

**UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
Illinois State University

Thursday, April 26, 2018  
2 p.m., Hovey 102

**MINUTES**

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

Members not present: Michael Byrns

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; and “ad hoc equity review committee” and “equity review committee” refer 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

Joe Goodman moved approval of the agenda as distributed prior to the meeting. Sarah Smelser seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

III. Review of CFSC standards

College of Applied Science and Technology (see attached)

Shively asked committee members about three passage of the CAST standards: “Composition of CFSC”; the sentence on page three of the document that states, “Promotion to rank requires sustained accomplishments across all three areas of performance review over a significant period of time”; and the sentence on page three of the document that states, “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.” With respect to each, Shively asked committee members if the passage should be clearer or more complete. She noted that “Composition of CFSC” could cite additional provisions from ASPT Policies. She said the phrase “significant period of time” is ambiguous; she reported that a similar phrase in standards of another college led to confusion regarding eligibility for promotion.

Dean said the role of URC is to ensure coherent compliance with ASPT Policies while allowing every college flexibility to write their standards as they deem appropriate. She suggested that URC might want to point out to CAST that ambiguities could create confusion on the part of faculty members, without requiring CAST to modify the passages. Catanzaro suggested that URC might also consider reminding CAST that in the absence of clarity or completeness in CFSC standards, provisions of ASPT Policies apply.

Sarah Smelser moved that URC approve the CAST standards as submitted to URC. She further moved to include in the communication to CAST a reminder that ASPT Policies apply in the absence of specificity in college standards and a friendly suggestion that CAST consider clarifying the passages regarding CFSC composition, eligibility for promotion to full professor, and use of external reviews in promotion decisions. Shively seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

College of Arts and Sciences (see attached)

Angela Bonnell noted inconsistencies throughout the document in capitalization of “college standards” (“College standards” in one reference, “College Standards” in others) and in capitalization of “department/school” (“Department/School in some references, “department/school” in others). Bonnell also noted inconsistencies in references to scholarship (“scholarship or creative work,” or “scholarship/creative activity,” “scholarship and creative productivity,” and “scholarship and creative activities”). She suggested that the inconsistencies be corrected. She also suggested removing the page reference on page three of the document (in the passage “see VII.E., p. 23), noting that the page reference will likely need to be changed once the ASPT Policies have been revised to include the disciplinary articles.

Regarding the sentence on page three of the document that states, “The D/SFSC is responsible for input and final approval of salary recommendations,” Goodman asked Catanzaro what would happen if a DFSC were to disagree with salary increments recommended by the department chairperson. Catanzaro said the DFSC could discuss the matter with the department chairperson and come to an agreement. In practice what happens, Catanzaro explained, is that the department chairperson calculates salary increments by following the formula set forth in DFSC guidelines for translating performance ratings to salary increments. The department chairperson then distributes the calculations to the DFSC for comment before the increments are finalized and the DFSC votes on them.

Smelser moved to approve the CAS CFSC standards as submitted to the committee subject to CAS removing inconsistencies in the capitalization of “college standards” and “department/school” and removing the reference to page 23 on page three of the document and then submitting the revised document to URC for its files. Jenkins seconded the motion. Doris Houston asked if URC members are permitted to cast votes on motions related to CFSC standards of their own college. Dean and Catanzaro responded that URC members may do so. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

IV. Recommendations to URC from the Ad Hoc Committee for ASPT Equity Review (see attached)

Dean introduced the discussion by noting that the next action regarding equity review is for URC to formalize its recommendations to the Caucus regarding the final report submitted to URC by the ad hoc equity review committee. Dean reported that the Caucus would like URC recommendations regarding the equity review report by fall 2018. If URC needs more time to discuss the report than is available during this meeting and during the last URC meeting of the academic year (May 3), URC could carry the discussion over into the fall.

Edwards asked to whom URC will be reporting results of each of the five studies set forth in the final report once a report has been approved by the Caucus. Dean responded that the final report provides for URC reporting its findings to the Caucus. Dean expressed concern over URC doing so, suggesting that URC might consider recommending that its reports be sent to Executive Committee of the Caucus. She expressed concern about more widely disseminating information about inequities, if they are found, when it may take a long time to address them.

In the course of the ensuing discussion, URC members considered the timeline and workload involved with conducting the five studies proposed in the five-year cycle, whether the final report to the Caucus should address how re-distribution plans are to be developed in the event inequities are found, and methodology involved in conducting the each of the studies.

Regarding timeline and workload, Dean said she is not sure if URC should specify due dates since URC does not yet know what will be involved in completing each study. She noted there will be work behind the scenes before fall 2018 to compile data for the salary study, but it has not yet been determined how the study will be

performed. She noted that if equity review starts next year, URC will be addressing equity review and the disciplinary articles at the same time, and in year two URC will be working on the tenure study while beginning the next five-year review of the ASPT Policies. Dean suggested that URC consider organizing the five studies in phases rather than years given both the uncertainties and the numerous other URC responsibilities ahead. Another idea, Dean said, might be to conduct a pilot project in the first year, perhaps with one college, to determine how long the studies might take. She said she realizes some people may not favor a pilot because they do not want further delays in the project. Houston agreed, noting that the project is already a year behind schedule.

