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***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: All right, everybody, I'm going to sort of softly call the meeting to order and remind everybody that there is food over in the corner, there's food… I noticed that the Provost is drinking from a glass that says "The Mother of Dragons," which seems very appropriate. I was trying to read that from here and it's awesome. Who wouldn't want to be the Mother of Dragons? We're going to be starting also in executive session, so we're going to be again asking guests to leave the room

***Executive Session: Distinguished Professor Recommendations***

The Faculty Caucus went into executive session to discuss the President’s recommendations for Distinguished Professor, per the exception to the Open Meetings Act established in Section 5 IL.CS 120/2, Section c, 1, which allows closed meetings to consider the “appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the public body or legal counsel for the public body.”

The Caucus concluded its business in executive session and returned to open session.

***Action item:***

***11.27.18.02 ASPT Article XII General Considerations Proposed Disciplinary Language MIL and MCN Mark Up***

Senator Kalter: So we're going to move on to our action item. The first action item is ASPT article XII, General Considerations, the proposed language for Milner and Mennonite. You may remember a little bit about this. Last time we tabled it. You now have the full article in front of you. There are two places where there are changes in XII.B.3. the Faculty Rights section down in the third paragraph of 3,we have just added the words "or more." Must be replenished to a minimum of five members through one or more of the following mechanisms, and then we have added a XII.B.4., “Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing, as colleges with no departments, are exempt from the requirements that CFSC members must automatically recuse themselves from disciplinary proceedings involving members of their own department. When CFSC members in Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing have conflicts of interest arising from other circumstances, they should recuse themselves from disciplinary proceedings as required in XII.B.3. The faculty of Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing will delineate in their college ASPT policies the means by which they will ensure that disciplinary proceedings are heard by a CFSC of at least five faculty according to the options in XII.B.3. (including the dean or designated associate dean as chair of the committee.)” I'm trying to remember, I think this was already an Action Item on the floor, so we're just taking it off the table. I think we might need a motion to take it off the table.

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Haugo, to remove the ASPT Article XII General Considerations revision proposal from the table. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. Do we have any more debate on this? We're moving back into debate. All right. If no debate.

The motion to approved 11.27.18.02 ASPT Article XII General Considerations Proposed Disciplinary Language MIL and MCN Mark Up was unanimously approved.

***Information/Action Item:***

***11.02.18.01 Proposed ASPT Section IV.A.2 Language Change  
11.27.18.01 ASPT Section IV Language Change MARK UP***

Senator Kalter: All right. Wonderful. So as you may remember, the President has not yet signed articles XII, the new articles XII, XIII, XIV, and XV, but will be able to do so now, and we will move now to the second one that I mentioned at the last Caucus. This is an Information/Action item, so we're going to begin in Information setting. This is proposed ASPT section IV.A.2. This is the part of the ASPT policy that deals with CFSCs, and you will notice that there has been special language for Milner Library in this article. That is being proposed for being taken out, because Milner is on its way towards making its DFSC a full DFSC with, I think, five members, including the, yes, including the dean, and so they are proposing to take out 2 and then add the sentence, “Since Mennonite College of Nursing and Milner,” and actually there's a typo in there, it should be Milner, not Miner, Library, so we'll change that. “Since Mennonite College of Nursing and Milner Library are colleges with no departments, CFSC members may participate in all deliberations unless these deliberations involve them as individuals, or if they have other conflicts of interest.” We gave you the entire article, but we're not having any proposal to change anything else in this article. So this is also coming to us from the URC. Do we have any questions or observations about this one? Sam Catanzaro, who knows where he is wanted. Come on over to the table. Grab a mic. Please have a seat. You need not stand.

Dr. Catanzaro: I don't think this is going to take long enough to really require sitting, but it's easier this way. I just want to note that now that there's only the one paragraph, the one under A can be struck, which is what we do in other sections of the policies where there's a single paragraph section.

Senator Kalter: That is an excellent, excellent idea, and we shall do that. That would be called a friendly amendment.

Dr. Catanzaro: Okay.

Senator Kalter: Absolutely. That's a great idea.

Dr. Catanzaro: And I will give credit where it's due. I was reminded of this by Bruce Stoffel.

