UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE
Illinois State University

Wednesday, February 12, 2020
1 p.m., Hovey 105

MINUTES

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

Member not present: Diane Dean, Melissa Oresky

Note: In the 2019 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," as in "ASPT policies" or "ASPT document," refers to Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure; "ASPT 2022" refers to the ASPT policies document to be drafted by URC, recommended by the Caucus, and approved by the President to take effect January 1, 2022.

I.   Call to Order

Chairperson Rachel Shively called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

II. Approval of minutes from December 13th, 2019 meeting

The previously distributed minutes were considered. Goodman moved to approve minutes. Buckley seconded the motion. The motion passed with six ayes (Nancy arrived after this vote).

III. URC meeting dates and times for spring 2020

The Committee looked over the proposed alternative schedule which alternates between Tuesdays and Wednesdays to accommodate conflicting schedules. The Committee discussed whether the meetings should be scheduled for 60 minutes or 90 minutes. If the main meetings are only 60 minsutes, the Working Groups could meet separately. He recommended looking into ways to try to have some flexibility. Use additional meetings/homework outside of the 1 hour meetings. The group consensus was to keep the meetings at 1 hour, with further Working Group meetings to provide more time for ASPT discussion.

Sam noted that there are essentially 4 weeks between meetings because of Spring break. There was a brief discussion about the possibility of switching and restarting the rotation following Spring Break. The Committee decided to keep the schedule as planned.

Finals week we may need to reschedule depending on how many people's finals schedule will accommodate the time. If not enough, may reschedule.

IV. ASPT revisions: review of what we've done and goals for spring 2020

The Committee asked Catanzaro about the time-line for the ASPT revision. Catanzaro refected backwards from when it the next book would ideally be ready. He said that it would be ideal if it could be submitted to the Senate at the beginning of Fall 2020 ("an ambitious timeline"). He suggested that the Committee could talk to senate to see if they could take it a little later. Shively will contact Susan Kalter to ask. So ideally, URC would complete the new ASPT language by May 15 2020.

Shively noted that some items have a higher priority, so the Committee could focus on those with higher need, but keep those meetings on table as a possibility.

Referring to the summary document.

The Working Subgroup's summarized their work from the Fall semester.

Subgroup 1 – Their comments are in the attachment document (Summary of Subgroup, ASPT revisions during Fall 2019) in red.

Subgroup 2 - Buckley reported on efforts to revise AFECG language as shown in agenda. The goal is to try to make the language more explicit about the options for appeal for the faculty. The new language, use to address Kalter's comments, was pulled from other sections of the document. The discussion of the changes focused on the first comment, not much on the others yet. The Committee thought that the changes look good. Catanzaro asks whether this could be crafted into an introduction section to avoid the repetition. Goodman remarks, concern is that redundancy is sometimes needed because faculty may not always know to look back to an introduction. The repetition may serve to reduce "I couldn't find it" types of comments.

There has been some discussion on the other issues, but the subcommittee hasn't had a chance to add anything written.

Subgroup 3 - Beck discussed the idea of having the D/SFSC evaluate each productivity area on a 3-yr rotation. It was concluded this would not save much effort, and at the cost of a major overhaul to the raise determination scheme. Beck reported that the group had made it through higher and shorter, made it through first 2 points in higher and slower (although not all of that is typed up yet). The italicized parts (see the attached summary) are what is proposed. After considerable discussion, the group ended up with "do not think this is a wise decision. Too many additional evaluations wrapped up in it". The group proposed a rotating model, scholarship year 1, teaching year 2, service year 3, and then restart the rotation. Rachel thinks we'd get a lot of pushback. Joe, DFSC's are overworked. Maybe it is time to tell CFSC's to tell their DFSC's to "stop." Lots of variability across DFSC's as to how much/what is required in annual reports. Way too much work being put in for the outcomes (ratings as well as raise increases). Shively asked, what is the Committee's role here and to what extent can we mandate these changes? Goodman replied that URC may have a role in streamlining departments' annual evaluation reporting requirements, which can be excessive given that merit raises are often minimal. This committee could think about proposing that the policy change is that all faculty should use a template (perhaps developed by each department). This would give the faculty a frame for what's relevant. DFSC need to be able to do an overall assessment, but they do not have to read every bit of every supporting material. Wants to have a system that supports judging quality, not just counting quantity in the DFSC evaluative processes. Shively asks: can this committee propose this kind of standardized practice? Catanzaro thinks that this is a good conversation for the faculty caucus to have. We will never have a policy that says "you have to use digital measures," but can say, "digital measures is a useful tool. It can do x, y, and z" and encourage that it be used for things. Catanzaro suggested that the URC could recommend a standard or template for department-level productivity reporting. Faculty could additionally submit any appendices to this template, but an FSC would not be required to use them. Digital Measures is being adapted for various reporting needs, but it is not likely to be a made the required standard for annual eval reporting. Catanzaro discussed some of the features of digital measures for committee workflow (he is working with campus IT on ways to develop this module for ASPT processes). Catanzaro offers to "take a crack at writing up a proposal".

Overview of the other 2 items - "consider relaxing the deadlines…" The subcommittee looked at the deadlines. Their analysis suggested that it is possible to move dates, as long as that that move doesn't contradict/interfere with other processes/deadlines. They looked at submissions of annual review, and of 5-year review and proposed that the annual review for Non-tenured faculty first could be reviewed at an earlier date, followed by a later date for review of the tenured faculty (aligned with the 5-year review). The subcommittee didn't see a big conflict (at first glance). The total difference of about two-weeks.

In a previous meeting the group discussed coming up with a calendar (internal for the committee) of all the dates

On the final point - colleges are the best place to say "departments should do this" rather than at the larger university level (because of diversity of things across different disciplines). College-level discussions more appropriate level than university-wide. That said, there can also be diversity too.

The committee discussed setting goals for the semester. The next committee meeting in two weeks. What is goal before next meeting? Should the subgroups get together prior to that meeting. The Committee agreed to meet as their subgroups prior to the next Committee meeting and to bring back thoughts about their assigned ASPT guidelines changes. Each subgroup will work to continue to drafting changes to bring to the larger Committee meeting for discussion.

Catanzaro directed the Committee's attention to Appendix 2 of the ASPT book which contains a list of things that could be considered. In light of some bigger pictures on campus (e.g., learning about inclusive teaching, advances in pedagogy, changes in publishing. Catanzaro would also like the Committee to discuss updating Appendix 2. Catanzaro will have a first draft of potential revisions to this section for discussion at the next meeting.

V.   Adjournment

Beck moved that the meeting adjourn. Goodman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 2 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Keven Edwards, Secretary

/jcc

Attachments:

Agenda item III:
Proposed Meeting Schedule for Spring 2020

Agenda item IV:
Summary of Subgroup, ASPT revisions during Fall 2019
Subgroups, ASPT 2022, University Review Committee, Fall 2019