**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, January 22, 2020**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

***Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.***

***Action Item:***

***Academic Planning Committee Confirmation***

Jeffrey Wagman, PSY, (replacing J. Cooper Cutting 2018-2020 term)

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to confirm Jeffrey Wagman as a member on the Academic Planning Committee. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Discussion Item:***

***01.15.20.01 University Professor policy working group memo***Senator Kalter: So, you have a working group memo from the group that we formed earlier in the year, about the University Professor policy and I will hand that over to the chair of that committee, who is Senator Horst.

Senator Horst: First off, I don’t think I’m formally the chair. It’s the working group, and, unfortunately, Craig isn’t here, but I wanted to thank Craig and Adena Meyers. We’ve been doing a lot of hard work in our working group. And we were charged with working on the University Professor policy. I gave you a report as to where we are right now. We’ve done a lot of research. We spoke with Claire Lamonica of the Center of Teaching, Learning and Technology, Professor Rosie Hauck of the University Teaching Committee. We had a meeting with Provost Murphy. We had a meeting with Chairperson Kalter. And, also, we had a meeting with the Associate Provost. We’ve been doing some benchmarking, looking at definitions of awards at different institutions, and also we’ve been examining the policy language of the University Professor. And as we were doing that, we initially really were considering the three components of the University Professor policy and that there is a part of it where you can recruit somebody under that title, and so there’s language in the policy about that. But then, the other ways you can be eligible is that you have national recognition for research, or national recognition as an outstanding teacher. The working group started focusing really on that piece of the outstanding teacher, but after some meetings, we realized that all three of these components are very important, and we’re really grappling with how to deal with all of these three different components of the University Professor policy in this same policy.

After doing some research, we realized that it might make more sense to expand the types of awards given to faculty, and perhaps include the Distinguished Professor policy in the discussion. There’s a lot of other institutions that have, for instance, a Distinguished Professorship in Teaching, a Distinguished Professorship in Research, even a Distinguished Professorship in Service. And so, we were trying to grapple with the University Professor policy, and its three different components, and we’re now realizing it might make more sense to look at both policies. So to that end, we’re asking for you to expand the charge.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you. And apologies to Senator Meyers and Senator Blum for assuming that Senator Horst was the chair. It’s just she’s the one I’ve been talking to the most. Do you have anything you want to add, Senator Meyers?

Senator Meyers: Yeah. I would just add, or a clarification. The way I was thinking of the three, there’s sort of three different areas of excellence. But then in terms of the University Professor award and title, I think part of what we were confronting was the fact that there’s sort of three different ways that it is used currently on campus, one is for recruitment, one is for administrators who have outstanding records that aren’t eligible for the Distinguished Professor, and then the other is for people who have profiles maybe similar to Distinguished Professor, but are maybe like a stepping stone to that, or something, and it seemed very confusing to have these three different functions of one award. And we were also noting that that third function that I mention tends to go to people with strong research records, which the Distinguished Professor already covers. So that’s what turned our heads originally in the direction of looking at maybe a teaching award, and why we were talking to people on campus that are involved in other teaching awards. I just wanted to clarify that there’s sort of the three different areas, but then there… We were really trying to work out what to do about an award that does three very different things, in terms of recruitment, honoring administrators, and then honoring other outstanding researchers on campus, sort of, instead of the Distinguished Professor.

Senator Horst: Yes. Thank you. I forgot about the administrator part as well. And I would just add that there is this component that says that you can get the University Professorship for outstanding teaching, or outstanding research, but a problem that came up when we discussed the Distinguished Professor policy last year was that we included a review committee for the DPs, the University Research Council. And then, I believe, it was Senator Mainieri said, well, who’s going to review the UPs, because there’s that teaching component, or there’s the research component. So, when we were grappling with that, you know, that’s why we had discussions with Claire Lamonica and some of the University Teaching Committee members. But as you can see, that the University Professor policy is addressing a lot of things and we’re just hoping that we could break it out. So, we are asking for this committee to allow us to expand our work to also look at the Distinguished Professor policy.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Thank you so much. And we have this as a Discussion Item right now, so, let’s discuss whether or not we would like to expand the charge of this subcommittee.