Senator Kalter: Ah, yes, of course, of course…

Dr. Catanzaro: I want that in the minutes.

Senator Kalter: I want that in the minutes as well. He was reminded by Bruce Stoffel. All right. Any further remarks on this?

Senator Kalter: All right. We have now a new ASPT section IV to go along with all of the other changes that we made last year and just now, and so now we'll move on to our last Action Item and we'll continue debate on the Distinguished Professors policy. We made efforts to come up with the data that was requested, so not all of that might be available, but you can ask questions about that. I'm trying to remember, did we put this on the table or did we just end… I think we just ended the session, if I remember correctly. We didn't actually table this, so we can continue the debate just from here. Do we have further debate on this one?

Senator Horst: Let's celebrate that we just passed all of the ASPT document before we move on to the Distinguished Professor policy, and thank you to Senator Kalter for steering all of these conversations quite wisely and working so hard on all of the drafts.

Senator Kalter: Well, and the credit goes back to Senator Horst, actually, because she began that process a long, long time ago. I can still remember how that music used to make me smile. So yes, we're finally done and thank you to our guests for coming and ushering us through all of that. Let's see. Okay, so do we have any debate on Distinguished Professors policy?

***Action item:***

***11.09.18.03 Policy 3.3.5 Distinguished Professors Mark up***

***11.28.18.01 DP UP History***

Senator Nikolaou: So this one is about the Procedure portion, because right now we are saying we are going to have the Distinguished Professors with the emeriti could decide to participate, and then the University Research Council, so they are going to be separate and they are not going to come into contact. So some of the concerns were that, you know, the DPs, they may not have specific criteria so we don't know specifically what we are looking at. And one idea would be instead of having them as two separate components, so we have the DPs and we have the URC separately, why don't we have, for example, the Distinguished Professors electing a number of representatives. So let's say they are voting for three of them, and then these three are going to be in the same committee as the URC to propose who it's going to be, you know, who are going to be the candidates for the Distinguished Professors. So instead of having two separate ones, just have the DPs elect who they think are going to be their representatives, and then we are having the URC, since the URC also has representatives from all different colleges, so we will not have the concern that, you know, we may not have representation from one or two colleges. So that's one idea.

Senator Kalter: So are you interested in making a motion and, if so, do you have sort of specific language?

Senator Nikolaou: So we also made a copy for anyone who wants to see it. And mainly it is instead of saying…

Senator Kalter: Oh great, wonderful. Somebody came prepared. Awesome. Oh, is this the language, Senator Horst? Okay, so the motion… Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead. Go ahead.

Senator Nikolaou: Oh no, no, go ahead.

Senator Kalter: No, it's actually more appropriate if the chair doesn't do it, so why don't you read out the motion.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay, well let me find it. So the new language, do you want me to read?

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Nikolaou: “The University Research Council and up to three representatives chosen by the current Distinguished Professors (including emeriti who choose to participate) will conduct the initial reviews of portfolios and forward all recommended nominees to the Provost. The Provost may,” and then it's, “the Provost may be present for and participate in the deliberation. Candidates whose portfolios are not recommended by the URC and Distinguished Professor representatives, the Provost may request feedback from the council and/or the Provost as to how the portfolio might be improved.”

Senator Kalter: All right.

Senator Nikolaou: And then the other change is just making into a single committee instead of committees.

Senator Kalter: Got you. And did this get passed around? I didn't quite see whether it went all the way around? All right, so let me reread that. I already have a copy of it, so what the motion is, is to strike the language in 3 that says, “Current Distinguished Professors (including emeriti who choose to participate) and,” just that phrase you'll see this at the bottom of the first page, and then to insert, “and up to”… In other words, the sentence in #3 would start with, “The University Research Council,” and then inserted would be, “and up to three representatives chosen by the current Distinguished Professors (including emeriti who choose to participate).” And the other thing that is happening, even though it's not looked at there, is that this would necessitate a crossing out of the full sentence that reads, “These two initial reviews shall be independent and simultaneous,” because it would no longer have two committees. All right. So that's the proposed motion that Senator Nikolaou was making.

Motion by Senator Nikolaou, seconded by Senator Marx, to change language under Procedure 3.

