UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Thursday, September 6, 2018
1 p.m., Hovey 401D

MINUTES

Members present: Frank Beck, Angela Bonnell, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Kevin Edwards, Joe Goodman, Yoon Jin Ma, Nancy Novotny, Rachel Shively, Sarah Smelser

Members not present: Diane Dean

Others present: Dallas Long (Associate Dean and College Faculty Status Committee chairperson, Milner Library), Chad Kahl (Associate Dean for Public Services and Technology and Department Faculty Status Committee chairperson, Milner Library), 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" and "ASPT 2017" refer 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; "DFSC" refers to department faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT Policies; "SFSC" refers to school faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT Policies; "Mennonite" refers to Mennonite College of Nursing at Illinois State University; and "Milner" refers to Milner Library at Illinois State University. Any references in these minutes to "DFSC" or "SFSC" refer to both DFSC and SFSC, any references to "department" or "school" refer to both department and school, and any references to "department chairperson" or "school director" refer to both department chairperson and school director.

I. Call to order

    Chairperson Joe Goodman called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Committee members welcomed new member Frank Beck, who has been elected by his peers in the Sociology Division of the College of Arts and Sciences to serve the last year of the term vacated by Doris Houston (in 2018-2019 Houston is serving as interim director of the School of Social Work).

II. Approval of minutes

    Sarah Smelser moved approval of minutes from the May 10, 2018 URC meeting and minutes from the August 21, 2018 URC meeting. Angela Bonnell seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

III. Review request from Milner Library for disciplinary articles exceptions

    Goodman reported that Milner Library faculty has voted to request a change to the new disciplinary articles. He said he received the proposed change from Dallas Long, the Milner Library CFSC chairperson. Goodman explained that the role of URC in this matter is to make a recommendation to the Faculty Caucus regarding the request, which reads as follows.

    > "Per language in IV.A.2 Milner Library CFSC members may participate in all deliberations unless these deliberations involve them as individuals and as noted in XII.B.3. In cases of fewer than five members Milner Library's CFSC will be filled with other Milner Library tenured faculty."

    It was noted that the proposed change exempts Milner from provisions in Section XII.B.3 requiring recusal of any CFSC member from disciplinary proceedings when the faculty member who is party to the proceeding is from the same department as the CFSC member. Because Milner has only one department, any disciplinary

cases involving Milner faculty members would have to be resolved by a group of CFSC members from one or more other colleges if the requested change is not approved by the Caucus.

Long reported that Milner faculty agreed to the proposed passage after lengthy discussion of the matter at several faculty meetings. He said Milner faculty members strongly support the proposed passage, because they want to retain library control over any disciplinary proceedings involving them. Bonnell noted that the Milner faculty vote on the matter was unanimous.

Catanzaro asked Long if Milner DFSC members would be eligible to replace recused CFSC members if the Caucus approves the request. Long responded that library faculty prefers the option set forth in Section XII.B.3.a of the disciplinary articles (i.e., selecting replacements for recused CFSC members from a pool of past CFSC members). Goodman asked if the library would also permit DFSC members to serve (if there are no former CFSC members eligible to serve). Long said the library would do so. Sarah Smelser asked if the library would select only from tenured faculty members serving on the DFSC. Long answered in the affirmative.

Rachel Shively asked if some Milner faculty members are reluctant to replace recused CSFC members with faculty members from another college due to concern that faculty members in other colleges may not be sufficiently familiar with the field (librarianship). Long confirmed that to be the case. Goodman asked what kinds of disciplinary issues might arise at Milner that would be unique compared to issues in other colleges. Long explained that reporting lines for Milner faculty differ from reporting lines in other colleges. He added that evaluation of library faculty members focuses more on library skills than on teaching.

Attendees discussed whether replacing recused CFSC members with former CFSC members should be explicitly stated in the passage sent to the Caucus for its consideration. Bonnell said Milner faculty members prefer that the passage not be that specific, to allow the library flexibility in the matter. She noted that how a recused CFSC member is replaced could depend on the number of faculty members eligible to serve in the position at the time. She noted that specifics regarding how replacements are to be selected would instead be included in the Milner CFSC standards.

Bruce Stoffel asked if Milner faculty intends to propose any related changes to other sections of ASPT policies. Bonnell responded that Milner faculty also wants to increase the number of CFSC members gradually, to four and then to five. Stoffel asked if that change needs to be made concurrently with the proposed addition to Article XII. Catanzaro said it would not. He suggested asking the Caucus to first approve the change to Article XII and then at a later date asking the Caucus to address any proposed changes to ASPT policies regarding Milner CFSC membership. Bonnell said if that approach is taken it might still be possible for the library to obtain Caucus approval of changes to Milner CFSC membership provisions by January (2019). Goodman asked if any changes to CFSC membership proposed by Milner faculty would need to be submitted to the Caucus through URC. Catanzaro said they would.

