**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, April 6, 2022**

Approved

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate chairperson Martha Callison Horst called the meeting to order.

***Public Comment:*** None.

***Action item:***

***Tabled: 03.24.22.11 ASPT REVIEW Section IX (University Review Committee chairperson Chad Buckley and Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Administration Roberta Trites)***

Motion by Senator Nikolaou, seconded by Senator Cline, to remove item 03.24.22.11 from the table. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Horst: You will note we have a new document, and it has the amendment from Senator Bonnell. I had some members of the Executive Committee suggest that we consider these edits separately in this document. As opposed to taking an entire vote on all of article IX, we do separate votes on each of the proposed amendments. Is there any objection to that strategy? (Pause) Okay. Seeing none.

Article IX, there’s no proposed changes in A. We go to B.5., “ Department/Schools will provide all faculty members with the Department’s/School’s, College’s, and University’s criteria for tenure. Under no circumstances should a candidate be promised or in any way assured of tenure.”

Article IX B.5 changes were unanimously approved.

Senator Horst: Now we are going to the language in C. The insertion is, “In certain exceptional cases a DFSC/SFSC may recommend an individual be initially appointed with tenure, and thus that individual is exempt from the requirements associated with the Illinois State University probationary period described in this section. Such individuals will have completed a probationary period at an institution with equivalent or greater standards for tenure at the department/school level and/or have earned tenure there. Other exceptions to these criteria, while possible, shall be rare.” Is there any debate on that item? (Pause) Hearing none.

Article IX C. changes were unanimously approved.

Senator Horst: Now we’re going to what’s marked as D. Procedural Considerations Related to Tenure. We have a number change (I’m including that) and the new text is, “Each candidate for tenure will undergo a formative mid-probationary tenure review conducted by the DFSC/SFSC in the candidate’s third or fourth year as specified in the Department/School ASPT document in order to assess the candidate’s progress toward tenure. The timing of this review should be stated in the Department/School ASPT document. For faculty who have had a stop-the-clock request approved, that year shall not be considered in the timeline (IX.B.3). Any scholarly or creative activity completed and submitted for consideration by the faculty member during the stop-the-clock period shall be included in all evaluations.” Is there any debate on that?

Motion by Senator Cline, seconded by Senator Nikolaou, to replace “should” with “shall.” The motion was unanimously approved.

Article IX D.3 changes were unanimously approved.

Senator Horst: Now D.4.

Senator Blum: I’d like to make a motion to amend D.4. I have a paper to hand out.

Senator Horst: Okay. Why don’t you read your motion and we’ll see if there’s a second?

Senator Blum: Sure. Strike “Effective August 16, 2028.” “All Departments/Schools may require that two or more peer evaluators, external to Illinois State University, review the credentials of each faculty member who is a candidate for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.” And everything else as it stands.

Motion by Senator Blum, seconded by Senator Lucey, to approve the amended language.

Senator Horst: So, it says, “This requirement must be stated in the Departmental/School policies and procedures document.” We’re noting that there are some absolutes in the following language that says they must do this, “Department/School guidelines must include…”

Senator Blum: Okay. That would be a friendly amendment to change that to “may.”

Senator Horst: Okay. Could I read for you the standing language? D.3. as it stands now: “A department/school may require that peer evaluators external to Illinois State University review the credentials for each faculty member who is a candidate for tenure. If peer evaluation is part of a department/school's tenure review process, this fact must be stated in the departmental/school policies and procedures document. Department/School guidelines must expressly state whether or under what conditions written evaluations will be considered without a waiver of confidentiality by the evaluator.” So, if we vote down these changes, this would be the standing language. We can go forward with your amendment, but we would have to also consider corrections to the other parts.

Senator Blum: Okay. So, why don’t we see if the amendment passes and then we can correct the other parts, if that’s acceptable.

Senator Horst: I’m just suggesting that the other way to go is to vote on the changes and if they don’t pass then this language stands. But if there’s some components in here that you like then the way to go would be to do your amendment.

Senator Blum: All of this depends on if they have to or not, right?

Senator Horst: So, the language that stands now says they may require the peer evaluators external to Illinois State, if the peer evaluation is part of the review process this fact must be stated. Departments and School guidelines must expressly state whether and under what conditions peer evaluations will be considered. So, it has some conditional clauses. It’s up to you, Senator Blum. We can continue with the process, but you might want to consider other revisions because of the language that follows.

Senator Blum: Oh. I see what you’re saying. So, yeah, adding if peer evaluations is part, returning that to its original form. That makes sense. Yes.