Senator Nichols: This seems like a fundamental change from what had been previously discussed with the DPs, so is there a way that we could bounce this by them for their input on this revision?

Senator Kalter: We could if the group wanted us to. It's up to you guys. So we can debate it here first and see whether it's even going to pass. We can do that. We can take a vote or not take a vote. Let me know how you want to handle that.

Senator Day: You know, with the current composition in terms of membership at the URC (inaudible)

Senator Kalter: So let me repeat Senator Day since he is kind of far away from a microphone. He asked, “What is the current composition of the URC in terms of numbers,” and that's going to take me a minute to look up. All right, so the current composition of URC, in other words, the University of Research Council, is one, two, three, four, five, six members. There is a member from every college, except for Milner. In fact, it looks like there is no provision… There's either no provision for a senator from Milner or there simply isn't one now. Do you know what that is, Senator Murphy?

Provost Murphy: I do not.

Senator Kalter: Do not. Okay. So right now there are six. There are some vacancies on it, but this could be an old website. And then there are also Graduate Council Research committee members, and there are four of those, so there are ten altogether it looks like. This does not include the associate deans and we wouldn't be thinking of including them in the vote. So debate includes debating what Senator Nichols has asked about, Senator Day, and do you want to speak into the microphone.

Senator Nichols: So they're proposing only three representatives of the current Distinguished Professors on this council.

Senator Kalter: Correct. That's what Senator Nikolaou was proposing.

Senator Nichols: Okay. Why the disparity in numbers then; 3 versus 10.

Senator Kalter: Yes. Good question. So Senator Nikolaou, do you have an answer to that, why the disparity of numbers; 3 versus 10?

Senator Nikolaou: Well, oddly, it's the number of the colleges represented. Because for the DPs, the main idea is that we want their input in terms of who they think is going to have similar qualifications to them, how it was going to be done in the past, but it's not necessary that they are going to be making the decision again. We are getting the input from the DPs about who they think they are going to be appropriate, but then the URC is going to keep more on track about what's going on with the research criteria and making sure that we are following what is going on.

Senator Blum: I just want to speak in favor of collapsing the committees. I could not, never see a rationale for having two separate committees, and it just seems sensible to have Distinguished Professors and URC work together. All right. In terms of numbers, I personally think three is fine, but I think if somebody has some suggestions, I think I would be open to hearing that as well.

Senator Ohler: I was just going to address Senator Nichols' point. From my recollection and talking with one other DP, it sounded as if they thought the rewrite of the policy was sort of infringing upon their decision making and that this newer language still sort of brings into, it moves them away from what they had been doing. It moves them away from the status quo. I would think that they're going to be upset, and maybe that's too strong of a language, with either of these two policies. I guess I'm just questioning the value of bringing it back to asking them again what they think of the policy, because they seemed to not like the policy to begin with.

Senator Nichols: If the concern is on the delay, that's fine as long as in the understanding going forward that the default is that they would not have changed their vote to favoring this modification. So we're not giving them the benefit of the doubt to say that yes, they have talked about it and they've had any change, we just would move forward with the default, or with the understanding that they weren't in favor of the original, they are not in favor of this either.

Senator Nikolaou: Just to echo what Senator Blum said, if you have suggestions for a different number of DPs in the committee, we are open, if you think that, you know, four might be more appropriate, you know, or I don't know specifically what the number is, but just that we are, that's a possibility.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Let me make a suggestion regarding Senator Nichols' concern. I think that if we move to a vote on this amendment and it passes, that we could then consult. If it fails, we would have no need to consult, and so it does seem sort of important first to get through the motion on the amendment to see whether there is support for it, and then cross that next bridge when we get to it, right? And so then going off of what Senator Nikolaou just said, do we have suggestions for increasing that number to something less than the full set of DPs? Is three too few for some of you who may be thinking of voting in favor of this amendment? If so, let us know here during this debate.

Senator Crowley: I would simply like to offer my support for the number three. If you consider that the URC's membership currently is ten, then we're looking at three university, pardon me, three Distinguished Professors joining that group for discussion and voting on potential new Distinguished Professors. That's nearly a third of the committee. I think that's good representation. The other members of the committee are representing different colleges and that sort of thing, so they have a different… It's not as if they are a block, and the University Professors, or pardon me, the Distinguished Professors numbering three, I think, is a very fair number.

