noted that the disciplinary articles provide for URC receiving annual reports from the Provost regarding disciplinary cases, however the data provided by the Provost will not necessarily be disaggregated by affirmative action categories.

Kalter then offered comments regarding the memorandum used by the ad hoc equity review committee to transmit the committee recommendations to URC.

Kalter noted that there had been discussion among Caucus members whether the equity review study should address inversion and compression. Some Caucus members, she said, wanted the study to address inversion and compression issues in addition to equal opportunity issues while other Caucus members only wanted the study to address equal opportunity. The decision was made, Kalter said, to review equity only from the perspective of equal opportunity matters. This approach, she noted, is consistent with the focus of equity review at the time it was introduced into ASPT policies in the 1970s. That said, Kalter continued, the ad hoc equity review committee recommends that the administration continue to monitor inversion and compression. She noted Joe Goodman's work on behalf of URC that led to increases in salary increments associated with promotion, adding that those increments should be monitored regularly for their competitiveness.

Another major issue of discussion by the ad hoc equity review committee, Kalter said, was whether the equity review study should investigate salaries of non-tenure track faculty members, as the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill has done. She reported that the ad hoc committee decided not to study non-tenure track faculty salaries because they are not covered by ASPT Policies. Nonetheless, Kalter added, the ad hoc equity review committee wants the Caucus to study how salaries of non-tenure track faculty members may impact salaries of faculty members who are subject to ASPT Policies.

Kalter added that the ad hoc equity review committee has cited numerous actions URC can take to promote equity from the perspective of equal opportunity and access even before URC has data to review. Kalter cited as examples providing guidance to units regarding templates used to collect information for faculty productivity reports and studying distribution of goods that support faculty, such as graduate assistantships, even though their allocation is not under the direct jurisdiction of ASPT Policies.

Shively said she remembers an observation documented in findings of the recent cultural climate survey that faculty members of color are often called upon to serve on multiple committees to provide the perspective of persons of color. Shively asked if the ad hoc equity review committee had looked into the issue of service load resulting from such requests. Kalter responded that the issue of service load was noted by the ad hoc equity review committee but was not studied at length. Dean reminded Kalter that the Caucus had asked URC to consider the issue of service load, but URC has been unable to do so given the work it has had with the disciplinary acts and other matters. Kalter said she figures service load is a more granular issue that is difficult to capture and suggested that it might be appropriate for colleges to ask their departments to look into the issue. Shively said URC could suggest that the colleges do so. Catanzaro agreed. He added that URC might seek ways to mentor faculty in learning how to say no to excessive service requests and might also seek ways to mentor chairpersons in making service assignments fairly and responsibly.

Kalter ended her overview by urging URC to look critically at the ad hoc equity review committee recommendations, adding that no one will be offended if URC suggests changes. That is the role of URC, she noted. Dean thanked Kalter for that freedom.

Dean asked if URC members had any other questions for Kalter. Kevin Edwards asked about URC monitoring of inversion and compression every year. Kalter suggested that URC could include review of salary increments related to promotion on a list of issues to periodically consider, to keep those increments current and competitive. She said it is clear to her that the Provost is concerned about inversion and compression as a phenomenon even though there may not be money to address it. Kalter added that the ad hoc equity review committee noted that inversion and compression is not addressed in Section II.D, however the committee wants URC to continue thinking about the phenomenon and how URC might guide departments when making equity adjustments for their faculty members.

Edwards and Sheryl Jenkins left the meeting at 4 p.m.

Kalter noted that DFSCs at the University take different approaches to the question whether a faculty member who is not performing at the level of their colleagues should receive an equity adjustment to their salary. Kalter said while it may be preferable to allow those different approaches across the system, doing so may further inconsistencies across the University. That is why URC needs to work with units on salary equity, Dean observed.

III. Review of CFSC standards

Dean tabled review of CFSC standards submitted by the College of Applied Science and Technology and the College of Arts and Sciences until the next URC meeting (scheduled for 2 p.m., April 26, 2018, Hovey 102).

IV. Other

There was no other business to come before the committee.

V. Adjournment

Smelser moved that the meeting adjourn. Goodman seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sheryl Jenkins, Secretary

Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

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.)

## 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.