

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Thursday, October 4, 2018
1 p.m., Hovey 401D

MINUTES

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

Members not present: Diane Dean, Nancy Novotny, Sarah Smelser

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

Note: In these minutes “URC” refers to the University Review Committee at Illinois State University; “Caucus” refers to the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate at Illinois State University; “ASPT” refers to appointment, salary, promotion, and tenure policies of Illinois State University; “ASPT policies” refers to *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies* effective January 1, 2017, Illinois State University, as subsequently amended; “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; “Milner” refers to Milner Library at Illinois State University; and “equity review committee” and “ad hoc committee” refer to the Ad Hoc Committee on ASPT Equity Review established by the Faculty Caucus of the Academic Senate at Illinois State University. Any references in these minutes to “DFSC” or “SFSC” refer to both DFSC and SFSC, and any references to “department” or “school” refer to both department and school.

I. Call to order

Chairperson Joe Goodman called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

II. Approval of minutes

Angela Bonnell moved approval of minutes from the September 20, 2018 URC meeting. Kevin Edwards seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

III. Update

ASPT professional development series

Catanzaro reported on the first two sessions of the 2018-2019 ASPT workshop series (held on September 25-26, 2018). Nineteen people attended the September 25 session, 25 people attended the September 26 session. Catanzaro said both sessions went well in that attendees were actively engaged in discussions. He reminded committee members that the plan had been to video record the sessions for the benefit of ASPT committee members unable to attend either session. Due to technical difficulties, Catanzaro said, it will not be possible to deliver a video of either session. Goodman asked whether it would be possible to repeat the session once more so it can be taped, since a video was promised and some faculty members may have decided to view the video rather than attend one of the sessions. Goodman suggested using the executive classroom in the College of Business, because it has recording equipment. Catanzaro said he would be willing to conduct another session and will investigate the possibility.

Catanzaro said the workshop series will continue with sessions this fall on assessment of teaching and scholarship, followed by sessions in the spring on equity and updating ASPT policies. Topics of the session on teaching will include recent research regarding bias in student reactions to teaching performance, methods of incorporating other means of teaching assessment in faculty performance evaluations given the possibility of such bias, and the tendency for a committee to overly rely on specific information or a specific value when

making a decision (i.e., anchoring bias). Topics of the session on scholarship, Catanzaro continued, will include approaches to assessing original research and applied research in faculty performance evaluations. He noted that departments need to have conversations about that periodically. Goodman asked if calendar requests can be sent to prospective workshop attendees rather than just an email invitation. Catanzaro said he will do so and will also send reminders to prospective attendees regarding the sessions.

Service assignments

Goodman said he has uploaded an Excel table to OneDrive into which committee members are asked to input information gleaned from their review of DFSC and SFSC guidelines. He said there are two columns into which committee members are asked to input information, adding that committee members should feel free to input any other information they deem pertinent. Goodman reported receiving an email from Faculty Caucus Chairperson Susan Kalter since the last URC meeting in which Kalter provides more information and guidance regarding URC study of service assignments. In her email Kalter suggests that URC investigate how much control units have in weighting service in faculty assignments and evaluations and how service is assigned to tenured versus probationary tenure-line faculty members. Edwards reported that Economics has established a detailed point system that is used when evaluating faculty. He added that Economics guidelines reference a detailed plan for rotating the selection of faculty members for service on university committees.

Goodman asked Catanzaro if the Provost provides guidance with establishing service assignments and evaluating service work. Catanzaro responded that the Provost's office provides guidance in such matters only in broad terms. He added that, from his perspective, guidance regarding service can be found in existing ASPT policies. He said those policies articulate an expectation that faculty members engage in service and provide that each unit vote on its own policies regarding service, including whether service should be weighted. Catanzaro observed that while those policies have become clearer over the years, more clarity and specificity is needed. He cited as examples the relationship between teaching, scholarship, and service and the practice of taking the faculty member's interests and preferences into account when making service assignments. Catanzaro offered to help start the discussions about service policies, reminding committee members that the Provost's office can take the lead in such discussions but cannot dictate ASPT policy.

Goodman reminded committee members that URC is scheduled to continue its discussion of service assignments at the October 18 committee meeting. Bruce Stoffel suggested that committee members contact him if they are unable to locate the guidelines they need to review before that meeting. He said he will check the tenure and promotion page on the Office of the Provost website and follow up with any unit whose guidelines are not yet posted there.

IV. Disciplinary articles: Revision proposed by Milner Library

Goodman reported that he will be meeting with Dallas Long (Associate Dean of Milner Library and chairperson of the Milner CFSC) after this URC meeting to review the addition to the disciplinary articles proposed by Milner. Goodman said he has not yet received word from Mennonite College of Nursing regarding the approach its faculty has chosen to take with regard to implementation of the disciplinary articles.

Angela Bonnell updated the committee regarding ongoing Milner faculty discussions of the disciplinary articles. She reported that Long has drafted wording based on those discussions and has received positive feedback from Milner faculty members. Bonnell said there was some discussion about either Long or Shari Zeck (interim dean of Milner Library) reaching out to Mennonite about members of the Mennonite CFSC serving on the Milner CFSC if Milner is unable to replace a recused member with another Milner faculty member. Bonnell said she thinks Mennonite has agreed to do so.