Senator Mainieri: I just read this, but it has escaped my mind, but on the memo about the Distinguished Professors' most recent nomination, it indicated how many DPs were on that panel this time around reviewing those applications and I was just wondering if we could be reminded how many people were…

Senator Kalter: In other words, how many DPs there are right now.

Senator Mainieri: I'm sorry, how many DPs chose to be part of the review process this time around. I think it's seven.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. There were sixteen who were able to be at the meeting, three who could not attend because they were in class at the time, and so they sent forward comments in writing. So a sixteen-member panel. We had input, but not votes, from three additional DPs. All of the DPs that were on that panel are currently employed at the… No, that's not true. There are some emeritus; they who still come to the University and do research, but are emeriti faculty, so a little accommodation.

Senator Kalter: So, in other words, we had a very large number of them participate relative to their numbers, who are of the living ones, of the ones who are alive and sort of in the area.

Provost Murphy: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Provost Murphy: They do participate in that process very much.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Further debate on the motion. All right.

The motion passed by a hand count vote of 13 ayes, 0 nays. There were 11 abstentions.

Senator Kalter: And so we are at the sort of… What I should say is we have about an hour. Let's continue to debate the policy, but then at the end not vote so that we can go back and consult the DPs about this new language in the process, in the Procedure. Do we have any other debate on the policy?

Senator Blum: Yes, regarding the language “Distinguished Professors will hold ten-month appointments for two years,” that it's been my understanding that there is no extra month's work as part of this. It seems to me that there is a substantive salary increase and I'm all for that salary increase, but if there's not extra work then I'm not for extending an extra month's pay for two years.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So are you making a motion to amend?

Senator Blum: So yeah, I'll make that motion to amend and strike that language.

Senator Kalter: So you are making a motion to strike in the Responsibilities and Rights of a Distinguished Professor, you're making the motion to strike #4, which is “Distinguished Professors will hold ten-month appointments for two years.” Is that right?

Senator Blum: Correct.

Motion by Senator Blum, seconded by Senator Marx, to strike number 4 that says “Distinguished Professors will hold ten-month appointments for two years.”

Senator Kalter: One thing that we talked about with respect…Senator Blum had queried about this in Executive Committee. Our theory is that when this policy was passed back in 1981, that probably because they could not afford at that time to add anything to the base salary, the ten-month appointment was in there and that that's probably why that's there, and then at some point in time they started adding base salary, but that is simply a theory. We don't know what the origin of any of that was. It's possible that they actually did fund right from the beginning the addition to the base salary, so just a little bit of sort of non-historical history there. Do we have debate on that motion? People in favor or against?

Provost Murphy: First of all, these are extraordinarily busy and active members of our faculty, so thinking, I mean they're here in the summer and they're working in the summer, but it just makes me nervous to think that we are sitting at the Senate voting to take salary away from distinguished members of our faculty. They are actively engaged and we are recognizing that excellence, and it is excellence that reflects at this university too, so I think I would just have you maybe think again and think long and hard before you change a policy that actually takes salary away from members of the faculty.

Senator Horst: Susan, can you clarify what the policy said about the amount of salary increase that they had? We're changing it to $5,000? It was $2,000 before? Is that correct?

Senator Kalter: So this particular… Thank you for reminding me, Senator Horst, that we actually did add back in the addition of $5,000 to the base salary into the policy that was proposed, and then that we were sort of debating back and forth about that, but in the current policy there is no mention of an addition to base salary. That only appears in the University Professor policy, and that amount in that policy is $2,500. So what had happened was that some committee somewhere made a kind of estimate that this might be based on performance increments, and so we had originally put in $8,000, because the promotion from Associate to Full had recently been raised to $8,000. And then after consulting with the Provost, found out no, in fact, this did not get raised. Right? So it's just $5,000. It doesn't go up or down with the promotional increases. So it doesn't currently say anything about an addition to base salary, but the copy in front of you does have, “2. A Distinguished Professor shall receive $5,000 added to base salary.”