Catanzaro said he supports adding the passage requested by Milner faculty. He suggested replacing the phrase "as noted in XII.B.3" in the proposed passage with "as noted in this section," since it is not known where the Caucus would insert the passage.

Stoffel reported that the library request could be discussed by the Caucus as soon as its next meeting (Wednesday, September 12, 2018), if URC decides to vote on the matter at this URC meeting. An option, he offered, would be for URC to wait until Mennonite College of Nursing faculty has decided whether to request changes to the disciplinary articles to accommodate its unique circumstances. He asked Nancy Novotny (representing Mennonite on URC) about the status of Mennonite faculty discussions of the matter. Novotny reported that the issue has been discussed by Mennonite faculty but no decision has been made. She said the next opportunity for Mennonite faculty to continue those discussions will be the first Tuesday in October, at the college faculty meeting. She added that she does not know if Mennonite faculty will vote on the matter at that meeting.

Shively said it would be helpful for a Milner representative to attend the Caucus meeting at which the Milner request is discussed. She said that the explanations provided by Milner representatives at this meeting help make it clear why Milner is making this request. Long said he plans to attend the Caucus meeting to represent the library.

Shively moved that URC recommend to the Caucus that it incorporate the following passage into Article XII (General Considerations) of ASPT policies, per the request of Milner faculty:

> *"Per language in IV.A.2 Milner Library CFSC members may participate in all deliberations unless these deliberations involve them as individuals and as noted in this section. In cases of fewer than five members Milner Library's CFSC will be filled with other Milner Library tenured faculty."*

Smelser seconded the motion.

Novotny asked for clarification whether recused CFSC members would be replaced with past CFSC members (even though the motion does not address that matter). Long reiterated that library faculty intends to add such a provision to the Milner CFSC standards. Chad Kahl noted that the library has so few faculty members that every one of its faculty members serves on the CFSC at some time.

The motion passed on voice vote, all members voting in the affirmative.

Goodman said he is unable to represent URC at the upcoming Caucus meeting (September 12, 2018). He asked Smelser if she would be able to fill in for him. Smelser said she will.

IV.   Establish a service assignments working group

Goodman asked whether in past years URC has organized a working group to study service assignments. Stoffel reported that URC had service assignments on its docket to study in 2016-2017 and 2017-2018; however, URC did not establish a working group to study the issue in either year because the committee had other priorities to address, principally the disciplinary articles. Goodman asked committee members how they wish to proceed. Shively asked if there are issues other than equity review to be addressed by URC this year, noting that studying service assignments could involve quite a lot of work. Goodman said work on equity review will be hefty.

Goodman said his initial thought about approaching this task is to survey faculty. He recalled that a URC working group (in spring 2016) conducted an informal survey of performance evaluation practices; he recalled that some URC members were shocked to discover the wide range of time faculty members spend on preparing their annual performance evaluation documents, from a few hours to an entire week.

Smelser asked what Caucus wants URC to study regarding service assignments and what Caucus hopes to accomplish by having URC study the matter. She said it may be difficult to study the issue because every faculty member's experience with service work is different.

Goodman said one issue URC could study is what activities are considered service (e.g., is working with a student considered teaching or service?). Another common question, Catanzaro said, is how service should be addressed in assignment letters (e.g., should assignment letters specify the percentage of time a faculty member is expected to commit to a particular committee or should service assignments be more general?). He added that it would be useful for URC to look into these matters even though a survey of faculty may yield information difficult for URC to interpret (e.g., each faculty member may have a different definition of service). Goodman cautioned that survey respondents typically want the survey sponsor to identify actionable items from the responses. Shively said one option to a faculty survey would be to ask DFSCs and department chairpersons about service policies and practices in their unit.

Referring to a document disseminated to committee members prior to the meeting (see attached), Kevin Edwards said he likes the first six questions (set forth in the Background section of the document). He said a seventh question he has is whether service conducted by a faculty member in the summer and for which the faculty member is paid is considered service (as governed by ASPT policies). Perhaps, Edwards offered, URC might look to encourage uniformity across colleges regarding this issue, including how such work should be cited in job descriptions. Edwards said he likes the idea of surveying faculty, but most respondents are likely to say they are doing too much service work. He said URC might instead ask SFSCs and DFSCs how they approach service; URC could then see how big the disparities may be across units and determine if that is a

problem. Goodman asked Catanzaro if it would be fair to instead ask CFSCs to review DFSC documents in their college for how service is addressed by their units, noting that CFSCs are responsible for oversight of DFSC guidelines. Catanzaro said it would be fair. Stoffel noted that most DSFC and SFSC guidelines are accessible to URC members on the (Office of the Provost) tenure and promotion website, should URC members want to study them.

