Senator Freeman made the following motion on behalf of CALS caucus:
We move that a vote on S14-19 be postponed to Fall 2015. Because the PRS forms the basis for every faculty evaluation it is critical that we have the opportunity to fully discuss the proposed changes with department faculty and seek their input. With the compressed Senate meeting schedule at the end of the academic year, many of our departments have no faculty meetings scheduled between the distribution of this docket item in preparation of the first reading on April 21 and the potential second reading and vote on May 5. Postponement until fall will allow us to have meaningful departmental discussions and more accurately present the desire of the faculty who have elected us to represent them.
The motion passed with one dissenting voice. Discussion of the proposal continued.
Past President Dark, who chaired the PRS task force, said that the proposed FH language implements the recommendations of the PRS task force. Their aim was to provide guidance and uniformity across campus. The task force examined more than 100 PRS from all parts of campus. They also took into consideration the task force report on engaged scholarship. They asked what a PRS should look like when it has a number of functions, including evaluation of faculty (for P&T, post-tenure review, and annual reviews). The PRS was initially introduced in 1999 as a tool for P&T of tenure eligible faculty. Since then the benefits of having a PRS have become more apparent. It is an important tool in all faculty evaluation. Consequently, faculty should be more careful in constructing their PRSs.
The first recommendation is that all new or prospective faculty should receive an annotated PRS right away. The task force supplied a generic template, but recommends that each college develop its own.

The task force had a variety of recommendations about the content of the PRS. First, the task force recommended expanding the number of categories of effort. Currently there are four areas: (1) research and creative activity, (2) teaching, (3) institutional service, and (4) extension and professional practice. The task force decided that these categories do not fully capture the varieties of work that faculty do. While they did not wish to create too many categories, they wanted to capture the major types of activities that faculty do. They recommended seven categories. The second major recommendation is to mandate use of percentages in PRSs. The task force determined that these percentages should express the proportion of effort expected from faculty. This will give guidance to faculty about how much time they should be spending on each of the areas of position responsibility. She added that the proportion of effort is over several years. So a faculty member cannot conclude from an especially busy week for service that she has performed her entire service for the year. The task force recommended that PRSs be developed for all faculty, including NTE faculty. They recommended expanding the mediation process to NTE faculty.

The task force also recommended that the PRS stipulate a formal review date. For post-tenure faculty, that date might be the date of the next post-tenure review. Furthermore, the task force recommended a more formal description of who is involved in development of a faculty member’s PRS.

Senator Freeman said that three of the current categories came from Ernest Boyer’s Scholarship Reconsidered. “Scholarship of Integration” was not included as a category. Boyer thought that extension and outreach/professional practice are the same, but they are not. An extension appointment is a financial arrangement, not a formal faculty position. But on Boyer’s account, lots of faculty are doing extension work that is not currently listed. This would complicate external review.
Senator Freeman added that the “should” in “should not be divided into fractions smaller than 5%” suggests that departments have the option of complying. He added that the restriction may lead to some work being unrecognized. For example, if editorial work takes less than 5% of time, then it should not be listed. But then the faculty member has no professional service listed and reviewers would see no evidence of professional service. Senator Freeman noted that institutional service is required for P&T: every faculty member has to perform at least 5% institutional service.

Past President Dark insisted that the FH section on PRSs holds that institutional service is required. With respect to percentages, Past President Dark underscored that these are guidelines and represent proportion of effort. If the activity occupies less than 5% of the faculty member’s activities, it should not be listed on the PRS. Its not being listed will provide guidance to evaluators: the faculty member is not expected to do much activity in this area. The task force decided that the percentages were needed to clarify the difference in expectations between 40% research and 25% research responsibility.

Senator Freeman replied that he agrees that faculty do lots of activities that are not scholarship. And he agreed that it is important to have percentages, not to designate a difference in terms of quality but quantity. He worried, however, that by having so many categories, faculty members may not be able to list activities that they do because they fall below 5% effort. So instead of the PRS saying that the activity wasn’t expected, the PRS will now say that the faculty member is not getting credit for it. To this point, Past President Dark responded that the task force was careful to say that proportions were not to be used as weighting unless the department decides that they are. Senator Freeman responded that any category with 0% tells the annual reviewer that the faculty member is not expected to do it. And reviews are based on the PRS. Past President Dark countered that reviews are based on materials, which are evaluated relative to the PRS. The PRS should not be regarded as a straightjacket. There need to be a sufficient number of categories to recognize the wide variety of responsibilities that faculty have. If your department does not have expectations for you in one of the categories, that does not mean that you will not be recognized for performance in those areas. Instead the change in responsibilities should be a basis for renegotiation of the PRS.

