

**UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
Illinois State University

Thursday, October 18, 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, Sarah Smelser, Rachel Shively

Members not present: Diane Dean

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; “PRPA” refers to the Office of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis 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 1:00 p.m.

II. Approval of minutes

Frank Beck moved approval of minutes from the October 4, 2018 URC meeting. Angela Bonnell seconded the motion. The motion passed on voice vote, with seven ayes and one abstention (Sarah Smelser).

III. Update

ASPT professional development series

Sam Catanzaro reported that the second program in the 2018-2019 series of ASPT workshops is scheduled to be offered twice in November: at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, November 6 in Stevenson 101 and at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, November 7 in Schroeder 238. The content of the two sessions will be the same: assessment of teaching. Catanzaro thanked Rachel Shively and Smelser for agreeing to preview the presentation slides he is preparing for the program. He noted that two former URC members, Christopher Horvath and Andy Rummel, have also agreed to preview the presentation slides and to assist with the program in other ways as needed. Catanzaro explained that Horvath and Rummel authored the first URC working group report on student reactions to teaching performance (approved by URC on May 13, 2016).

Catanzaro further reported that the first program in the 2018-2019 ASPT workshop series (an overview of the ASPT system and new disciplinary articles held on September 25 and 26) will be reprised once in November. The extra session of the program is scheduled for 9 a.m. on Tuesday, November 13 in State Farm Hall of Business 430. Catanzaro explained that the third offering of the program is an opportunity to obtain a video recording of the program, for use by ASPT committees. He noted that the room is equipped with video recording technologies and that College of Business information technology staff will attend to record the

session. Catanzaro said he hopes that, by the end of the session, at least one member of every ASPT committee will have attended one of the three offerings of the program. Catanzaro thanked Goodman for suggesting and helping arrange the reprised session.

#### Revisions to disciplinary articles proposed by Milner Library

Goodman reported that a meeting has been scheduled with representatives from Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing to discuss their respective plans for implementation of the new disciplinary articles, the request to the Faculty Caucus by Milner faculty for an exception to the recusal clause in the articles, and any requests to the Caucus from Mennonite faculty for exceptions to provisions of the articles.

#### IV. Discussion of service assignments research

Committee members discussed findings from their research regarding content of DFSC/SFSC guidelines related to service activities. Committee members had reviewed those documents and entered their findings in an Excel spreadsheet posted on OneDrive (a component of the Microsoft Office suite). Goodman distributed a print copy of the spreadsheet to committee members help guide the discussion (see attached).

Goodman expressed surprise that many DFSC/SFSC guidelines do not set forth weights for teaching, service, and research for purposes of faculty assignments or faculty evaluation. He observed that among those guidelines that do set forth weights, the minimum weight for service is 10 percent. He said from his review of the research findings he can see why the Caucus raised some of the concerns regarding service assignments that it did in 2016. Nancy Novotny said she is particularly appreciative of learning from the research documentation that some units emphasize the quality of service contributions over quantity.

Goodman reported having recently received additional questions from Susan Kalter (Faculty Caucus chairperson) regarding service: whether it is appropriate that some faculty members are assigned service and some are not and whether it is clear to faculty members what activities their DFSC/SFSC categorizes as service. Catanzaro said a related question is how a unit evaluates the quality of service. Shively asked if the Caucus chairperson wants URC to draft policies regarding service. Goodman said he understands that the chairperson wants service issues addressed by URC as it compiles the next edition of ASPT policies (scheduled to go into effect January 1, 2022). Shively said that approach would be appropriate, because policies in the (ASPT) document regarding service are vague. Beck noted that service policies may not be specified in ASPT documents, but that does not mean such policies do not exist; he noted that an informal agreement among faculty members in a unit may be in play.

Kevin Edwards observed that (the Department of) Special Education is an outlier in terms of its weighting of teaching, research, and service, at 33 percent each. He reported having emailed the department chairperson for additional information regarding the weights. He said he learned that Special Education allocates 25 percent of faculty time to service in its faculty assignments but weights service at 33 percent when evaluating faculty performance. Edwards said his unit weights faculty time in its faculty assignments at 40-40-20 (teaching, research, service), and those same weights are observed when evaluating faculty. Catanzaro said the practice of weighting teaching, research, and service differently in faculty assignments and faculty evaluations is not unique to Special Education and is a phenomenon difficult to unravel. Yoon Ma noted that her unit changed its allocations of faculty time from 33-33-33 to 60-30-10 some years ago to better reflect faculty members' work.