Senator Horst: I’m sorry. So, can you clarify? So, you have this amendment. And then what else do you want to add to it? If peer evaluation is part of the Department/School tenure review process…

Senator Blum: Right. Everything starting with that sentence.

Senator Horst: So, your amendment would read, “All Departments/Schools may require that two or more peer evaluators, external to Illinois State University, review the credentials of each faculty member who is a candidate for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. If peer evaluation is part of a department/school's process…” and the original says, “A department/school may require that peer evaluators external to Illinois State University review the credentials for each faculty member who is a candidate for tenure.” So now, you’re basically proposing what is already standing.

Senator Blum: Yeah. But they would leave the other language. I think that adding the portion is important.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, we have your language and then you want to add the sentence that standing here, “If peer evaluation is part of the Department/School tenure process,”etc. You want to add in that language?

Senator Blum: Yes.

Senator Horst: Okay. Do you want to speak to the motion?

Senator Blum: You know, to me this is like inside baseball. I’ve traveled all over. I’ve talked all over. No one ever ever asks me or even talked to me about the College of Education has a real problem because they don’t have external review. As I’ve listened to many people here, I’ve come to appreciate that there are actually disciplines where this is quite important. And I believe that those disciplines should be allowed to pursue that, and should have that for them, for their procedures. The language in the amendment that I suggested here, if you want to begin peer evaluation, if you want to have it, then you can have it.

I have gained an appreciation through the Information Item. There are some disciplines that really need to hear from… “is this person an expert in Philosophy. Is this person an expert in Geography or a specific kind?" And if that is necessary in the discipline, the DFSCs can make that choice. They’re going to know to make that choice. I do not think this has anything to do with the trajectory of the university itself. We are an amazing university. We are an amazingly scholarly institution.

Someone asked me, Why is your department—by the way my department is unanimously opposed to this. My department is one of the most productive departments. We have many many research award winners, grant award winners, millionaire club. We are a highly productive department, and we did it all without external review. So, it’s not that we can’t, or we won’t accomplish that, but we actually have.

You know, one of the interesting arguments that I’ve heard for this is, “Well, we’ve done it for 20 years and we haven’t had an issue.” Well, if it’s inconsequential then why are we mandating it? Why are we forcing people to do it? And if we really believe as a body for people to make these kinds of decisions, to make them at the department level, to provide guidance on how to do it, then who better to do it than the departments? If the URC wants to make this a university-wide thing, what better opportunity than to allow people to decide? If people are not going to decide or if they have issues with it, or there’s something not right with the discipline… In my department, we have vision and deaf or hard of hearing. There are very, very specific protocols that would be needed to be put into place. You couldn’t make decisions at the college level about that. I didn’t change that, but there is no ASPT requirement for this even to be there. The CFSC could decide on its own shared governance way about the procedures for this. We have some very, very specific…so vision, you have a major conference with people with vision, they can fit the entire discipline in a room and take a picture. So, we’re not all the same.

What I would ask you is that even if you are really for this, and you’re for this in your discipline, I ask that you support this change. And then if we really believe, as an institution, that we can come to an agreement and to a large body agreement, then we should do that. And we should take the time necessary. And we should not wait five years to figure that out. If there are departmental concerns for a variety of reasons, then what better role for the URC to come find out what those are. And then five years down the line this document will be under consideration again. So, I think, and so I implore upon you, to support this amendment. Support it because it allows for choice. Support it because it allows for disciplinary considerations. And support it because if your faculty want it, they can have it.

Senator Cline: So, we’re in debate?

Senator Horst: Yes, we are, and we’re speaking to the amendment. And just to clarify again, we’re only adding the sentence, “If peer evaluation is part of the Department/School’s tenure review process this fact must be stated in the departmental/school’s policies and procedures document.” That’s what we’re adding, correct?

Senator Blum: Yeah. And changing the first part of the sentence, striking it out. Strike, effective 2028.

Senator Horst: Yup. We’re striking that and adding that sentence.

Senator Cline: I don’t think it comes to any surprise to people in the room that I have had issues with this as we have gone through it. I appreciate the amendment; but this past week, I made the opportunity to speak to all the untenured faculty in my school, none of whom would be affected by this. But all of them implored me to vote for it as it’s written, not the amendment. My concern is that the decision would have to be made for the college. It can’t be an ad hoc decision for each individual faculty member, and there are circumstances where there is tension and difficulty between the senior members of a faculty area and the junior members of the faculty area. The young faculty said to me that they felt that they would be most protected if they could rely upon the external evaluation of people who represent the changes in the discipline that they represent, against a tax from the less modern thinking faculty. So, although my intension, I think, on my own, might have been to support the amendment, I’m concerned that this doesn’t meet the concerns of these young faculty as individuals that need that protection. And if the college didn’t make the decision, they would find themselves back to where they started.