Senator Horst: Was it correct to say that the old language had the ten-month salary language, and now the practice has been to add to the base salary, so we're clarifying that now in the new language that we're adding to the base salary and to keep both is a question why we'd want to keep both of those, because we are now adding this language about base salary that wasn't in the former policy. Is that correct?

Senator Kalter: I'm not sure I would agree with that. It sounded to me like some of that was position rather than… In other words, opinion rather than fact. We don't really know the facts. Right? We don't really know why the base salary thing wasn't in there from the beginning. Our theory is that it wasn't there because they couldn't afford it at that time, and then it got put in, but it's possible that it for some reason was just not in there.

Senator Horst: So it's been practices.

Senator Kalter: So it has been practiced for, not time immemorial, but for as long as the most senior people who have been debating this, which is I think Senator Day and Senator Murphy, they don't remember, you know, back into that history when it might have changed or whether it changed or not. So for whatever reason it was never in the original policy, but the ten-month was. The ten-month was.

Senator Horst: So I would just support the motion because I think now we're clarifying the position about the base salary and so, in my opinion, the ten-month salary language is no longer needed.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Further debate about removing the ten-month for two years.

Senator Crowley: I'm still just a little bit confused based on what Senator Murphy said. So currently if I'm named a Distinguished Professor, my salary goes up by a full month. Is that correct?

Provost Murphy: You get one month of summer support for two summers, basically.

Senator Crowley: Okay, so that's not permanent.

Provost Murphy: No. That's not permanent.

Senator Crowley: Okay, but the $5,000 increment is permanent.

Provost Murphy: Is permanent to your base.

Senator Crowley: Okay.

Provost Murphy: Yes.

Senator Crowley: All right. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Further debate. People in favor of or against removing that.

Senator Dawson: I'm in favor of putting in that $5,000 as an increase to base salary. Sometimes we wonder if that's been the practice, I think we should continue that...

Senator Kalter: I'm going to cut you off just for a minute, because we're actually debating taking out the…

Senator Dawson: Taking it out of the proposal.

Senator Kalter: No. We're debating taking out the ten- month for two years, not the base salary. We can debate that later if we want to, but we are currently debating…

Senator Dawson: Then I'm in favor of leaving it in.

Senator Kalter: Of leaving in the ten-month.

Senator Dawson: It's a two-year commitment, and I think much is expected of those who are honored in such a way, and they'll be working for the University and bringing great honor to the University, and I think we could expect an uptick in their activities and should be supported with additional salary.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Do we have further debate on that?

Senator Midha: I take that as we are honoring the Distinguished Professors by increasing the salary or by rewarding them a full month, but we cannot continue after two years, so we are just incrementing it by $5,000 afterwards. I would rather support that we increment their salary for life, because that brings honor to the University.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so just again to clarify, we have both in the policy proposed right now. So there is one line that says that we would add $5,000 to the base salary and another line that says that they would hold a ten-month appointment for two years. Right now we're debating whether to take the ten-month out or to leave it in, so your position is to leave it in?

Senator Midha: Leave it in.

Senator Kalter: Leave it in. Okay.

Senator Ohler: I have a close relative who is a Distinguished Professor at OSU, Oklahoma State, and he actually advocated, he got his department to move him from a ten-month appointment to a nine-month appointment so that he could do more consulting work during the summer, so external to the university, and so I would advocate for leaving in the ten-month appointment so that they're doing, at least for the 2 years after they're titled a Distinguished Professor, they're actually doing work for the university.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Further debate? People in favor of or against removing the ten-month.

Senator Meyers: I would be in favor of keeping the practice the way we've been doing it. I'm not sure what the rationale is for taking that away if that's what we've been doing all along.

Senator Blum: All I would like to say is that I'm not sure what the rationale for including it is. I mean, if we are in fact going to ask them to do ten months and they are in fact for two years going to do ten months, then I think that's fine, or if there is some job responsibility that's associated with that, then I'll withdraw this motion, but it does seem to me at this point that there's not a specific prescribed job responsibility in the policy, and so for me it's more like consistency. So, I mean, why two years, why not ten. So I would like, if there is a ten-month and we want to keep the ten-month, I mean it seems like there should be something specific required that matches the ten-month, but for right now I'm going to leave the motion on the…