V. Discussion of equity review plan

Goodman asked committee members how they want to proceed with review of the equity review plan URC received in spring 2018 from the equity review committee (the Ad Hoc Committee on ASPT Equity Review). He noted that URC still needs to discuss what it has termed phases three, four, and five of the plan. Edwards recalled that URC completed its discussion of the plan last spring not knowing if URC will be able to get the

data cited in the plan. He asked if URC should proceed with its review of the plan without knowing if the data can be obtained. Goodman suggested that the committee do so. He suggested inviting Angela Engel (director of the Office of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis) to meet with URC before the committee finalizes its recommendations, to discuss data availability and access. Committee members present concurred. Rachel Shively addressed whether URC should inform its discussions of the remaining phases by drawing from either the more detailed document or less detailed document compiled last spring by then URC chairperson Diane Dean. Shively said committee members last spring had talked about recommending a less detailed document to the Caucus while retaining a more detailed version as a document internal to URC, to guide URC implementation of the plan. She said having Caucus approve a less detailed version could afford URC flexibility in modifying the methodology if URC deems that necessary based on its experiences implementing the plan. Shively said she recalls Dean being particularly concerned about some aspects of the plan received from the ad hoc committee, thus leading her to draft the more detailed document, but does not recall other URC members having those concerns, including URC member Doris Houston who served on the ad hoc committee. Shively expressed concern that URC not stymy progress that has been made in developing the plan to the point that the plan is never implemented. Bonnell agreed with Shively's assessment. Goodman said he prefers proceeding with URC discussion of the plan by drawing from the less detailed document drafted by Dean. Edwards agreed, adding that it may have been appropriate to work from the more detailed document when crafting recommendations regarding phases one and two, but that is not the case with phase three.

[Bonnell left the meeting at 1:45 p.m.]

Committee members next discussed the section labeled "Phase three" in the "Simple Edits" document compiled by Dean and dated May 7, 2018 (see attached). Referring to Dean's edit of the first line of the section, Goodman asked why Dean had questioned use of the phrase "Quantitative analysis of conditions or dynamics ...". Edwards responded that URC may have access to information regarding dynamics of the tenure-to-resignation/retirement phase of faculty careers but not to information regarding the conditions. Shively suggested replacing "Quantitative analysis of conditions and dynamics" with "Quantitative analysis of data," to be broader in scope. Edwards suggested the phrase "Quantitative analysis of the data on progress ...". Shively moved to revise phase three, as set forth in the "Simple Edits" document, by replacing "Quantitative analysis of conditions or dynamics from tenure through resignation/retirement" with "Quantitative analysis of the data on progress from tenure through resignation/retirement." Frank Beck seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. Edwards then moved to approve phase three as set forth in the "Simple Edits" document but with the revision just accepted by URC. Yoon Ma seconded the motion. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

Goodman said the committee will continue its review of the equity review plan at another URC meeting, starting with discussion of phase four. Edwards asked if URC has to vote (again) on phases one and two. Goodman responded that the committee will do one last review of the entire document, including phases one and two, once all sections have been discussed. Goodman asked whether the style of the document recommended by URC to the Caucus should be consistent across phases one through five. Shively suggested that URC focus on substance at this point. Edwards agreed.

Goodman asked what the Caucus expects of URC with regard to the equity review plan. Stoffel explained that the Caucus has asked URC to review the draft plan and report its findings and recommendations to the Caucus. He added that the Caucus will make the final decision whether to approve the plan. Shively asked if URC should submit the equity review plan received from the ad hoc committee with URC comments and recommendations or the equity review plan as edited by URC. Stoffel suggested that Goodman confer with Kalter for an answer to that question.

VI. Adjournment

Edwards moved that the meeting adjourn. Beck seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Shively, Secretary
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

Proposed Scope of Equity Review Cycle (“Simple Edits”), May 7, 2018, compiled by URC Chairperson Diane Dean based on discussions at spring 2018 URC meetings

Phase three of Proposed Scope of Equity Review Cycle, as approved by URC on October 4, 2018

**Proposed ~~Scope of each year's equity study~~Equity Review Cycle
Based on ASPT equity ad hoc committee's discussions**

Year-Phase 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.

~~At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may~~

compromise individual faculty member's privacy. Ideally, the completion time for the study will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.

Year-Phase two

Quantitative analysis of ~~conditions~~ or dynamics from appointment through tenure, ~~university-wide, longitudinal; no controls for departmental affiliation in year two, judgment of URC and the administration whether or not to include department affiliation in years seven and beyond~~ subsequent reviews.

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.

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.

At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty member's privacy. Ideally, the completion time for the study will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.

Commented [DD1]: Reference to "conditions or dynamics" removed because the type of study proposed does not investigate that type of phenomena.

Commented [DD2]: See rationale offered in footnotes for separating out reviews of "tenure" and "promotion"

Commented [DD3]: Reference to "controls" removed because these are descriptive studies.

Year-Phase three

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

Commented [DD4]: See previous comment re: "conditions or dynamics."

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.

At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty member's privacy. Ideally, the completion time for the study will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.

Year-Phase 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.

At the conclusion of each analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty member's privacy. Ideally, the completion time for both studies will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.

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.

[At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty member's privacy. Ideally, the completion time for the study will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.](#)

Phase three

As Recommended to the Faculty Caucus by the University Review Committee
at its October 4, 2018 meeting

Quantitative analysis of the data on progress from tenure through resignation/retirement

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.

At the conclusion of the analysis, the URC will report its findings to Faculty Caucus. To preserve confidentiality, findings will be reported only in the aggregate, without any identifying information that may compromise individual faculty member's privacy. Ideally, the completion time for the study will be one year. However, actual completion time may vary in the implementation of the review. At the conclusion of the study, URC will also evaluate the overall process and make procedural recommendations for future reviews.