Senator Mainieri: To that question, I support this. I feel like separating the University and DP, I think is really hard to do. And so, I don’t think we can consider one without another. If I had a suggestion in addition to that, do we wait until after a motion to approve the expansion of the charge, or do I suggest that now? I’m just trying to think about procedurally.

Senator Kalter: That’s a good question. So, I think let’s stay on the question of whether or not we should think about expanding the charge, and then bringing up that, whatever you have, after that.

Senator Pancrazio: Just a simple question, what is an award structure?

Senator Horst: Well, at different universities…

Senator Pancrazio: I understand a type of award or criteria for an award, but I’ve never heard the expression “award structure.”

Senator Horst: Like, for instance, at SUNY, they have the Distinguished Professor, the Distinguished Service Professor, the Distinguished Teaching Professor, the Distinguished Librarian. So, there’s a lot of different… pardon?

Senator Pancrazio: It seems to be a type. Like, type is a synonym for that.

Senator Horst: Type? Yeah.

Senator Pancrazio: A type of an award. Okay.

Senator Horst: Right now, our structure of our awards is we have the two. And so I’m just… We’re trying to consider whether or not we should broaden out all of the different award types, so maybe I’ll just say award types.

Senator Pancrazio: I understood the rest of it. I just wanted the definition for, yeah, I just wanted the definition for structures.

Senator Horst: Yeah. No worries.

Senator Meyers: I would add too, part of our current structure is that we’re, the UP working group was constrained by the fact that the DP policy says this is the highest award. So, part of the structure is the hierarchy of the awards, I guess.

Senator Kalter: Further discussion? For or against expanding the charge. (Pause) All right. Right now, because it’s a Discussion Item, we would have to move it to an Action Item, essentially to expand the charge.

Motion by Senator Marx, seconded by Senator Nikolaou, to move to Action Item. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. We are now in an Action Item, so the motion, and I should probably let one of the committee members put this on the floor, but the motion would be essentially to expand the charge so that you can look at both the DP policy and the UP policy at the same time. Is that…?

Senator Horst: Yes. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: All right.

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Meyers, to expand the charge of the University Professor policy working group to include the Distinguished Professor policy.

Senator Kalter: All right. So, I’m going to call first on Senator Mainieri, since you indicated you had something else to add to that.

Senator Mainieri: Sure. So, I think as we expand the scope of the working group to include Distinguished Professors, and keeping in mind our discussions over the last year involving these policies, I would propose that we add a few members to the working group, in particular to have a voice representing University Professors, and a voice representing Distinguished Professors.

Senator Kalter: So, your motion is to add one of each of those.

Senator Mainieri: Um-hum.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, you’re making a motion to amend the motion that’s on the floor to add to the working group one Distinguished Professor and one University Professor, is that correct?

Senator Mainieri: Correct. And invited members for both of those.

Senator Kalter: Explain a little bit more about that.

Senator Mainieri: So, that we could reach out to people who would be able to best contribute to that discussion.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Senator Horst: Just a point of order, is the membership of the committee on the agenda?

Senator Kalter: Actually, the Action Item itself is not on the agenda. Interestingly enough, right. So, the constitution of the working group is not on the agenda, anymore than moving it to an Action Item was on the agenda.

Senator Horst: Right. But just because of a group brings a report, that doesn’t necessarily mean that the committee itself, the structure of the committee, is on the agenda.

Senator Kalter: So, you’re saying, in other words, that since Senator Mainieri is talking about the constitution of the working group itself, and your motion is about what the working group is looking at, that those have to be separate. Is that correct?

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Would people… does anybody have any objection to what Senator Horst is bringing up there?

Senator Pancrazio: Clarify that again. And could you clarify the whole thing, because your voice is very soft, Senator Horst, and I can’t always hear you.

Senator Horst: The working group gave you a report as to the status of our work.