Senator Kalter: So my comment on this is not an in favor of or against. I just want to address that I have always read 7, which currently says, “The assignment of a Distinguished Professor will include teaching, research, and other activities that are professional in nature, with specific assignments to be made with the mutual agreement of the professor and department chair,” right, that that was most likely in there to address what would be happening in that ten-month. I may be wrong. I'm not sure, the Provost may have some information about that. We also, one possibility could be to clarify that to show that that is supposed to be about that tenth month or we could say well, as you're observing, there is no requirement for the tenth month, no obligation or whatever, and so we either take it in or leave it out based on that, but that's always been my reading of the policy. It's simply inference, because there's no direct… Currently there is no direct language that links those two. We could if we wanted to put in that language. Further debate.

Senator Nichols: I just read it as giving them the $1,000 operating budget for new activity as a Distinguished Professor seems to parallel that. You're going to have new activities, so here's a little bit of money to help deal with that, and then here's a little bit of extra time in which to make that adjustment as well. So I think it seems fairly consistent with another aspect of the policy as stated.

Senator Kalter: So you're arguing in a sense that it's kind of like a URG. Right? That giving a little bit of summer salary for two years for those research activities. Further debate on this motion.

Senator Qaddour: But the ten-month in my opinion, the ten-month appointment, or maybe for two years or three years, you can always (inaudible) if there is a specific, you know, things to do, you can always bring this; not necessarily to attach it to the policy.

Senator Kalter: I didn't, because somebody was popping a can, I didn't quite hear your first statement.

Senator Qaddour: So what I'm saying, I'm against it to keep it, so to remove it, because you can always, you know, award him for ten months just for two years if you need him for three, four, whatever. If there is, you know, specific tasks to do for that.

Provost Murphy: I don't have a debate about that, but I do want to respond. You mentioned item 7. To me where it's the assignment of DP will include teaching, research, and all of that, to me that statement is just always a reminder to the Distinguished Professor that they are a member of the faculty and that being a Distinguished Professor doesn't mean that they no longer teach. That's how I have always read that, that their teaching assignments, those kinds of things, still are assigned by the department chair/school director, so that to me is what that item 7 means.

Senator Kalter: I will actually bet that I just read it in both ways, but you're reading it in that way instead of in the other way that I suggested.

Provost Murphy: My point is that when I read it, that's what I've always read. Whether that's right or wrong, that's in my mind what it always says. So, right or wrong.

Senator Kalter: Got you. Further debate. All right. Okay, so we have a motion on the floor, it's the motion to amend, and the amendment will be to remove the line that says, “Distinguished Professors will hold ten-month appointments for two years.” So if you vote aye, you are voting in favor of removing that tenth month, those two years of ten-month salary. If you vote nay, you are voting to keep it in the policy.

The motion to remove Procedure item 4 failed.

Senator Kalter: And the chair votes nay as well. Okay, so that stays in. Do we have further debate. Further debate on the overall motion.

Senator Nichols: Under Procedure, item 3, when it is saying that in the event of a negative recommendation, that the candidates can request feedback as to how to make their application stronger, my preference would be that that not be something that the candidate need to request. I would prefer that whichever final decision making or recommending body that we have, they should have to produce that at the time or shortly after their decision. Then it would be up to the candidate to either look at that information or not, but I think it would be best if that was the default mode that it be produced for the candidate.

Senator Kalter: So actually that strikes me as a friendly amendment to the language. Does it strike anybody as a need to debate it?

Provost Murphy: So are you saying that we should produce to them in writing the reasons they were not selected or recommended for DP?

Senator Nichols: Yes.

Provost Murphy: I am concerned about that. I think that would be a pretty difficult practice. So then a candidate can take that like a checklist and then come in the next year and I've checked off that list and there is still a judgment call. So my preference is always to have a conversation, not to provide a written list of why they, I mean, why, we don't do that for other awards. We don't give someone a written list of why they didn't get a University Teaching Award. I mean, I think we have to be very careful about that practice. I think it sets us up for some liability.