Senator Otto: I’m going to echo what Senator Cline just said. I do appreciate where Senator Blum comes from, I’m also a Senator in the College of Ed. I’m from a department that is supportive of external reviews. In education, do you think it’s shocking not to have external reviews? I write many of these myself, as I said before on the floor. My concern with this amendment is that, as Senator Cline was saying, there is something of a generational divide in this, and I think that younger faculty, maybe pre-tenure faculty, are supportive of external reviews. I think if we change the language in this way, what we are effectively doing is kicking this can down the road to the college, as Senator Cline said, or to the department. I feel like that can put pre-tenure folks at risk who really want to insist on this. Because a lot of us came up through Research 1s. this is just part of how we were socialized; and to understand how we come to our place in the profession and that external review is a part of that. So, I worry that this is going to cause a scuffle and debate within units or within colleges that we really should be handling at the university level.

Senator Bonnell: I just want to support Senator Blum’s sentiment. What he’s said agrees with what I’m hearing from Milner faculty, and I think you did a great job of expressing that. So, thank you.

Senator Nahm: I would also like to support Senator Blum’s amendment. And this is based on feedback that I have gathered from my constituents, which range from pre-tenure faculty to tenured professors. The feedback that I have gotten from my constituents in the School of Theatre and Dance has been overwhelmingly negative in mandating a university wide policy for external evaluation letters.

Senator Garrahy: I would also like to thank Senator Blum for his very reflective comments, and I support your motion to amendment.

Senator Lucey: I’d also like to thank Senator Blum for his comments. I also think his proposal is consistent with Senator Bonnell’s proposal from last meeting, stating that scholarly and creative productivity varies from discipline to discipline, and to give latitude to each DFSC/SFSC and CFSC, and I think this amendment consists of the spirit of that.

Senator Meyers: In the spirit of the friendly amendment, I’m just wondering, the amendment, as it stands, there’s still a bunch of stuff in here that would seem like it needs to be edited.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I just conferred with Senator Nikolaou and we’re thinking we’ll do this vote, and then, if it passes, we might have further revisions. But as it stands now, we are making a motion to strike and amend 4 to say, “All Departments/Schools may require that two or more peer evaluators, external to Illinois State University, review the credentials of each faculty member who is a candidate for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Scholarly and creative productivity varies considerably from discipline to discipline. Each DFSC/SFSC and CFSC has the latitude to and shall develop governing documents consistent with their specific disciplines establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers.” Now, to her point, it says that they shall develop governing documents that establish qualifications. So, shall implies that they must do it? I’m turning to the English professor.

Dr. Trites: In that case, “shall” should become “should.”

Senator Horst: Should or may?

Dr. Trites: I think they’re saying if X and Y. So, if X happens, if they do it then they should also do this.

Senator Horst: Do you accept that as a friendly amendment?

Senator Blum: Yes.

Senator Lucey: Yes.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, it should be should. So, “Scholarly and creative productivity varies considerably from discipline to discipline. Each DFSC/SFSC and CFSC has the latitude to and should develop governing documents consistent with their specific disciplines establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers.” Sounds good. “If peer evaluation is part of a department/school's tenure review process, this fact must be stated in the departmental/school policies and procedures document.” So, that’s the change we’re proposing to the first paragraph of 4. Is there any debate on that?

Senator Schmeiser: Forgive me, but on the wording, if we use this wording, wouldn’t we strike the first all? In other words, wouldn’t we just say, “Departments may?” Because “All departments may” sounds odd to me.

Senator Horst: Okay. Do you accept that as a friendly amendment?

Senator Blum: Yes.

Senator Lucey: Yes.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, striking all. Start with departments.

Senator Otto: I just wanted to offer that if this is going to become a choice whether or whether not we will also need to have an effective date for the departments or the colleges that wanted to change their policy to include external review. I say that because we talked about this moving the goal post problem. And so, I think it’s important that if there are units that want to move in this direction, that we give guidance on when that would begin.

Senator Horst: Are you proposing an amendment to the amendment?

Senator Otto: I’m proposing that we take that under consideration because that would be something that would need to be done in these further revisions.

Senator Valentin: And to add to that, if it’s optional that the departments and schools may require peer evaluations, does that also mean that they can also rescind that requirement at a later date? So, not only having a time set for when that requirement would be put into place, but does that also provide the option for a department or school to…

Senator Horst: It’s optional now, isn’t it, Dr. Trites?