Catanzaro spoke about a common model at the University for allocating faculty time: 75 percent to teaching activities and 25 percent to research activities. He said the model evolved from the practice of assigning tenure-line faculty members three three-credit-hour courses and reassigning time that would be allocated to teaching a fourth course to research. As that model evolved, he said, service activities were left unaddressed in faculty assignments but were instead considered an implicit responsibility of every faculty member to help run the University. An option, he said, might be for all units to adopt that approach to service and that practice of allocating faculty time.

Goodman noted that URC is charged with focusing on university-wide ASPT policies and CFSCs are charged with oversight of DFSC guidelines. He noted that URC has reviewed DFSC documentation regarding service only to inform URC discussions of university-wide policies. He added that if there are concerns regarding service assignments, he prefers asking CFSCs to review and address those concerns. Beck agreed. Edwards asked for a sense of committee members whether the ASPT document (ASPT policies) needs to be revised with respect to its treatment of service. Goodman said he agrees that service provisions in the ASPT document may need to be revised but he does not support prescribing point systems. Edwards agreed, noting that units can best decide their policies. Shively suggested that URC can at least ask units to be clear about their service policies in their (ASPT) guidelines.

Goodman said he plans to give Kalter a synopsis of the committee findings and ask her how she thinks URC should proceed with this matter.

#### V. Continued discussion of equity review plan

Goodman questioned how URC should proceed with drafting its description of equity review phase four. Shively asked if the committee still plans to consult with the Office of Planning, Research, and Policy analysis regarding availability of data specified in the plan; she noted that the phase four description references use of private information, which might not be available to the committee. Goodman said he plans to email the PRPA director to arrange for her attendance at a URC meeting to discuss data availability. Edwards asked if PRPA has access to the data referenced in the draft phase four description. Catanzaro responded that data regarding non-reappointment of faculty members and performance evaluation outcomes are already made available to URC annually by the CFSCs, albeit in aggregate. He explained that URC does not currently ask for that information disaggregated by race or gender. He noted that connecting background information regarding individual faculty members with information contained in the CFSC reports would be challenging.

Edwards asked Catanzaro how many faculty members at the University receive (overall) unsatisfactory performance ratings each year. Catanzaro said that number averages five or so. Shively observed that it would be hard to draw conclusions from so little data. She suggested compiling the most recent five years of data and reviewing that instead. Edwards agreed, noting that URC would almost have to use that approach to conduct any meaningful statistical analyses.

Goodman said, in practice, the burden of proof is on the faculty member who believes he or she is the subject of discrimination, adding that it is the responsibility of the faculty member to raise the issue. Goodman said he realizes that discrimination exists in his profession, but he would like to think that the University addresses it appropriately. An option, Catanzaro offered, might be for URC to track data to identify trends and potential problems and to encourage faculty members to use processes already in place to address concerns regarding discrimination. Shively reminded committee members that the equity review committee studied this matter for quite a while; she said she is satisfied with the plan presented to URC by that committee because the plan reflects much prior thought.

Regarding the draft phase four description in the plan, Edwards said he does not see reasons to change much other than to incorporate use of exit interviews to determine why faculty members leave the University. He said summaries of exit interviews could be reviewed for trends. Committee members discussed challenges with exit interviews, including some faculty members being reluctant to share their reasons for leaving. Goodman noted that the University is legally responsible for investigating any concerns regarding discrimination (with respect to protected class) articulated in exit interviews; he added that some faculty members may choose not to raise such concerns in their exit interview to avoid a lengthy investigation at a time when their focus is on their next position. Catanzaro suggested that such challenges could be taken into account when designing and implementing a study of exit interviews. With expansion of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access staff, perhaps an exit interview database could be created, he said.

Goodman asked committee members how to proceed with review of equity review phase four in light of the discussion at this meeting. Edwards offered to email committee members the changes he proposes, for discussion at the next URC meeting. Goodman thanked Edwards for the offer.

VI. Other business

Goodman reported having received an email from Kalter asking if a faculty member may serve on the Academic Senate and a DFSC at the same time. Goodman said URC need not discuss the matter at this time; he said he is reporting the question so it is on the record for discussion the next time the ASPT document is reviewed by URC.

VII. Adjournment

Smelser moved that the meeting adjourn. Shively 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

Attachment:

*College and Department/School ASPT Standards, Service Assignments Research, Fall 2018*, compiled by Dr. Joe Goodman, Chairperson, University Review Committee, Illinois State University, October 18, 2018.