Goodman said he does not know if URC can resolve the question of whether and how to study service assignments without more information. He said he will reach out to Susan Kalter (Caucus chairperson) before the next URC meeting to ask about long-term expectations the Caucus may have regarding this issue. Shively suggested asking Kalter what information Caucus wants regarding service and what goals the Caucus has for asking URC to study the issue.

V.   Discuss plans for ASPT professional development series

Catanzaro announced he is doing a series of workshops this academic year with URC, Goodman, and the Caucus regarding ASPT issues. He explained that the Office of the Provost typically has one workshop each year to cover ASPT policies in a general sense. He said this year multiple ASPT workshops are planned so ASPT issues can be covered in greater depth. The first workshop in the series, he said, will be held later this month (September 2018) and will cover general ASPT issues and the new disciplinary articles. Topics to be covered in subsequent workshops, Catanzaro said, include assessment of teaching, assessment of scholarship, equity, and review of local (i.e., department/school and college) ASPT policies. Catanzaro said the workshops will be announced shortly. He is scheduling two offerings of each workshop (with the same content) and will hold the sessions on campus rather than at the alumni center (both for the convenience of faculty members). He said he is also looking into the possibility of videotaping the sessions and making them available online behind a log in.

VI.   Other business

There was none.

VII.   Adjournment

Novotny moved that the meeting adjourn. Edwards seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 1:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Shively, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:
URC Working Group: Service Assignments (compiled by B. Stoffel, 9-4-18)

URC WORKING GROUP: SERVICE ASSIGNMENTS

Background

During its discussions on January 27, 2016 regarding proposed ASPT policies, the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate raised questions regarding the appropriate treatment of service assignments in ASPT policies. The questions and issues raised more specifically related to Article VII: Faculty Assignments and Faculty Evaluation, but similar questions were raised during subsequent consideration by the Caucus of Appendix 2 (University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation). Among the questions/issues raised …

- It has been reported that not all units assign service to faculty members (i.e., that service is not officially part of their load). Is this the case? If so, is it appropriate?

- Similarly, it has been reported that some units make teaching and scholarship assignments totaling 100 percent but then expect faculty members to be involved in service activities above and beyond the 100 percent. Is this the case? If so, is it appropriate?

- Do units make specific service assignments or do they permit faculty to choose their own service activities (much like faculty members set their own research agenda)? Is either or both acceptable?

- What activities should count as service (versus teaching and research)?

- How much credit should service be given in promotion and tenure decisions?

- In a related matter, how should administrative-type activities be counted (teaching, service, or research)?

The Faculty Caucus has asked URC to consider these and any other related issues and report its findings and recommendations. URC planned to establish a working group to study this matter, first in 2016-2017 and then in 2017-2018. Due to other priorities (including the ASPT disciplinary articles and equity review), URC has not yet done so.

Next steps

Establish a URC working group to study the issues raised by the Faculty Caucus regarding service assignments and report findings and recommendations to the full University Review Committee.

Additional information

To provide the University Review Committee with more detailed information for use in planning its approach to this issue, the following documents are attached.

- An excerpt from minutes of the January 27, 2016 Faculty Caucus meeting, documenting Faculty Caucus discussion of service assignments.

- ASPT 2017 Article VII: Faculty Assignments and Evaluation.

- ASPT 2017 Appendix 2 (University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation).

- An excerpt from minutes of the November 10, 2017 University Review Committee meeting (the last URC meeting at which this issue was discussed) documenting suggestions committee members had regarding study of service assignments.

Note: The recording of this meeting was lost prior to being transmitted to the Senate office, so the minutes are a re-creation based on notes taken by URC Recorder Bruce Stoffel. Even where seemingly verbatim, they should not be assumed to be so.

Call to Order
Senator Kalter called the meeting to order.

Election of Library Committee Representatives (Term Spring 2016):
Carlyn Morenus, CFA
Clinton Warren, CAST

The Caucus unanimously elected these two nominees to the open seats on the newly expanded Library Committee.

ASPT Discussion:
Action items session on existing Articles VI-VIII, X, XII (and related appendices)

Article VI
Senator Kalter called for a motion to approve the changes proposed to existing ASPT Article VI.

