

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Friday, January 25, 2019
9:30 a.m., Hovey 102

MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting), Kevin Edwards, Joe Goodman, Nancy Novotny (via telephone), Sarah Smelser

Members not present: Frank Beck, Diane Dean, Rachel Shively, Yoon Jim Ma

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” and “ASPT 2017” refer to *Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies* effective January 1, 2017, Illinois State University, as subsequently amended and reissued effective January 1, 2019; “ASPT 2022” refers to the ASPT policies document yet to be compiled and scheduled to take effect January 1, 2022; “CFSC” refers to college faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT policies; and “DFSC” refers to department faculty status committee as provided for in ASPT policies. Any general reference in these minutes to “DFSC” (i.e., a reference other than to the DFSC of a particular unit) refers to both DFSC and SFSC, and any reference to “department” or “school” (other than to a particular unit) refers to both department and school.

I. Call to order

Chairperson Joe Goodman called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. He welcomed committee members.

II. Approval of minutes

Angela Bonnell noted that the term “dusty coral” near the top of page four of the draft minutes should be changed to “living coral.”

Sarah Smelser moved approval of minutes from the December 13, 2018 URC meeting with the change suggested by Bonnell. Bonnell seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on voice vote.

III. Committee tasks for spring 2019

Goodman said a committee priority for the spring term is finalizing recommendations to the Faculty Caucus regarding the equity review plan submitted to URC by the Ad Hoc Committee for ASPT Equity Review in spring 2018. He noted that URC members had agreed in fall 2018 to consult with Office of Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis staff before finalizing URC recommendations to the Caucus, to determine what data identified in the equity review plan can be made available to the committee and what data cannot.

Bruce Stoffel noted that URC will need to review and approve CFSC annual reports submitted to the committee by May 1. He said he hopes to provide URC members longitudinal data compiled from CFSC reports submitted this year and in prior years, to help committee members study the data for trends.

Sam Catanzaro addressed the committee regarding preparation of the next edition of ASPT policies, scheduled to take effect January 1, 2022. For the next edition to take effect on that date, he said, the completed edition as approved by the Caucus would need to be distributed to units in fall 2021 so units have time to make any changes to their ASPT standards or guidelines needed to align with ASPT 2022 before the end of calendar 2021. For there to be a final version of the document to distribute to units in fall 2021, the Caucus will need to vote to approve the edition in spring 2021. Catanzaro said URC will need to submit its final recommendations for ASPT 2022 to the Caucus by fall 2020, to provide the Caucus sufficient time to review the

recommendations and seek any additional documentation or vet any additional revisions through URC. That suggests, Catanzaro continued, that URC will need to complete a first draft of ASPT 2022 in 2019-2020, next academic year. He recommended that URC compile a list this spring of changes the committee wants to consider when compiling its draft of the new ASPT policies document.

Catanzaro said he has begun to compile a list of issues he would like URC to consider when it begins discussing ASPT 2022. Among them, he said, is use of external reviews to inform tenure decisions. Catanzaro noted that external reviews are required by some units but not by all. He said it might be time to incorporate external reviews university-wide. Catanzaro noted that the College of Arts and Sciences phased in use of external reviews across all of its units over the last 10 years. The process is now well established, he said. He noted that using external reviews to guide tenure or promotion decisions serves as a faculty support mechanism for faculty members with unique areas of interest and scholarship whose significance may not be widely understood by other faculty members in their unit. Catanzaro said URC could provide ground rules for what information is sent to a person selected to write an external review for an Illinois State faculty member and what information our units should expect to receive in external review letters. He suggested that external reviewers should not say whether the faculty seeking tenure should be tenured by Illinois State or whether the faculty member would be eligible for tenure at the external reviewer's institution. Instead, Catanzaro suggested, the external reviewer should be asked to write about the significance of the faculty member's contribution to the discipline.

Smelser asked how a list of external reviewers is made. Catanzaro responded that the College of Arts and Sciences requires each of its units to specify the method the unit will use to select external reviewers. Kevin Edwards said in his unit (in the College of Arts and Sciences) the faculty member seeking tenure proposes who should be asked for external review letters. Catanzaro explained that there typically is a conversation involving the faculty member seeking tenure and DFSC members. He noted that external letters are confidential, but the faculty member seeking tenure knows who the external reviewers are. Catanzaro said URC might think about how introduction of external reviews across all units at the University might be staged over time, perhaps by delaying the effective date of the requirement to give probationary faculty members time to think about who might be on their external reviewer list when it is time to apply for tenure.