Senator Nichols: I'm fine with the difference between written and just a conversation. Whatever form it takes, I think that it should be default that they get feedback, that they don't have to ask us for feedback, so…

Provost Murphy: I hear you, and we are actually doing that this year very intentionally, because I agree, and I think that we owe them that, but it would be a preference to me that that is done as a conversation rather than put a checklist. Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

Senator Kalter: So I'm not seeing anybody saying this looks like anything but a friendly amendment, and so what I would suggest, we're in again Procedures 3 at the last sentence where currently it reads, “Candidates whose portfolios are not recommended by either of the councils to the Provost may,” and we're going to have to change that just a little bit by the URC, right, “by the URC to the Provost, may request feedback from the council and/or the Provost as to how their portfolio might be improved.” We can change that wording to say, “Candidates whose portfolios are not recommended by either of the councils to the Provost will receive feedback….” So should we leave in the, “and/or.” In other words, “will receive feedback from the council and/or the Provost as to how,” or should we put that as an, “and the Provost.” Senator Murphy is saying and/or. So we'll leave in the and/or. Does that sound good to everybody as a friendly amendment? Okay. Do we have further debate on the policy itself?

Senator Martinez: We're talking about the general policy.

Senator Kalter: Yes. We have no amendments on the floor right now.

Senator Martinez: Got you. So I was looking at the list of criteria for the changes. I guess was it the faculty committee who put this together?

Senator Kalter: The original proposal came out of Faculty Affairs Committee and then it was tweaked a little bit based on the ad hoc committee's discussions with the URC.

Senator Martinez: Got you.

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Martinez: Okay. So I'm looking at item 3.

Senator Kalter: Are you in the Responsibilities and Rights or in the Procedures?

Senator Martinez: No, I'm just reading some supplementary information that came along with these changes supporting the changes. And so the third item says “representation of all colleges in the selection process/avoidance or minimization of further [politicizing the selection process].” And then there are four sub questions, and these are all in question form. Question one: Should the faculty members of the University Research Council also review the nominees for DP and UP in addition to their being reviewed by the Distinguished Professors and University Professors before being recommended to the Provost? Number two: Alternatively, should representation of all the colleges be achieved by inviting either ISU emeritus faculty or distinguished faculty from unrepresented colleges who work at other institutions to participate in the DP review of DP nominees/UP review, UP nominees? Three: Should the Provost always sit on these two to four meetings? The DP review of DP nominees meeting, the UP review of UP nominees meeting, the URC review of DP nominees meeting, the URC review of UP nominees meeting. Prior to Dr. Murphy's stint as Provost, the DPs and UPs might have often met only amongst themselves. And the last one: Alternatively, should the Provost completely eliminate DP/UP review of DP/UP nominees and make the decision alone without input. I think that most of the changes reflect this body of questions. What I don't see are the answers to the questions. It just goes from question to solution, and to me that seems problematic. So I'm against the changes.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. What you were reading from was the items that the ad hoc committee discussed with the URC.

Senator Martinez: If I had data to support those questions, I would be more likely to vote in favor of the changes.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So was there any data that you did not get that you requested?

Senator Martinez: Yeah. The email I sent you with the data requested is what I was requesting.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So as I understand it, you requested the how many people were who applied, is that right?

Senator Martinez: Okay, some of the information that I required is how many total unsuccessful applicants have there been over the years, and what would they say about the process. We had a panel of three DPs, some of which had been rejected once before and said that they didn't experience a selection bias. And I said that maybe this data can be attained by surveying past applicants. Certainly not all of them, okay, but at least a sample of them to see what their experiences have been. If it's pretty, you know, statistically significant that there seems to be an unfairness, then I would be supporting these changes.

Senator Kalter: Okay, I'm going to have Senator Murphy actually address most of that with regard to the issues of confidentiality, but what we did supply was the number of nominees per year since 2011 for the UPs and since 2012 for the DPs, and then the number of awards given. The problem with this data, there are a number of problems with the data, but one significant one is that people can apply over and over again, and so these data are not, you can have, for example, in 2012 there were seven nominees and one award given. In 2013, there were two nominees. Both of those, two could have been of the seven that applied the previous year, and then the next three for the succeeding year could be the other one. So it's very hard to know from that exactly how many individuals were nominated. And so then you also asked some questions about surveying applicants and that kind of thing, and so I'll ask Senator Murphy to address those questions.