Motion: By Senator Daddario, seconded by Senator Huxford, to approve proposed revisions to Article VI.

Senator Kalter reviewed the recommended changes. She noted that the word "Dismissal" would not be added to the title at this time.

A Senator [name not recorded] made a motion amend VI.G. to "in this case" retain the "must" rather than changing it to "shall." There was no second.

Senator Kalter recommended against any motion to amend of this nature, explaining that the Caucus had already decided to reject all changes proposed by URC to the must/shall, will/shall, etc., areas as well as deferring all changes related to the proposed new disciplinary articles, which will not be approved until at least 2016-17. She recommended against any motion to amend so that the other changes to the proposed version before the Caucus could be made without engaging in extended debate on the must/shall question. She explained that VI.G would indeed retain the "must" in any event under this previous agreement so that the motion to amend was not necessary.

After asking for debate and seeing none, Senator Kalter called for a vote.

The motion to approve the proposed changes to Article VI was unanimously approved.

Article VII
Senator Kalter called for a motion to approve the changes proposed to existing ASPT Article VII.

Motion: By Senator Huxford, seconded by Senator Hoelscher, to approve proposed revisions to Article VII.

Senator Kalter reviewed the recommended changes. She noted that the section reference in VII.F would not change as a result of the vote but may change later. She noted again that the must/shall changes would also be disregarded.

Senator Krejci, referring to the recommended change to VII.A, noted that service is an area that is not often assigned to a faculty member.

Senator Kalter: Some departments include it (service) in their assignments, some don't.

Senator Krejci: No, I am referring to faculty usually volunteering for service rather than having service assigned to them. Some volunteer, some don't.

Senator Kalter: There is an interesting middle ground. In my college we are assigned to some (service work) and some we volunteer for.

Senator Krejci: The question I sometimes get is "I wasn't assigned service."

Senator Kalter: Let's refer that to URC for a longer discussion. How do we make sure this (wording) reflects that well?

Senator Krejci: So, I appreciate the changes made (to VII.A). So if we are to say we are to support service, we aren't doing that necessarily.

Professor Dean, URC Vice Chair: So, in your reading (of the passage), the switch to a positive word may imply an expectation?

Senator Krejci: It implies all faculty get assigned to teaching, research, and service. This almost gets interesting. We don't assign such activity (service). But (this passage) may not be interpreted that way. I just want to raise it (the issue). (The passage, as revised,) may not be (interpreted) that we are assigning these things (service), but it could be.

Senator Troxel: I should delay comments before fully forming them. My question is the definition of assignment relative to contributions being evaluated. Maybe add language like including voluntary (service) but maybe this needs more thought.

Senator Krejci: It says assignments are in all three areas. We don't assign in all three areas. If there is a way to change that (language in the passage).

Senator Clark: Instead of saying "teaching" maybe "the teaching assignment shall support …"

Senator Kalter: We are assigned research but we aren't told what to research. I may be assigned three courses and one unit of release time (from teaching) for research. That is your assignment. On top of that we add 10 percent service.

Senator Kalter suggested keeping the wording in VII.A as it was, keeping the status quo (rather than accepting the URC's proposed change).

Senator Huxford: Maybe we should think about this more deeply. 100 percent is teaching and research. No time is assigned to service. But you're judged on it (by DFSC/SFSC). It is part of the job but we aren't given time to do it.

Senator Daddario: Service is unpopular.

Senator Troxel: When I was interim chair completing the faculty report, I was told that service kind of counts in teaching. This needs more discussion. Is the assignment for you to do teaching, research, and service? Not that it is balanced out.

Senator McHale: As I read this, for me at least, (the change) modifies (the word) "contributions" rather than (the word) "assignments." Whatever the assignment is shall not inhibit teaching, research, and service.

Senator Alcorn: I think that is correct, if you parse it. Would it be beneficial to be very clear?

Senator Kalter: We could (decide) to leave (the passage) as is and ask URC to work it out. Or we could table (the matter). I recommend not changing VII.A and approving the rest of the article. Senator Huxford has brought up a long-standing issue.

Senator Hoelscher: Should we vote (the motion) down?

Senator Kalter: I recommend a friendly amendment to keep VII.A as is.

Senator Clark: Or we could vote the motion down.

Senator Rich: Let me add one more note. I am comfortable with (the word) "support." The expectation has not changed. There is an expectation depending on the department. Then they are in conflict in the faculty activity report. There are three ways we look at this. In the time and effort report, implicitly, and in the faculty activity report. This is conflict in the time and effort report. I think the language (recommended by URC) is laudable. The time and effort report is the issue.