College and Department/School ASPT Standards  
Service Assignment Research Fall 2018

**College of Applied Science and Technology**

Research	Teaching	Service	Other Informative Findings
25	65	10	Can vary. "For assignments other than the typical assignment, the faculty member will meet with the DFSC to highly quantitative; must meet a threshold of service activity to maintain their tier rating on scholarship and teaching assignments."
na	< or =40	na	Use a point system of accomplishments, in which service is scaled variably with level of achievement; at higher level faculty specify their ASPT weights. Those failing to specify default to: Teaching 50%, Research 40%; Service 10%
40-55	35-50	varies?	Use a 5 point system; "While service is an important aspect of professional life, it is expected that faculty will negotiate differential weights for tenure-track faculty. "Tenured faculty have the option to negotiate differential weights for service assignments and pre-tenured faculty are expected to be at least 20%.
40	40	20	Individual assignments of teaching and services are determined through consultation with the chairperson; service is determined through the DFSC's performance evaluation of all faculty members shall be the quality of work performed. "Ordinarily, to get a satisfactory performance rating for service for a calendar year, a faculty member must have a minimum of 20% of service time spent in the classroom. Faculty are evaluated on Tier I, II, or III for each of the three areas and relative to the annual assignment letter.
45*	45	10	The weights can be tailored to each faculty member's roles. Includes detailed plan for service assignments and pre-tenured faculty are expected to be at least 20%.

Agriculture  
Criminal Justice  
Family and Consumer Sciences  
Health Sciences  
Information Technology  
Kinesiology and Recreation  
Technology

**ASPT Evaluative Percentage Weights**

Research	Teaching	Service
40	40	20
40	40	20
40	40	20
45	45	10
Not specified		
Not specified		
Not specified		
Not specified		
na	na	na
40	40	20
Not specified		
Not specified		

**College of Arts and Sciences**

Research	Teaching	Service	Other Informative Findings
40	40	20	These are the typical weights; weights may vary with individual assignments. All faculty are expected to contribute to the college's mission through teaching, research, and service. Weights may vary within a range of Research 20-60, teaching 20-60, service 10-40. DFSC Appendix C.
40	40	20	"...holistic method" "Holistic" means the faculty member is a teacher-scholar-participant in the academic community. The weights can be tailored to each faculty member's roles. Includes detailed plan for service assignments and pre-tenured faculty are expected to be at least 20%.
45	45	10	Individual assignments of teaching and services are determined through consultation with the chairperson; service is determined through the DFSC's performance evaluation of all faculty members shall be the quality of work performed. "Ordinarily, to get a satisfactory performance rating for service for a calendar year, a faculty member must have a minimum of 20% of service time spent in the classroom. Faculty are evaluated on Tier I, II, or III for each of the three areas and relative to the annual assignment letter.
Not specified			The weights can be tailored to each faculty member's roles. Each weight must be at least 20%.
Not specified			Tenured faculty is expected more than pre-tenured faculty; no service expectation during the first year once hired.
Not specified			
Not specified			

Biological Sciences  
Chemistry  
Communication  
Communication Sciences and Disorders  
Economics  
English  
Geography  
History  
Mathematics  
Philosophy  
Physics  
Politics  
Psychology  
Social Work  
Sociology and Anthropology

**ASPT Evaluative Percentage Weights**

Research	Teaching	Service
20-40	40-60	10-30
40	50	10
30	50	20
20	50	30
Not specified		
na	na	na

College of Business  
Accounting  
Finance, Insurance, and Law  
Management and Quantitative Methods  
Marketing

**ASPT Evaluative Percentage Weights**

Research	Teaching	Service
33.3	33.3	33.3
Not specified		
ASPT Evaluative Percentage Weights		
The document is not available to review		
Not specified		
Not specified		

College of Education  
Educational Administrations and Foundations  
Special Education  
Teaching and Learning  
College of Fine Arts  
Art  
Music  
Theater and Dance

**ASPT Evaluative Percentage Weights**

Research	Teaching	Service
ASPT Evaluative Percentage Weights		
Research		

Memnonite College of Nursing  
DFSC

"Every faculty member of the School of Theatre and Dance is expected to support the School's mission by serving the community through teaching, research, and service."

ASPT Evaluative Percentage Weights  
Research Teaching Service

Miller Library  
DFSC