Senator Pancrazio: Um-hum.

Senator Horst: The work… the contents of the committee, the working group, sorry, the working group is not on the agenda. And if you want to amend an agenda, you would be going against the Open Meetings Act, right.

Senator Pancrazio: So, we would have to have a motion to suspend the rules to actually do that.

Senator Kalter: Actually, I’m not sure that we can do either one. In other words, it may be that we need to table this right now. Put the Action Item on a further agenda, because, according to the Opens Meetings Act, I don’t think you can suspend that rule. If we’re going to bring that up.

Senator Nichols: Yeah, I just don’t think that that was an accurate portrayal. You just didn’t offer a report, you’re asking for an expansion of the charge. The charge comes at about the same time that the description of the roster happens. If we’re reviewing the charge of the committee, it’s not unfair at that time to make sure that the committee is staffed by individuals that best represent the people who could handle that charge as amended. So, I think separation of those two things is not optimal. That, my understanding of going forward with an expanded charge would be to make sure that the committee has the right people on it to best fulfill that amended charge.

Senator Kalter: Senator Nichols, let me clarify that for a moment. So, what I was suggesting is that we could have two motions tonight, right: one about the scope of what the committee is looking at, and the other one about the constitution of the committee. Would that be acceptable according to what you were just saying?

Senator Nichols: Depending on the order.

Senator Kalter: Depending on the order.

Senator Nichols: Right. If it’s conditional on a change in the committee status, I think that would need to be handled in such a way that the amendment, or the proposed amendment, was addressed first, up or down, before going to the vote on whether to expand the charges.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, we don’t have yet a second to Senator Mainieri’s motion. I’m not going to ask for one yet, because what I’m going to suggest is that we would have to table the original motion, go to Senator Mainieri’s motion, and second it, and then debate that, and then come back.

Senator Nichols: Right.

Senator Kalter: Does that seem acceptable to everybody?

Senator Nichols: Yep.

Senator Kalter: Anybody object to that? All right.

Motion by Senator Mainieri, seconded by Senator Pancrazio, to table the motion to expand the committee charge. The motion was approved.

Motion by Senator Mainieri, seconded by Senator Nichols, to add two members to the working group: one representing the University Professors and one representing the Distinguished Professors.

Senator Horst: I would just say that the working group has met several times throughout this last semester. We met bi-weekly. We’ve come a long way in our discussions. We have every intention of including the Distinguished Professor and the University Professor in our further discussions. However, we’ve done a lot of work as a group and I think it would disrupt that work to change the membership of the working group mid-stream, would put us back at square one. We have no intention of not consulting members who represent the UPs and the DPs. So, I speak against the motion.

Senator Midha: I just want to clarify, when you said invited members. So, if it’s a formal vote they can vote, in the voting process?

Senator Mainieri: My motion doesn’t say if they’re voting or non-voting. I think that that maybe is something that we need to clarify.

Senator Midha: So, full membership not just invited as guests.

Senator Kalter: I think it’s important, Senator Mainieri, that we do clarify that. Are you making a motion for voting members or non-voting members?

Senator Mainieri: I think it’s important that if they are members they have a voice. So, I think having them being official members, would that be ex-officio if they weren’t voting?

Senator Kalter: So, a non-voting member does have a voice, just like in our committees, for example, in Rules Committee, Sam Catanzaro sits as a non-voting member but he has a voice. Same for Academic Affairs, you have Dr. Hurd has a voice. So, voice and a vote are two different things. So, your motion is asking for members.

Senator Mainieri: Yep.

Senator Kalter: The question that we need to clarify for you, and then to have you’re seconder, Senator Nichols, agree to, is whether you’re asking for voting or non-voting members.

Senator Mainieri: Sure. My idea would be non-voting.

Senator Kalter: Non-voting. And is that agreeable to the seconder?

Senator Nichols: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, we’re talking about two non-voting members: one DP, one UP. Now the method of choice is still not clear, so perhaps that should be part of what we’re debating, in addition to debating this, whether we should vote this up or down. So, do we have further debate on the motion?