Professor Dean: [To Senator Kalter] We (URC) can accept that as a friendly amendment.

Senator Rich: I am pretty indifferent.

Senator McHale: I would make a motion to keep the language "not to inhibit".

Senator Rich: I'm happy either way. I don't think that the change changes much.

Senator McHale: Senator Kalter suggested we would change the language for future consideration [??].

Senator Kalter: The first option is to keep VII.A as it is but refer these questions to URC. The third option is to change it to "support" and still refer them to URC. The second option is to table it all.

Assistant Vice President Catanzaro: You could vote it down.

Senator Kalter: But I don't want to dump VII.F.

Senator Clark: But we have a motion.

Senator Kalter: I suggest an amendment.

Motion: By Senator Rich, seconded by Senator McHale, as follows:

Senator Rich: I move to move it back to "not to inhibit" with the understanding that URC will take this up.

Senator McHale: Second.

Debate followed on the motion to amend the language in VII.A (Rich/McHale) so that it remains unrevised as in the 2012 ASPT document.

Senator Krejci: I wish I hadn't mentioned it [laughter]. I didn't want anyone to believe that faculty could be assigned specific things in all three areas. But I've heard you are not interpreting it that way. I am concerned that someone might do this.

Senator Daddario: There are two different definitions of "assignment". [???]

Senator Crowley: Looking at this, the fourth line (of VII.A) is too long.

Senator Kalter: We are not wordsmithing.

Senator Crowley: Break (the sentence) into two pieces.

Senator Kalter: I am still going to rule it out of order as it doesn't relate to the motion. Is there further debate?

Senator Daddario: Call the question.

Seeing no objection to calling the question, Senator Kalter asked for a vote on the motion to amend.

The motion to amend (Rich/McHale) was approved. The effect of the vote is to leave VII.A as it is in the current version of the ASPT document and to refer the matter of assignments to URC for discussion.

Senator Kalter: Is there further debate on the article as a whole?

There being none, Senator Kalter called for a vote, explaining that VII.A is to read "not to inhibit".

The motion to approve the proposed changes to Article VII as amended was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: What we will do with Senator Crowley's suggestion is to ask URC to consider the length of the sentence.

Senator McHale: Long introductory phrases can muddy the water. But I am wordsmithing.

Article VIII
Senator Kalter called for a motion to approve the changes proposed to existing ASPT Article VIII.

Motion: By Senator Rich, seconded by Senator Dyck, to approve proposed revisions to Article VIII.

Senator Kalter reviewed the recommended changes. She noted the need to re-letter sections since a new "C" has been added. She explained that Senator Bushell had requested this (new section "C"). It pulls language from another article, from Article IV.

Senator Kalter: Any debate?

Senator McHale: Move to approve.

Senator Kalter: We already have a motion.

There was a pause in the proceedings for Dr. Catanzaro to review his copy of Article VIII.

VII. Faculty Assignments and Faculty Evaluation

A.   Faculty assignments are integral to the mission of a department/school and thus of the University. Each faculty assignment represents the part that the faculty member will play during the coming academic year in carrying out that mission. Faculty assignments shall embody the principles of consistency and flexibility. Because the University expects from all faculty consistent high-quality performance in the mutually supportive areas of teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service, faculty assignments shall be designed not to inhibit faculty members from contributing in all three areas over their term of employment. Appropriate effort shall be made to achieve flexibility in faculty assignments so that the changing needs of the University are recognized and so that, by giving faculty members the latitude to explore academic and professional opportunities as they arise, faculty contributions to the University can be maximized. Faculty assignments may differ from person to person in a given year, and an individual

faculty member may complete several types of assignments during the course of several years.

B.   The Chairperson/Director shall communicate to all faculty members in writing and in a timely manner courses they are expected to teach and whether the Department/School will allocate to them reassigned time for the completion of activities that do not involve direct classroom instruction.

C.   Faculty assignments within a department/school shall be defined in writing so that faculty members understand the nature of their assignments for the coming year. In the performance evaluation of faculty members, the DFSC/SFSC shall recognize that individual efforts and activities elicit different types of productivity and that the quality and thoroughness of work done by a faculty member in completing an individual assignment constitute the criteria on which performance evaluation decisions and summative reviews may be based.

D.   Prior to Departmental/School performance evaluations, faculty members shall provide to the DFSC/SFSC activities reports specific to their assignments. Department/School ASPT Guidelines should provide guidance regarding the format and content of activities reports. Electronic submission of activities reports is encouraged and may be required by DFSC/SFSC Guidelines. Items that are difficult or impossible to document electronically may be submitted directly. Reports are due by January 5 of each year.