Provost Murphy: Well, I have not seen what you're reading from, so in terms of surveying past applicants, we can try to find a time to do that. Part of it is just manpower. I imagine that Jean Ann Dargatz, who is my assistant, will need to do that, but certainly would not have time to have done that in November or December, so perhaps that's something we can do. I'm trying to think of January, if we've got a little break in January. In terms of the number of awards, so what we've given you that data is for the entire institution. It would be very difficult to break that down by college and protect people's confidentiality, because we do have colleges where maybe one person has been truly, you know, one person has applied and if I give you a smaller college and say one person applied and didn't get it, people in that college will know who that is. I mean, we have to be very careful about this, because these are people who have applied and not received DP. So we want to be careful. The Arts and Sciences is probably the only college where we could actually pull that data out separately and give you Arts and college, just because we get so many applicants from the College of Arts and Sciences. I'd be very careful about pulling it out separately for any of the other colleges, because we only get sometimes one applicant over a two- or three-year period and people might know who that applicant is if they don't receive that. If you've got questions you want us to send out to past applicants, we would be glad to do that. And we could see if we could find some time to do that in January or early February.

Senator Kalter: I remember I had a conversation with you, Senator Martinez, afterwards where you were going to come up with a survey for them. Did you have time to do that?

Senator Martinez: Well, if you want me to, I can. But I think another, and you just mentioned this, another approach, which surprisingly wasn't taken, I think it's a much less controversial approach, is in the same Faculty Affairs document if you look at the fourth item the title is Absence of Stated Criteria. I know we've talked about this before. It says currently there is no established criteria for becoming either a Distinguished or University Professor. No set research impact. No teaching and/or service impact. Is this as it should be or should there be published criteria or unpublished criteria, but still set criteria that is used in selection. Now if that change would have been proposed, I would have wholeheartedly accepted it, because I think it's less controversial and makes a lot more sense. The changes as they are assume this kind of like a bias or corrupt selection process, which I have seen no evidence. The most recent nominee is an excellent choice, so that confirms to me that there isn't any shenanigans going on. It seems to be like the process seems to work.

Senator Horst: The Distinguished Professor policy is very old. It has never really been revised. I think the text says something like the Provost will establish criteria. That's what the policy says right now. We're making a step forward. We've made a lot of decisions. We've had a lot of late nights. So I am supporting these changes to this policy. Is it perfect? No. We can continue to work on the policy, but I'm hoping that we can pass this policy. I'm wondering if we can have a motion to table formally.

Senator Kalter: So are we done with debates in terms of changing the wording of the policy and ready to vote it up or down in January after we consult with the DPs as Senator Nichols has suggested? Or do we have further debate on the language. In order to consult with them, I would like to have the policy as we would want to vote on it rather than to have further changes and then have to go back to them. So do we have any further debate?

Provost Murphy: I just want to address the policy. The current policy does not say that the Provost will develop criteria. The policy just says I will develop a process and a procedure for selection.

Senator Horst: Sorry. I used the wrong word. The Provost will develop a process.

Senator Kalter: So what we did in 1 under Procedure. Developed seemed to be 1981 and it already had been developed, so we crossed that out and said maintain and circulate a uniform policy. We could actually change that word policy to procedure, since this is the policy and that should be the procedure, but that's what Senator Horst was remembering was that it said develop. It does not, however, say criteria. It says for nomination and documentation.

Provost Murphy: So we kind of develop what the process will be used and that it's an electronic submission and that that's how we distribute information out to the panel who will evaluate them, but we have never developed criteria.

Senator Horst: I apologize.

Provost Murphy: That's all right. I just wanted that clarification since that's what we're talking about right now.

Senator Horst: But my request is if people would like to table this. I'm hoping that those people can put forward a motion to table.

Senator Kalter: So before we put forward the motion to table, do we have any further debate on the language at all? All right. I will entertain any kind of motion that you want to throw at us.

Senator Nichols: I move that we table it until we get feedback from the DPs about the revised policy.

Motion by Senator Nichols, seconded by Senator Haugo to table until feedback is given from the Distinguished Professors about the revised policy. The motion was approved with one nay and one abstention.

Senator Kalter: It is 9:15 p.m. Great, we are making progress. Have a great winter break.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Dawson, seconded by Senator Lucey, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.