Senator Meyers: I just have a question. Does a working group have votes? I mean, like one of the points of discussion has been what’s the title of this group. It had been referred to as a task force, but then we looked back and found that it was really supposed to be called a working group. What is a working group?

Senator Kalter: So, I believe, technically speaking, according to our Senate rules, all internal committees (which we are one) are able to have sub-committees. So, you are technically a sub-committee of the Caucus. I would say it is important for you to think about yourselves therefore as having votes, and if we choose to, to have members who have either votes or non-votes, right. So, you are technically a sub-committee of the Faculty Caucus.

Senator Meyers: Okay. A follow up questions, does the proposal… I’m assuming that then these non-voting proposed additional members, they won’t be part of the Faculty Caucus necessarily, so…

Senator Kalter: That seems to be what Senator Mainieri is proposing since we, as far as I know, we have no DPs or UPs sitting currently on the Senate. Correct.

Senator Lucey: I’m wondering if we expand the number of people on the working group, I’m wondering if we could ensure that we have representation of members of the community who are underrepresented? To ensure that they have a voice in that process.

Senator Kalter: Senator Lucey, I believe that it is not legal for us to determine committee membership according to things like race or gender.

Senator Lucey: Okay.

Senator Kalter: There are obviously other things that we could do to get at those, those dimensions of concern. For example, there are certain faculty who contribute to programs on campus that teach about African American Studies.

Senator Lucey: Right. So, could it be part of the charge is then that that committee look at those issues in their processes?

Senator Kalter: So, I’m going to say, in terms of Robert’s Rules, that if you want to bring that up as a separate motion about the constitution of the committee, because I’m assuming you’re not just referring to the DPs and UPs, but to other additional members of a working group, that we should wait on that until we’ve debated Senator Mainieri’s motion.

Senator Lucey: Okay. Makes sense.

Senator Kalter: Right. So, I’ll come back to you once we’re done debating and voting on that motion.

Senator Lucey: All right. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Other debate on the motion on the floor, about adding or not adding non-voting members: one DP, one UP?

Senator Ferrence: I was going to suggest maybe… So, I guess this is more of a question than a comment, but I think it matters kind of… how do you go about populating the two individuals? Does the Provost pick the individuals? Do the DPs vote and pick an individual? Does this body pick, and just say, you will do it? Because there’s not a huge number of UPs, there’s not a huge number of DPs, and we also need to make sure that you have a committee that can work well together if you’re going to put them together. So, how would we go about vetting that? I think it’s just worth asking at this stage, because we want to make sure that we have a functional committee if we change the composition of the committee.

Senator Kalter: I think that’s a very important point, Senator Ferrence, that if we’re going to debate this, we do need to have outlined how exactly those members will be chosen. Now, I will say that I think that the “who choses them?” is this body. That has been the tradition, it should probably not stop being the tradition, that this body choses its own subcommittee members, and also, you know, seats members on other committees, etc. In fact, endorses DPs themselves, right, says yes or no in that vote. So, I think it would be helpful for the membership here to formulate exactly how that DP and UP would be chosen, should the Caucus decide to put them on the committee. Do you have any suggestions as to how they should be chosen? Or how they should be nominated to the Caucus, I should say?

Senator Ferrence: Right. So, I suspect it’s a challenge to discuss, you know, after we get things laid out, you know, if we go down this road, you know, maybe the group committee put forth names. I suppose we should be careful with the language so that, I’m specifically thinking of UPs, because the total number of them who are still on campus, so who would be likely to be able to serve is fairly small. And so, we should probably also have something in there that we invite, but we don’t want to back ourselves into a position that if none of the standing, say UPs, was willing to serve that that would cause the sub-committee to cease to exist. And normally I wouldn’t worry too much about it, but I’m just thinking about the numbers, I think, pretty small. And you know, that we could make, and I think the thing to do in both cases would be to bring a list, maybe to the floor, maybe start it with the Exec, because it’s a smaller group, and you know, that we can advise, but then come to everybody and say here’s a couple of names two or three that the Exec thought that might be good, does anyone else have suggestions of who we might reach out to. So that’s one option. The other option would be to just put it out as nominations including self-nomination. See what attention you attract, and then whatever applicants, as it were, that this body get, we could vet. But then, we’d have to design some protocols assuming that we got more than one.