E.   Departments/schools must develop guidelines for what constitutes overall "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" performance. The term "satisfactory" is defined as meeting or exceeding minimum expectations as defined within Department/School Guidelines. The annual performance evaluation process shall include (1) an annual assessment of a faculty members' performance in teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service; (2) a separate interim appraisal of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion, if applicable; and (3) an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance in the evaluation period as either "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." 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" or "unsatisfactory," but must provide an overall assessment as well.

F.   Departments/Schools shall provide a detailed letter including intended recommendations and overall assessment to each faculty member at least 10 business days (days when University offices are open to the public) before submitting these recommendations to the CFSC and provide

opportunity, if requested, for the faculty member to meet informally with the DFSC/SFSC or for a formal meeting. Formal meetings with the DFSC/SFSC are required prior to an appeal to the CFSC. Requirements for formal meetings and appeals are found in XIII.D. Intended recommendations will become the final recommendation at the end of 10 business days unless additional information is discovered or unless the Department/School changes its recommendation following an informal or formal meeting with the faculty member.

APPENDIX 2

University Guidelines and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Faculty effort and activity are evaluated in three areas: teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service. Because these areas are mutually supportive, the activities undertaken in one area may at times overlap another. Despite this interdependence, each area has its own definition, its own activities, and its own guidelines and criteria for evaluation. The activities referred to in this section are illustrative rather than prescriptive. Departmental/school guidelines for evaluating teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service must be consistent with University guidelines. Departments/schools are expected to adapt these guidelines to their own unique situations as outlined in Section V.B.1 of the Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies. Departments/schools must consider a demonstration of quality of accomplishment and a standard of excellence as they select guidelines and criteria for evaluation.

Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

The majority of direct instructional activities by Illinois State University faculty are undertaken within classrooms, laboratories, studios, etc. Indeed, faculty and student interaction within the traditional classroom is the most common form of teaching. At the same time as new instructional technologies develop and as a variety of forms of out-of-class learning experiences become more important, Illinois State University faculty members will engage increasingly in such activities, devoting more time to modes of instruction that occur outside of the traditional classroom. To be adequate, any mechanism for the evaluation of teaching must be comprehensive enough to encompass these new activities and technologies. Moreover, the scholarship of teaching likewise may focus not only on traditional classroom instruction but also on other forms of teaching such as conducting laboratories, mentoring interns and advanced graduate students, tutoring individual students, and student advising.

Therefore, teaching is here defined as faculty and student interaction or faculty support activities in which the focus is on student gains in skills, knowledge, understanding, and personal growth. This definition clearly encompasses traditional classroom instruction but it also includes a broad array of less traditional activities.

Common Teaching Activities

Below are listed some of the common teaching activities together with the forms that they might assume.

Group Instruction

1.   Instructing students in courses, labs, clinics, studio classes
2.   Instructing participants in workshops, retreats, seminars
3.   Managing a course (grading, planning, maintaining records)

Advising, Supervising, Guiding, and Mentoring

1. Supervising students in labs and fieldwork
2. Advising and mentoring students
3. Supervising teaching assistants
4. Supervising students with internships and clinical experiences
5. Supervising students in independent study
6. Directing or serving as a reader on student research projects, theses, and dissertations
7. Advising co-curricular activities

Developing learning activities

1. Developing, reviewing, and redesigning courses
2. Developing and revising curriculum
3. Developing teaching materials, manuals, software
4. Developing and managing distance learning courses
5. Developing computer exercises
6. Conducting study-abroad programs

Developing as a teacher

1. Evaluating teaching of colleagues
2. Conducting instructional and classroom research
3. Attending professional development activities

Factors Used for Evaluation of Teaching

Guidelines and criteria for the evaluation of teaching are based on common teaching activities such as those listed above. Adequate evaluation of teaching requires consideration of a variety of factors concerning these activities. Departments/schools must use two or more types of factors to evaluate teaching performance, one of which shall be student reactions to teaching performance. The following items include but are not limited to examples which may be used to identify meritorious teaching:

1. A record of solidly favorable student reactions to teaching performance;
2. Favorable teaching ratings by peers through review of instructional materials;
3. Favorable teaching ratings by peers through classroom observation;
4. Favorable teaching reactions by alumni;
5. Evidence that the faculty member's students experience cognitive or affective gain as a result of their instruction;
6. Syllabi from various courses that feature clarity of instructional objectives, clear organization of material, and equitable and understandable criteria for the evaluation of student work;
7. Breadth of teaching ability as this is illustrated by effective teaching in different classroom settings, effective teaching of different types of students, preparation of new courses, or significant modification of established courses;
8. Evidence of meritorious supervision of students in independent studies, internships, clinical experiences, laboratories and fieldwork;
9. Creditable advising and mentoring of students in their preparation of research projects, theses, and dissertations;
10. Significant involvement in sponsoring student organizations and co-curricular activities;

11. Development or review of teaching materials (textbooks, workbooks, reading packets, computer programs, curriculum guides, etc.);
12. Development of new teaching techniques (videotapes, independent study modules, computer activities, instructional technologies, etc.);
13. Service as a master teacher to others (conducting teaching workshops, supervising beginning teachers, coaching performances, etc.);
14. Recognition of meritorious teaching by winning teaching awards;
15. Submitting successful competitive grant proposals related to teaching.

Criteria for the Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Productivity

The term "scholarly and creative productivity" comprises a variety of activities, including those typically defined as research. Because activities considered to be scholarly and creative productivity vary considerably from discipline to discipline, the University recognizes that scholarly and creative productivity includes all forms of discovery and integration of knowledge, critical analysis, and products and performances.

Definition of Research

A large subset within the area of scholarly and creative productivity is commonly called research. The term "research" has been defined by the University Research Committee and the faculty evaluation system shall continue to recognize the University Research Committee's definition of research and modes of documenting research. The University definition for research is given below:

> A formal procedure which contributes to the expansion of basic knowledge or applies such knowledge to the solution of problems in society or exemplifies creative expression in a specific field of study. The results of research are communicated to professionals outside the University through a peer reviewed process in a manner appropriate to the discipline.

The University recognizes both the scholarship of discovery and scholarship of integration. The scholarship of discovery contributes to the stock of human knowledge and involves the pursuit of new knowledge for its own sake. The scholarship of integration interprets, draws together, and brings new insight to bear on original research.

Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity

The evaluation of scholarly and creative productivity requires consideration of a variety of factors and must consider the quality and significance of each contribution. Factors used to evaluate meritorious scholarly and creative productivity include but are not limited to:

1. Authorship or co-authorship of published materials that undergo peer-review, refereeing, or jurying as appropriate for the discipline. Examples of such materials include journal articles, abstracts, monographs, books, book chapters, case studies, artistic works, software, or other professional and technical documents;

2. Authorship or co-authorship of published materials such as editorially reviewed books, articles, abstracts, translations, software, case studies, artistic works or other professional and technical documents;
3. Development or co-development of software applications or intellectual property that is licensed or patented;
4. Production and presentation of radio and television works, films and videos related to the scholarly or creative discipline;
5. Serving as a journal editor or editorial board member; refereeing or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts;
6. Peer-reviewed/refereed presentations and papers delivered at local, regional, national and international meetings;
7. Performances, exhibitions, and other creative activities locally, regionally, nationally and internationally;
8. Managing or serving as a consultant for exhibitions, performances, and other scholarly creative activities;
9. Submitting proposals for competitive grants, internal or external, or other resource development activities related to scholarly and creative productivity;
10. Obtaining competitive external or internal grants related to scholarly and creative productivity;
11. Writing and submitting required grant and contract reports;
12. Receiving internal or external awards obtained for scholarly or creative productivity;
13. Providing evidence that scholarly or creative works have been submitted for review;
14. Documenting scholarly or creative works in progress;
15. Demonstrating leadership of teams conducting scholarly or creative work, especially where that leadership contributes to the success of other faculty, students, or staff.

Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

Illinois State University recognizes under the category of service two major sub-categories: professional service and university service. Professional service is the application of faculty professional expertise to needs, issues, and problems in service to professional associations as well as to business, government, not-for-profit enterprises, and the general citizenry. University service is the application of faculty expertise to the operation and governance of the University, including academic programs, departments/schools, colleges, and other components of the University.

Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Service Activities

The evaluation of service requires consideration of a variety of factors that include both professional service and university service. Factors used to evaluate service include but are not limited to the following:

1. Holding office or completing a major assignment with a national or regional professional organization;
2. Consultation and service to civic organizations, social agencies, government, business, or industry that is related to the faculty member's teaching, research, or administrative work at Illinois State University;
3. Holding office or completing a major assignment in professional organizations;
4. Responsibility for planning workshops, seminars, or conferences for department/school, college, or University groups;

5. Chairing or leading department/school, college or university committees;
6. Nomination for or receipt of an award that recognizes service to department/school, college, university, or to groups outside of the university;
7. Serving as program chairperson (state, regional, national or international);
8. Serving as consultant, advisor, board member to educational, civic, social, business or other groups;
9. Refereeing or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts;
10. Serving on accreditation or evaluation teams;
11. Chairing a professional session (state, regional, national or international);
12. Submitting competitive grant or contract proposals for activities related primarily to service;
13. Obtaining a competitive grant or contract for activities related primarily to service;
14. Service on a university, college or department/school committee;
15. Administering areas or programs within the department/school, college, or university.