Senator Bigelow said that he too was concerned about the restriction to 5%. He said that professional service is considered at annual reviews. He worried that this could be spun as a negative. If the PRS does not list professional service but the faculty member performed it, the reviewer could say that the faculty member should not have spent her time doing it. He also raised a concern about the number of categories; with a smaller number of categories, similar activities could be lumped together to compose sufficiently large percentages. Past President Dark countered that the four categories do not recognize work in administration. Many faculty do not have administrative responsibilities, but some do. Furthermore, this proposal enabled the PRS to distinguish between institutional service and professional service. Serving as editor for a journal is not service to the university, but service to the profession. FH makes clear that not all service is the same. With this distinction, the PRS can recognize that faculty members are doing service, just not to the university. With four categories, it’s unclear where professional service should go. It’s not extension. In Psychology, it’s listed under research, even though it clearly does not fit there.

Senator Beattie was concerned that the number of categories removes flexibility. If a faculty member is elected to a professional board, she might do less institutional service. Senator Beattie’s current PRS provides her enough flexibility to accommodate this. She agrees that all faculty should do institutional service. With the task force’s proposal, Senator Beattie would have to renegotiate her PRS every year to reflect differences in her professional activities. Past President Dark replied that
the percentages are meant to be guidelines. 5% of effort may cover 1% to 8% of effort. She added that institutional service already is a category listed in FH. The task force’s proposal does not change this. Instead, what is changed is where to list professional service. It never should have been listed under institutional service. Senator Beattie replied that when the PRS is used for P&T review, it is not treated simply as a guideline. Instead, committee members review the candidate’s performance in terms of these percentages. Past President Dark responded that the task force doubted this claim: when faculty are evaluated for P&T, research and creative activity are the main focus. But only scholarly products reviewed externally belong in this category. When faculty are assessed by external reviewers, it’s on the basis of their research activity.

(A motion was passed with some dissension to extend the meeting for five minutes.) Senator Sturm said that he did not see anything in the proposal that would prevent a faculty member and chair from agreeing to a PRS that lists 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. In his experience, P&T does not evaluate research only. He is aware of cases where faculty were denied promotion because of poor teaching. But he agreed that he had never seen someone denied promotion because of poor service or extension work.

Senator Freeman said that there is nothing in FH that says that institutional service must be a category in the PRS. It is a requirement for tenure-track faculty. Nothing says that a faculty member must be effective in every possible area of position responsibility. Instead the language allows faculty members the opportunity to list items in their PRS that are helpful to them. Past President Dark said that the requirement for institutional service is listed somewhere in the introductory sections of the PRS. Senator Freeman countered that it does not say that exactly those items have to be listed. For example, Senator Freeman does not have an extension appointment, so no extension activity is listed in his PRS. But in the FH section on P&T criteria, institutional service is required. Past President Dark replied that P&T is an evaluation, and evaluations are supposed to be relative to the PRS. All important categories of responsibility need to be listed in the PRS. The task force tried to make clear that for people other than tenured professors, the proportions of effort should reflect the expectations regarding promotion, tenure, or advancement in the department. Senator Freeman countered that it does not say that exactly those items have to be listed. For example, Senator Freeman does not have an extension appointment, so no extension activity is listed in his PRS. But in the FH section on P&T criteria, institutional service is required. Past President Dark said that it is listed somewhere in FH. Senator Seeger said that separating extension from outreach is confusing. He said that in Landscape Architecture, faculty describe themselves as performing extension and outreach. He recommended that the committee take a closer look at how the activity is defined by that office. Senator Seeger said that his activities were evaluated point by point with respect to his PRS. Past President Dark said that the task force found extension and outreach to be very contentious. One person on the committee representing extension commented that he found it strange that extension and outreach were conflated. The task force report on engaged scholarship said that extension is a formal appointment. People on the PRS task force read the engaged scholarship report as suggesting that “extension” should be eliminated and replaced with “engagement and outreach.” But a strong contingent of the PRS committee insisted that there needs to be a category of extension for people who have extension appointments. Senator Seeger replied that as an extension specialist, he is doing outreach. But he could understand how someone could do outreach without an extension appointment.

Senator Ryan said that PRS percentages are definitely used in P&T. Past President Dark said that not every PRS lists percentages of effort. What is primarily evaluated in P&T is the extent to which the faculty member has made contributions in research and creative activity. Senator Ryan disputed this, saying it is not true and does not hold in every college.
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Past President Dark said that she had not received any further comments. She thought the time allotted for discussion in FS should be longer. She asked whether she would be responsible for presenting this motion in the fall. Senator Paschke said that Tim Derrick would be the new chair of FDAR. Others, including Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince, thought that Past President Dark would be a good presenter because she was present at all of the discussions of the policy.