Senator Pancrazio: Could I ask that we divide the two questions of how we’re going to choose the people, only after an event if we actually decide to have those people on the committee?

Senator Kalter: Decide to have those people.

Senator Pancrazio: Yeah. If we have to focus specific on debate, to have or not to have those ex-officio people on there. And then, decide, if so, and willingness to serve is usually a good key.

Senator Kalter: So, that if we were to vote to put people on that committee, it would be contingent about deciding on an agreed upon method for how to do so. But yes, absolutely, we can split those questions.

Senator Pancrazio: But if we decide not to, then we don’t need to have that discussion.

Senator Kalter: Exactly. Yes.

Senator Martinez: This is a similar question. I’m kind of leaning towards Senator Horst’s position, but you mentioned that you had worked with the DPs and University Professors, or at least consult with them, how would you go about doing that?

Senator Horst: Well, we would create a draft. I was just going to comment that this policy before was worked on by the Faculty Affairs Committee, which consulted with the DPs and the UPs. Then it was picked up, I’m trying to remember… The problem with the Faculty Caucus is it doesn’t have a body to generate policy language, right. So, the problem… one of the perceived problems I had with our discussion with the DP policy last year is that our chairperson was the one who was charged with all of the edits, because we don’t have an internal committee that does the policy work. So, that in my mind was what our little group was doing was basically the work of the Faculty Affairs Committee, or some sort of analogues to that, that works for this body. Of course, we were planning on creating a draft, and then bringing them in. Adena and I even talked about, you know, holding a couple of information sessions with them, and then we were also planning on bringing them to the discussion when it’s presented to the Faculty Caucus. So, that’s what we were planning. But, you know, we meet every other Mondays at 3. It’s a small working group at this point, and that’s what it is right now.

Senator Kalter: So, Senator Martinez, I think you were edging towards speaking against the motion, is that correct?

Senator Martinez: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Do we have further debate?

Provost Murphy: I would speak in favor of the motion. It’s hard for me to imagine that we would simply present that to the DPs and UPs as an information item. They have an important voice in this process, and they have a lot to offer this process. These are people that are our current DPs and UPs. So, I think just my sense of shared governance is that they belong with a voice in this process.

Senator Midha: I’d rather have both of them as voting members. Anyways, this group has three members, if I see. So, three is a very small group, in my opinion, for making policy changes. So, having five voting members would be appropriate.

Senator Kalter: So, just to clarify, the three members are not making policy changes. They are suggesting them eventually to this body. It would be this body that does the action on those proposed policy changes, and can make any edits, or, you know, rejections of suggestions, whatsoever. So, just so that’s clear.

Senator Midha: Yes. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Now, the first thing that you said was about voting versus non-voting and…

Senator Horst: Making an amendment to the motion.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. You would be making an amendment to that motion. Would you like to make a motion that we turn this from non-voting into voting?

Senator Midha: Yes. I would like to do that.

Senator Horst: And do we have a second? Somebody who also wants to see these members as voting members? If they should be… Senator Melton, are you seconding?

Motion by Senator Midha, seconded by Senator Melton, to amend the motion to become voting members.

Senator Kalter: Do we have debate on whether or not the members should be voting or non-voting?

Senator Ferrence: I’d like to know in that context for Faculty Caucus, when Faculty Caucus has sub-committees, either current or past, how frequently are members of the sub-committees who are not Caucus members voting members of the sub-committees? Is that common practice, or is it more common practice? or is it more common practice to have them as non-voting? Or is there no particular precedent?