Dr. Trites: I believe it’s handled usually on the college level.

Senator Horst: But it says a department/school may require that peer evaluators externals…

Dr. Trites: Yeah. Thank you. It’s non-optional in the 16 Arts and Sciences departments. It is optional for others. But you raise an excellent question about nullification, if you will, later down the road.

Senator Cline: I’d like to call the questions and ask for a roll call vote please.

Senator Horst: Is there any objection to calling the question? (Pause) Is there any objection to a roll call vote? (Pause) Okay. Then let us begin our roll call vote. We are voting on this amendment, D.4. striking the first paragraph and replacing it with the following: Departments/Schools may require that two or more peer evaluators, external to Illinois State University, review the credentials of each faculty member who is a candidate for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Scholarly and creative productivity varies considerably from discipline to discipline. Each DFSC/SFSC and CFSC has the latitude to and should develop governing documents consistent with their specific disciplines establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers. If peer evaluation is part of a department/school's tenure review process, this fact must be stated in the departmental/school policies and procedures document.

So, a vote yes is a vote to have this language.

The motion to amend was approved, 16-8.

Senator Horst: All right. So, now let us consider what to do with the rest of the document. So, now we have, “Candidates for tenure and promotion will provide the DFSC/SFSC a list of potential reviewers from which the DFSC/SFSC will solicit external letters.” That sounds fine to people?

Senator Cline: I might make a motion to amend the beginning of that sentence to something like, “In participating units, candidates for tenure and promotion will…” that would solve a lot of the hard language.

Senator Horst: “This requirement must be stated in the Departmental/School policies and procedures document.” Okay. And then it has the language of the guidelines, but it will be the participating units. I’m looking at the URC. So, the proposed amendment for this is “In participating units, candidates for tenure and promotion will provide the DFSC/SFSC a list of potential reviewers from which the DFSC/SFSC will solicit external letters. This requirement must be stated in the Departmental/School policies and procedures document.,” in participating units, or do you think it holds?

Senator Cline: I think it holds.

Senator Horst: Okay. “Department/School guidelines must include specific policies and procedures for:” and all of that. Is there any further need for clarification that it would only be the participating units? I think it’s clear. Do you agree?

Senator Cline: Do I need a second?

Motion by Senator Cline, seconded by Senator Garrahy, to amend. The motion was unanimously approved.

Article IX D.4. and 5 changes, as amended, was unanimously approved.

***Adjournment***Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Stewart, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Attendance | Motion to Amend IX.D.4 |
| Avogo, Winfred - EXCUSED | 0 |  |
| Blum, Craig | 1 | 1 |
| Bonnell, Angela | 1 | 1 |
| Cline, Lea | 1 | 0 |
| Garrahy, Deb | 1 | 1 |
| Harpel, Tammy | 1 | 1 |
| Holland, Dan (rep Marx, David) | 1 | 1 |
| Hollywood, Mary | 1 |  |
| Horst, Martha | 1 |  |
| Lahiri, Somnath | 1 | 1 |
| Lucey, Tom | 1 | 1 |
| Meyers, Adena | 1 |  |
| Midha, Vishal | 1 | 1 |
| Nahm, Kee-Yoon | 1 | 1 |
| Nichols, Wade | 1 | 1 |
| Nikolaou, Dimitrios | 1 | 0 |
| Novotny, Nancy | 1 | 1 |
| Otto, Stacy - VIRTUAL | 1 | 0 |
| Pancrazio, Jim | 1 | 0 |
| Peters, Steve | 1 | 1 |
| Samhan, Bahae | 0 |  |
| Schmeiser, Benjamin | 1 | 1 |
| Seeman, Scott | 1 | 1 |
| Smudde, Pete | 1 | 0 |
| Stewart, Todd | 1 | 1 |
| Tarhule, Aondover\* | 1 |  |
| Torry, Mike | 1 | 1 |
| Valentin, Rick | 1 | 0 |
| Vogel, Laura | 1 | 0 |
| Bowden, Rachel (chair rep) | 1 | 0 |
| Vacant - 1 CAS SS Faculty | 0 |  |
| Vacant - 1 CAST Faculty | 0 |  |
| Vacant - 1 Faculty Associate | 0 |  |
| **QUORUM IS 17** | 26 | 16 |
| \*(Provost Tarhule - NV) |  | Total voted: 24 |
|  |  | Yea: 16 |
|  |  | Nay: 8 |
|  |  | Motion Passes |