Senator Butler asked about the limit to how small percentages may be. What happens if someone has three duties which are equally weighted? Past President Dark replied that a strict interpretation of the percentages was not intended; all percentages are plus or minus 5%. So a 30% effort would include 33%. The PRS provides rough guidelines of approximately how much time a faculty member should spend over a year on different kinds of activities. Senator Selby recommended that the task force drop the limits on percentages, because it doesn’t serve the task force’s goal. She didn’t see any harm in allowing someone’s PRS to list an activity as occupying 3% of effort. Past President Dark said that the task force was motivated by advice from Paul Tanaka of University Counsel: PRSs should not be so detailed that they become job descriptions. Senator Selby noted that if there had been no mention of limits on percentages, these objections wouldn’t have arisen. Past President Dark countered that some departments in LAS wanted to avoid using percentages at all. The proposed policy would make PRSs more uniform, but it is important to emphasize that these are guidelines.

Senator Bigelow objected to the combination of limits on percentages and the large number of categories. For instance, PRSs currently list “service” as an activity area. The proposal would distinguish institutional and professional service. If a faculty member’s PRS states 5%, but the efforts are just less than 5%, then he or she will not get credit from her chair for those activities for P&T. He recommended adopting fewer categories or removing the limit.

Senator Freeman asked if the problem to be solved concerns percent of effort, why does the policy need to identify the categories? Under current policy, faculty can negotiate with their chairs what the categories are. Past President Dark replied that there is variation across the university. Senator Selby added that the variation makes it difficult for the Provost’s Office or University P&T Committee to assess a dossier when institutional service is not listed as an area. Senator Freeman countered that there isn’t a problem when it comes to P&T, because P&T policies state what the categories of evaluation are. If a faculty member cannot document (significant) institutional service, then he or she should not be promoted. Senator Minion asked how someone could be evaluated for P&T if his or her PRS did not list percentages.

Senator Butler observed that discussions about percentages of effort and evaluation conflate considerations about effort and about output. Senator Freeman replied that higher percentages of effort imply the expectation of greater output. Colleges stipulate how much effort should be assigned to teaching based on number of classes. In CALS, 50% teaching is two classes per semester, whereas in Engineering, 50% teaching is two classes per year. Senator Butler observed that this frustrates the goal of uniformity. Past President Dark replied that there is uniformity within the colleges. Senator Bigelow observed, however, that counting classes is difficult: how to count labs, large classes, etc.

Senator Sturm read his PRS aloud to EB. Members thought that his PRS was much too specific, listing particular course numbers to be taught. Past President Dark said that the goal is to provide an outline of expectations, not conditions for continued employment.
Senators raised concerns about disadvantages that new faculty face when negotiating their PRSs. Senator Bigelow suggested that an important factor for success is good mentoring when negotiating. Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that the current practice is that faculty members receive a complete PRS along with the letter of intent. Past President Dark said that the new policy would send a PRS template with the letter of intent. Senator Bigelow thought that the policy didn’t need to be changed, but mentoring needs to be better. Senator Freeman said that there should be an alignment between the PRS and the job announcement. Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince replied that the PRS should be individualized and flexible.

Returning to teaching, Senator Paschke asked what a higher percentage of effort for teaching means. Does it mean more classes? More innovation? Higher course evaluations? Senator Freeman replied that it means that the faculty member should be effective in a larger number of classes. Past President Dark added that there are circumstances where that might not be true. For instance, if a faculty member is developing a new curriculum, that activity may fall under teaching, in which case the faculty number might teach fewer classes.

Senator Freeman argued that extension and outreach should be regarded as the same thing. Although one activity might be budgeted, they are the same activity. He thought this was confirmed by the single university office of extension and outreach. Senator Zarecor said that the previous complaint was that the category of extension and outreach didn’t cover scholarship of engagement. She proposed lumping all of these categories together. Past President Dark said that the separation was in response to faculty members with extension appointments. Senator Zarecor provided an example of a colleague who performs one set of activities that are extension and outreach, and it would be impossible to parcel them out into separate categories of effort. Senator Minion supported distinguishing extension from outreach. Clinicians interact with the public in a variety of ways as outreach, not extension.

This discussion returned EB to the question of whether the policy should enumerate specific categories. Senator Butler suggested recommending categories, but allowing faculty members to combine or distinguish categories as appropriate. Senator Sturm replied that appeals in J&A were made on the basis that the PRS was not precise enough. Senator Bigelow recommended combining extension and outreach, allowing faculty to define the category as appropriate for their department. He observed that even if the proposed policy were to pass, these questions would persist.