Senator Kalter: The only recent precedent that I can think of is the ASPT Equity Ad Hoc Committee, which had a combination of Caucus members, faculty, and administrators. And in that case, because we have sort of a general practice of having administrators being non-voting members, and faculty and students being voting members (or faculty, students and staff being voting members), the faculty who were not on the Caucus were also voting in that case. I’m trying to think if there are other examples. There was also an AIF Ad Hoc Committee, all of those members were faculty, and all of them were voting, except for Dr. Lacy, who again, because he was in his AVP role was a non-voting member of the committee.

Senator Ferrence: So, at the risk of being (what was the word I learned this morning) pettifogging… (Laughter) Thank you. So, if we talk in the context of…so, faculty, even if not on the Faculty Caucus, had been voting, but administrators aren’t. If the DP or UP chosen to serve happens to be currently an administrator and not faculty, would that change whether they have voting status or not on the subcommittee? I don’t really care, and maybe we’re getting a little too deep there, but it’s because it’s kind of a unique situation, I think it’s worth mentioning.

Senator Kalter: Because we were in debate, I was going to ask you to take a position on that, then you decided to take the position of I don’t care. And I was going to be a little bit worried that you had never heard the word petty before, but now that I know it’s pettifogging, I’m comforted. So, you do not have a position on whether, if the UP or DP chosen were an administrator, whether or not that should make a difference?

Senator Ferrence: So, my own personal position is, I would rather just have the Caucus members be voting, and everybody else be non-voting.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Senator Ferrence: But if we were to decide that the DP/ UP should be voting, then I’m rather ambivalent as to whether they’re an administrator or not.

Senator Kalter: So, for the purpose of this debate, that is a debate against the motion.

Senator Ferrence: Correct.

Senator Kalter: Against Senator Midha’s motion.

Senator Ferrence: Correct.

Senator Kalter: You would prefer to have non-voting members. Do we have further debate?

The motion did not pass.

Senator Kalter: So, that motion is defeated. We go back to Senator Mainieri’s motion that we add two members; one UP, one DP to the working group. Do we have further debate on whether or not we should add a UP and a DP to the working group, or the sub-committee?

The motion was approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. So, the aye’s have it, so that we will expand that sub-committee to five members, three voting members of the Caucus, two non-voting members: one UP, one DP. Now before we move to Senator Lucey’s concern, we need to determine how we will choose those members. Let me give you a possibility. We can come up with a list of all of the DPs and UPs that are currently employed at the University, have a round of voting here, simply, in other words, giving everybody all of the names, all of the members to make more than 50% would be essentially eligible, right. But then, we would have to go through a process of determining which of those is willing to serve, and I haven’t quite thought it through beyond that, but does that sound like a good start, or would you like to go in a different direction?

Senator Pancrazio: Ask them which one would like to serve.

Senator Kalter: First?

Senator Pancrazio: Start with willingness to serve, rather than drafting.

Senator Kalter: Rather than having… what I’m concerned about there, Senator Pancrazio, is we get a volunteer, maybe we get one volunteer to serve and the Caucus doesn’t want that volunteer because they don’t trust them for some reason. That seems like a fairly awkward…

Senator Pancrazio: I don’t think it’s a good idea to question people’s motives.

Senator Kalter: What’s that?

Senator Pancrazio: I mean we don’t know who the person is.

Senator Kalter: Can you say that again?

Senator Pancrazio: I don’t think we’re in a position to question anybody’s motives. And even if we don’t know who the person is.

Senator Kalter: In other words, I’m saying that there’s a possibility that the Caucus could reject any one person, and I wouldn’t necessarily want to put that person in the position of having volunteered, and then been rejected in that way. But I understand what you’re saying, right. That you’re thinking that anybody who volunteers we should put them on.

Senator Pancrazio: I’m thinking that we run the risk of drafting a person that doesn’t want to serve, or we end up selecting people who are overburdened at the current moment, and it might be easier to winnow down the group to find and say yes, they would like to participate in that. I mean, time is always, it’s the one resource that runs out.