Smelser said that organizing the studies in phases rather than years might be helpful, because one study might take more than a year to complete while another study might take less than a year. Houston suggested that if URC decides to recommend organizing the studies by phases, the plan should state that all five phases should be completed within so many years, so the studies are not drawn out indefinitely. Dean noted that the plan provides for reports from URC to the Caucus after each of the five studies to identify changes needed for future iterations of each study; thus, a more definite timeline can be developed for a second implementation of the cycle of five studies. Edwards noted that Kalter seems to have considered the magnitude of the five-study cycle and the effort that would be involved. He suggested that URC consider retaining the target of completing all five studies within five years and decide what work can reasonably be accomplished within each year of the five-year period.

Goodman expressed his preference for organizing the five studies into phases rather than into years because of a 180-day regulation (per Ledbetter Fair Pay Act) regarding corrective actions. He explained that every time a salary inequity based on protected class has been determined to have occurred, the University is required to study the 180-day period prior to that violation to determine if any inequities occurred during that period (thus making it difficult to project how lengthy a salary study may be). Edwards asked if there is work CFSCs can do on the studies to reduce the URC workload. Catanzaro noted that the idea is for colleges to review results of each study and integrate information on faculty performance. CFSCs will be asked to make sense of the study results pertaining to their college, he added.

Regarding equity re-distribution plans, Dean asked if URC should at this time discuss how a re-distribution plan might be compiled rather than wait until inequities have been found. Shively said discussion of re-distribution plans seems independent of what has been proposed by the ad hoc review committee in its final report. She asked Dean if URC can decide how to proceed with re-distribution plans outside the scope of the final report. Dean responded that URC can do so but should be mindful that whatever studies are approved by the Caucus, URC will be required to implement them. Houston suggested that it might be valuable for URC to ask the Caucus to establish a second ad hoc committee, to discuss possible remedies if inequities are discovered. She said work of a second ad hoc committee could help URC given all the other work URC has to accomplish.

Catanzaro said URC might consider establishing principles for re-distribution plans in advance, to guide URC in developing such a plan if inequities are discovered. Dean asked Catanzaro if he could draft principles for URC to consider or if it would be more appropriate for URC to ask Alan Lacy (Associate Vice President for Academic Fiscal Management) for his help doing so. Catanzaro suggested that URC might consider setting aside a meeting to confer with Lacy to brainstorm principles that would be involved, after which he and Lacy could compile a first draft of principles for consideration by URC. Catanzaro added that the discussion of re-distribution plan principles could occur as salary data are being compiled and analyzed.

Goodman noted that a re-distribution plan may need to look beyond salary and consider other issues such as SURS. Shively said it had been her impression from Kalter that the University could proceed with equity review without having funds to rectify inequities. Goodman clarified that if a study conducted by the University determines that a member of a protected class has been treated inequitably, the University will be required by law to remedy the inequity. Dean asked what URC could do if inequities are found through the year two study regarding tenure decisions, nothing that faculty members denied tenure would have likely left the University. She asked if it would be appropriate to suggest mentoring programs for departments regarding tenure decisions. Shively said two separate issues are involved: what the University will do to remediate the inequity and what the University will do going forward to prevent such inequities. Smelser posited that how inequities should be addressed may be part of a larger conversation. She said URC could ask CFSCs how they might remedy

inequities discovered in their college, noting that URC could be overstepping its jurisdiction if it were to decide remedies since URC is not familiar with the culture of each college.

Regarding methodology, Dean asked if the committee is amenable to removing details regarding methodology from the final report to the Caucus and instead decide methods with the implementation of each study. Goodman suggested that determining methodology could be deferred if the University is discussing equity review proactively and not doing so in response to prior litigation. Committee members then discussed item (d) in the "Type" section of the salary study description. The question was asked whether there are any potential concerns with the University identifying a group by race and gender for comparison purposes. Catanzaro asked Dean if she could share the reasons for the ad hoc equity review committee including item (d) in the final report and how item (d) could yield information different from information obtained by implementing the standard model. Dean recalled that the equity review committee felt that white males are doing the best of any race-gender group at the University and every other group would be raised to that level. Goodman cautioned against designing a salary study with any such assumptions. He cited a court case involving the Springfield, Illinois, police department in which it was found that white males in the department were being paid less than females in the department. Shively posited that item (d) may have been included by the equity review committee in recognition of historical systemic inequities, adding that she questions whether it is necessary to include the item. Dean agreed, stating that her preference is to retain only items (a), (b), and (c) in the list of types.

Dean said she will draft revisions to the ad hoc equity review committee final report based on discussion at this URC meeting. She said URC can then discuss the proposed revisions at its May 3 meeting (2 p.m., Hovey 102).

V. Other business

There was none.

VI. Adjournment

Edwards moved that the meeting adjourn. Goodman seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sheryl Jenkins, Secretary

Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

*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.)

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.