Senator Butler wondered whether the task force was making changes in response to a problem where only greater awareness was needed to improve departments’ practices. Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that it was not simply a couple of departments; there were many bad practices all over the university. Senator Freeman asked why there needs to be so much consistency. Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that the proposal is an ideal, but each college should make its own guidelines. Senator Freeman countered that the current proposal tells colleges what the categories will be. Senator Selby and Senator Bigelow agreed, saying that the proposal does not allow colleges to change the categories.
Special Order
A. PRS Changes to Handbook (discussion only; no vote) – [S14-19] Dark
(Past-) Past President Dark provided an overview of the substantive differences proposed.
Senator Han (Greenlee School) asked about the category for administrative work. If a faculty
member is an associate professor and associate chair of the department, he or she spends time in
administrative duties. How does this affect the decision for promotion to professor? Can a person be
promoted primarily based on performance in the service or administration category? Past President
Dark replied that this is not a question that the PRS is designed to answer. For such a faculty
member, some proportion of his or her effort is supposed to be devoted to administrative work. Other
parts of FH specify that administrative work is not grounds for promotion. Senator Freeman added
that FH clarifies that the primary category for evaluation for promotion is excellence in scholarship
and national and international recognition in field. If a faculty member has administrative
responsibilities listed on the PRS, the faculty member should perform those responsibilities well. The
second criterion for promotion is effectiveness in areas of PRS. But just being a good administrator is
not grounds for promotion.

Senator Guyll (Psychology) asked about FH 3.4.2.3, concerning the clause about collegiality. Senator
Guyll was concerned that “collegiality” may be defined differently by different units, colleges, or not
at all. He thought that it was problematic to introduce collegiality at all in evaluation of faculty
performance. In 1999, AAUP recommending against using collegiality as a criterion for evaluation.
As currently worded, FH requires an affirmative or positive expression of some behavior rather than
preventing non-collegial behavior. He said that if there should be any statement about collegiality, it
would be better to have a statement about proscribed behavior rather than expected behavior. Past
President Dark said that the most current version of recommendations simply describes a collegial
work environment and refers to FH chapter 7. All faculty members’ conduct is expected to comply
with FH chapter 7. Senator Guyll said that the recommendation should simply refer to FH chapter
7 and not discuss inclusion of a statement of collegiality in faculty members’ PRSs. Past President
Dark replied that some colleges and departments have statements of collegiality. The point is that
those affected faculty’s PRSs should mention those statements. Senator Guyll said that the policy
should use “should” or “might” or “may” instead. Past President Dark replied that the goal is to
ensure commonality in what goes into PRSs across college and departments, but allow some room
for flexibility. When the task force examined PRSs from different colleges, they discovered a lot of
difference. There’s no mandate here. If your college or unit wants something included, there’s
flexibility to include it in the PRS. Senator Guyll asked whether the policy needs to say specifically
that colleges or units are allowed to include collegiality statements. Would they be prevented from
including these if the policy did not say so? Past President Dark said that from conversations with
University Counsel, it was recommended that there be a statement that explicitly told faculty that
professional behavior was a condition of employment. Most people assume this, but it doesn’t hurt to
include it. Some colleges do include this, and the task force tried to take into account the different
templates. There was a lot of discussion about whether this should be mandated. The task force
resolved that that’s a decision that the university shouldn’t make, but different units should make.

Senator Guyll said that University Counsel also said that behaviors they wish to prevent were already
implied in FH chapters 7 and 5. These were already conditions of employment and didn’t need to be
additionally made explicit. Past President Dark disputed that Paul Tanaka (from University Counsel)
said this. There is a general expectation that faculty members behave in a professional manner, and
FH chapter 7 addresses this. But in the PRS—as a generalized job description—the goal is to make
clear to both parties (the faculty member and the university) what the expectations are. Mr. Tanaka thought it was a good idea to make an explicit reference to the conduct policy in FH 7. Senator Guyll respectfully disagreed. He thought including this explicit statements opens up a potential misunderstanding and may be misused against people with difficult relationships whose behavior does not rise to such a level that it affects the functioning of the university, its mission, or other individuals.

Senator Amidon said that every faculty member at ISU is subject to FH chapter 7. Therefore an affirmative statement in a “PRS” excludes the possibility that faculty will think that they are somehow not or cannot be held responsible for conduct as members of faculty. A clear distinction between faculty performance and faculty conduct is important, but there are places in FH where they overlap. He thought it was important to keep the distinction clear and useful.

Senator Clough (At Large from Human Sciences) suggested ending the statement after the mention of FH chapter 7. Nothing in FH chapter 7 concerns collegiality. Past President Dark said that the task force had also recommending that the word “collegiality” be introduced in FH chapter 7. That proposal is not under consideration here. But, she added, some colleges do have statements of collegiality. This proposal acknowledges that. Senator Clough asked what happens if a college has interpreted “collegiality” but FH does not address it. Because “collegiality” does not appear in FH, it should not be included here. Future FS discussions may take up introducing “collegiality” into FH, but that would be a future discussion.

Senator Guyll said that in the February 26, 2015 edition the word “collegiality” does not exist. It is implied in FH 7.1.2, but the word is not used.

Past President Dark asked senators to provide more feedback before the next meeting in the fall.