Senator Kalter: So, you would prefer that…

Senator Pancrazio: That we ask them, like a representative.

Senator Kalter: You would prefer, in other words, that we send all the UPs an email, and ask them individually, please answer back if you would be willing to serve on this committee. Same for the DPs.

Senator Pancrazio: That is how I would approach it with my colleagues.

Senator Kalter: Same for the DPs. We collect that, and then we hand that out, and then we would see who gets the highest number of votes.

Senator Pancrazio: I mean, they may winnow it down amongst themselves and say, hey, these are just the two. But I mean, I would certainly do that in a departmental committee. I’d say, who would like to serve.

Senator Kalter: Yes. What I’m asking you, though, is, are we saying as a Caucus that the UPs get to select their representative, or that we get to select that person? Same with for the DPs. Sounds like you’re suggesting that they put up their one nominee and that we vote them up or down.

Senator Pancrazio: That’s certainly a possibility. I can live… I tend to ask people if they want to serve on something rather than we’re going to pick the people that we want on it. But that’s… I’m not speaking as a we, that’s an I statement. Now, other people may have different ones but I’ve said my piece.

Senator Horst: I just wanted to make one request, that we do have a functional time right now of 3-4 on Monday’s. So, if it at all could be possible… That doesn’t work for you, Adena? It doesn’t work for you. Okay, we have no functional time. Okay. So, we have no functional time, so the time’s up in the air. I mean traditionally when the Senate seats the committee, the names are presented on our agenda, and we approve the names. Traditionally, the Faculty Caucus approves all of the people who serve on committees that are created by the Caucus.

Senator Midha: I favor Senator Pancrazio’s option, but if we have multiple nominations, then the Senators can vote. If it’s just one nomination, then we have a member on the committee.

Senator Kalter: So, as the Chair of the Caucus, what I would say is that we still need, even if we have only one nominee, to confirm that nominee. I’m not willing to give away the Caucus’ power in that way, to say that people get to decide that they sit on our committees. We decide that.

Senator Midha: That’s fine then.

Senator Pancrazio: Fair enough.

Senator Kalter: But that’s alright if we only have one nominee, we can put that person out and have them confirmed or not confirmed.

Senator Midha: Has there been a case where this happened? Because we already actually selected them to be the DPs and UPs, so we already have chosen them. So, why would we not want to have them on this committee?

Senator Kalter: It’s extraordinarily rare for this Caucus to reject a nominee who volunteers for a committee. It does happen every once in a while.

Senator Midha: Okay.

Senator Kalter: I wouldn’t anticipate it. I just want people to understand that it’s possible. Right. And when we do the vote, we would generally go into an Executive Session if somebody…it would be helpful if somebody had an objection that they wanted to share with the Caucus to allow me to put us into Executive Session, so that we’re not talking about that objection openly. But that is the kind of circumstance, especially when we talk about seating for Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance or Ombudsperson, every once in a while, an objection may come up and I could imagine that, potentially, it could come up in this instance.

Senator Midha: Sounds good. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: So, we need a motion, and a clear motion about the kind of process we’re doing to select.

Senator Pancrazio: I would move that the active chair of the committee request nominees from those two groups.

Senator Kalter: In other words, the chair of the sub-committee?

Senator Pancrazio: Of this sub-committee, correct.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, your proposal is that…

Senator Pancrazio: And that those would come to the Faculty Caucus for our confirmation or non-confirmation.

Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Nichols, that the chair of the University Professor working group request nominees from the Distinguished Professors and University Professors to be confirmed by the Faculty Caucus.

Senator Kalter: Do we have debate?

Senator Meyers: We don’t have a chair.

Senator Pancrazio: Oh.

Senator Horst: I would be happy to do that. I will be happy to send out a request as long as I get an email listserv.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. We can say one of the members of the committee. How’s that? One of the members of the committee will send out this invitation.

Senator Pancrazio: I can live with that.

Senator Horst: I will be happy to do all of that.

Senator Kalter: Okay. But she’s not the chair.