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Friday, November 10, 2017
3 p.m., Hovey 302

MINUTES

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

Members not present: Joe Goodman

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; "AFEGC" refers to the Faculty Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee at Illinois State University; "DFSC" refers to department faculty status committee; and "SFSC" refers to school faculty status committee. References in the minutes to "DFSC" are intended to refer to both DFSC and SFSC.

I. Call to order

II. Approval of minutes from the October 20, 2017 meeting

III. Report from the working group on teaching evaluations

Dean explained that the Caucus charge to URC regarding service assignments was one of the tasks set aside by URC in 2016-2017 until the committee had completed its work on the disciplinary articles. Dean reviewed a description of the charge (see attached) with committee members. She reported having recently consulted Caucus Chairperson Susan Kalter about the matter. Dean said Kalter confirmed the charge and encouraged URC to consider any other issues related to service. Kalter also indicated that discussion of service assignments is not a high priority for the Caucus this academic year, so URC can take the time it needs to study the matter. URC members then discussed whether and how URC should proceed with its study.

Dean asked if URC should investigate what is happening in units with regard to service assignments or if the committee should approach the issue philosophically. Jenkins said her impression from the charge presented to URC is that the Caucus wants to know what is being done by units with regard to service. Houston agreed, adding that URC could approach this charge as it approached the charge to study performance evaluations (i.e., by investigating unit policies and procedures). Jenkins said she was a member of the spring 2016 URC working group (facilitated by Angela Bonnell) charged with studying performance evaluations, specifically whether ASPT policies should be changed to reduce the reporting burden on faculty members. She said the working group informally surveyed faculty colleagues regarding the scope of performance evaluation in their unit. Bonnell noted that the working group was able to document a wide range of approaches to performance evaluation through the survey. Dean asked if administering the informal survey was manageable. Jenkins replied that it was. Dean said another approach URC might take is to ask each college to investigate how their units approach service assignments and to report their findings to the committee.

Bruce Stoffel noted that a related issue raised by Houston during URC review of the 2012 ASPT document is how administrative work should be recognized and whether it should be categorized as service. Dean asked if it mattered to the discussion whether the faculty member is paid for administrative work. Houston suggested that URC should include in its investigation administrative work for which a faculty member is paid or receives release time. Jenkins said it was her understanding that faculty members are compensated for their service work through their regular salary. Rachel Shively said the issue is complicated, noting that faculty members in her unit may receive release time or a summer stipend for administrative work. Edwards suggested surveying DFSCs right after the performance evaluation season regarding their approach to service contributions and administrative activities.

Catanzaro noted that a portion of a faculty member's work is assumed tacitly to be service even though it might not be explicitly assigned as such. He noted that service is part of the shared governance system and that a certain level of service is considered part of faculty members' duties. Catanzaro added that once the amount of time a faculty member spends on service activities exceeds some threshold, it may be considered worthy of recognition or an explicit time assignment. Catanzaro said it could be a useful contribution to the ASPT system to have URC think through these issues. He suggested consulting AAUP guidelines and other documents to determine how service is recognized by other institutions.

Dean said that how service contributions are weighted in performance evaluations and promotion decisions is also a pressing question. Shively said her department has codified that 20 percent of a faculty member's work should be spent on service activities. She asked if other units adhere to that standard. Committee members responding said their units do not. Catanzaro pointed out that how service is weighted in a faculty member's annual assignment and how actual service work is weighted in the faculty member's performance evaluation may differ. Bonnell raised the question of how the percentages are defined and applied, noting that the official 37.5 hour work week is typically exceeded by faculty members. She noted that answers to that question have

been elusive. Dean said the quality of a faculty member's service contribution is another issue to consider. Jenkins said her unit considers the quality and significance of committee products when evaluating committee contributions. Bonnell said in her unit faculty members are responsible for describing in their performance evaluation papers the contributions they made to the committees on which they served.

Jenkins said it might be helpful for URC to spend additional time discussing service before initiating extensive research into the matter. Dean agreed. She said she will allot time on the agenda of the next URC meeting to continue the discussion.