Catanzaro said another issue he would like URC to discuss is standardizing the approach units take regarding mid-probationary reviews. He noted that mid-probationary review is a chance for DFSCs to take a broader view of a faculty member's progress toward tenure than is possible if relying solely on annual performance evaluations. A goal of mid-probationary reviews, he said, is to avoid having faculty members denied tenure after having received satisfactory performance reviews each year of the probationary period. He said URC might consider providing a context in ASPT 2022 for how mid-probationary reviews should function.

Catanzaro noted that most other issues on his list for URC discussion involve clarifying or elaborating on existing policies. He cited as one example deadlines for annual evaluations. He noted that the long-standing policy for when annual evaluations are to be conducted is based at least in part on a budget process and a budget timeline that are no longer followed and may never again be followed. Stoffel suggested that URC may also want to consider reviewing reporting requirements set forth in ASPT policies, since that was not done when ASPT 2017 was compiled. It may be useful, he said, for URC to consider what information it needs to receive regarding the ASPT system and for what purposes.

Goodman reported that he is scheduled to meet with Caucus Chairperson Susan Kalter next Friday (February 1, 2019) to talk about spring tasks for URC. Among the tasks Kalter has already mentioned to him, Goodman said, are discussions regarding how the Distinguished Professor and University Professor designations might fit into ASPT provisions, continued discussions regarding service assignments, and discussions regarding use of counter offers to retain faculty members.

Bonnell said she is taking from the discussion (at this meeting) that URC has a lot of work ahead. She asked if she should share that information with faculty members who might replace her on URC when her term expires in May (2019). Goodman said that would be appropriate, noting that URC has become a heavy service assignment in recent years.

IV. Update regarding CFSC standards

Goodman noted that, as the fall term ended, the College of Applied Science and Technology and the College of Business were holding faculty votes on their revised CFSC standards or were planning to do so in January 2019. Goodman said he will seek from both colleges the CFSC standards approved by their faculty, so URC can take final action on them. He asked Catanzaro if there is anything URC might do in the future to ensure that final action has been taken by the colleges on their CFSC documents before their effective dates. Catanzaro posited that delays in college action on ASPT matters may be occurring in part because the responsibilities of deans have increased over time. Catanzaro said he might have a conversation with the Provost about how the Provost's office might better support the deans with their expanded roles. Bonnell noted that the length of time deans stay in their positions is perhaps shorter than in the past. She said it may be helpful to work with deans so they understand what they need to do and what their units need to do (regarding and related to the ASPT system). Stoffel thanked Goodman for his extensive work during the fall term to encourage and support the colleges in revising their CFSC standards to incorporate the new disciplinary articles. He noted that Goodman communicated regularly with college deans or associate deans throughout the fall term and met personally with staff in some colleges to explain the changes that needed to be made and the options colleges had for doing so.

V. Equity review plan, phase five and next steps

URC next considered phase five of the equity review plan (see attached), the last section to be reviewed by the committee for recommendations to the Caucus. Edwards asked if the phase five tasks involve work with the smallest numbers compared to numbers expected when implementing the other four phases of the plan. If so, he said, URC might ask OEOA (the Office of Equity Opportunity and Access) to conduct the phase five analysis and report to URC if the office believes there to be an equity issue that needs to be addressed. Goodman noted that the small number of cases the committee may encounter in any of the five phases may make it problematic for the committee to conduct equity review. Catanzaro agreed. Catanzaro also expressed concern about maintaining confidentiality of faculty members involved in disciplinary matters given the small number of cases anticipated, even if cases across multiple years are aggregated for study by URC. Edwards asked if there is oversight by the University in matters involving so few cases. If so, he said, URC might not need to be involved. Catanzaro responded that there is no systematic monitoring of these matters at this time. He explained that OEOA involvement in equity matters has been focused on claims of discrimination with respect to protected classes. Goodman suggested that URC modify the phase five description to provide for reporting of counts rather than percentages. Because there will likely be low numbers of counts, he said, the low percentages calculated using those low counts may lead to a conclusion by some that a problem does not exist when that might not be the case.

Noting that the meeting was nearing its end, Goodman suggested tabling the discussion until the next URC meeting. He thanked the committee for the useful discussion thus far. *Bonnell moved to table discussion of equity review plan phase five. Nancy Novotny seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on voice vote.*

VI. Other business

There was none.

VII. Adjournment

Smelser moved that the meeting adjourn. Bonnell seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 10:34 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachment:

Proposed equity review plan phase five (aka "Year five"), "Simple Edits" document compiled by Dr. Diane Dean, Chairperson, University Review Committee, May 7, 2018.

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.](#)