Senator Horst: But I’m not the chair, I’m a worker. Long live the workers.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. Let’s see. So, now we need to go back, I believe, next to Senator Lucey and since I’ve articulated the legal concerns, do you have another way of getting at what you are thinking of?

Senator Lucey: Yeah. So, I’m wondering if somehow we could add to the charges to the committee, if they are not there already, some sort of charge that asks the committee to look at the procedures for selecting the two professors to ensure that equitable conditions are in place to provide equitable opportunities for receiving that distinction.

Senator Kalter: So, because that’s to a motion about the constitution of the sub-committee of the Caucus, I think we should first go to whether or not the committee charge should be expanded period.

Senator Lucey: Okay.

Senator Kalter: And then whether it should be expanded to include that, whether that’s a motion to amend, or a separate motion, or what have you. Do the members of the sub-committee want to put their… or actually, we have to take it off the table, right. We had put it on the table. So, does somebody want to offer a motion to take the first motion that we had tonight off the table?

Motion by Senator Nichols, seconded by Marx, to take off the table the motion to expand the University Professor working group charge to include the Distinguished Professor policy as well. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. So, we are back to debating the motion of whether to expand the charge of the sub-committee to include examination of the Distinguished Professor policy, along with the University Professor policy. Do we have debate on that motion?

Senator Ferrence: So, we were just looking at language here, and I don’t have… I’ll leave it to somebody else to come up with good language, but I’m assuming that somewhat the motion has to do with… you know, the last sentence on our memo to us (the January 16, 2020 memo) says, “We wish to consider a broader selection of award structure such as those observed at peer institutions.” And it seems to me a good way to get at Senator Lucey’s suggestion would be to, if that’s being used in the motion to amend, to add a little bit of language stating to be sure to consider issues of underrepresentation in the distinctions.

Senator Kalter: And, Senator Lucey, you had said to examine procedures for selection.

Senator Lucey: I think this language is consistent with what I’m seeking.

Senator Kalter: Senator Ferrence’s language?

Senator Lucey: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Senator Horst: Underrepresentation in the DPs and the UPs? Is that the motion? Just so I could hear it again.

Senator Ferrence: Right. So, somewhere it says, “we wish to consider broader selection of award structures such as those observed at other peer institutions,” and to consider issues associated with underrepresentation of the awardees that are the receiving the distinction.

Senator Kalter: Among the awardees.

Senator Ferrence: Yeah. Among the awardees.

Motion by Senator Ferrence, seconded by Senator Lucey, to amend the original motion to include after the statement “We wish to consider broader selection of award structures such as those observed at other peer institutions,” the phrase “and to consider issues associated with underrepresentation among the awardees.”

Senator Horst: I support that change.

Senator Seeman: Yeah. I just had an issue. Where is the initial charge located? I kind of feel like that’s not really spelled out what the initial charge is.

Senator Horst: There is none.

Senator Kalter: The initial charge is not… I don’t know if it is written out but it could be described in one sentence, which is to examine the University Professor policy and propose changes to the Caucus. Right.

Senator Seeman: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: So, this is expanding it beyond that. Does that… I don’t know if that satisfies but.

Senator Seeman: Yeah. I just was looking at just what they reviewed, I didn’t know if that came from the charge, those six things that you looked at.

Senator Kalter: As I recall, we did this very informally, and didn’t actually write up a formal charge for the sub-committee. But they basically were charged with looking at the UP policy and suggesting changes to the Caucus.

The motion to amend the original motion regarding expanding the charge was approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. So, we have a motion on the floor that reads like this, that “the charge of the sub-committee would be expanded to be able to consider both the DP and the UP policy simultaneously to consider a broader selection of award structure, such as those observed at other peer institutions, and to consider issues associated with underrepresentation among the awardees.” Do we have further debate on that motion? (Pause) I’m so excited tonight, can you tell? This is a great roundabout Robert’s Rules debate. All right.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. We have an expanded charge, an expanded committee, and we have the end (I hope) of the night.

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