**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, September 23, 2020**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: Alright, I'm going to call the meeting to order. And I'm going to start by suggesting that we actually set a hard stop time on this meeting and go back to our usual practice of saying 9:30p.m., so that will stop this meeting by 9:30 p.m.

***Action item:***

***Appointments to the Academic Planning Committee memo***

 ***Academic Planning Committee appointment confirmations***

Qiliang He, HIS, 2020-2022

Jennifer Sharkey, MIL, 2020-2022 (second term)

***Second Academic Planning Committee appointment confirmation for 2020-2021***

Paul Ugor, ENG

Allison Alcorn, MUS

Angie Bonnell, MIL

Brenda Johnson, MCN

Stephanie Gardiner-Walsh, SED

Maria Boerngen, AGR

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Blum, to approve as a slate. The motion was unanimously approved, with the exception of Senators Tranel and Midha abstaining.

***Academic Impact Fund ad hoc committee report***

Senator Kalter: Wonderful, thank you so much. The next is the Academic Impact Fund ad hoc Committee Report. This is actually being carried over from last September, if you remember. So, the Caucus discussed this report last September, and was about to vote to approve it, but I wanted to make sure that Senator Meyers saw the wording that I was adding at her request. As you can see from the minutes excerpt, there was little other discussion about this report, because this is the 20-year mark report, which basically covers from about 1996 through roughly 2016-2017. And we are now moving into new territory with the AIF, especially with the hiring freeze this year, etc. The Caucus Executive Committee thought that it was a good idea to just conduct this vote now rather than putting it off any further. Basically, this 20-year mark report joins a previous 10-year mark report. And then there were also a couple of comprehensive reports that were done, I think maybe around the three year mark, when the AIF was much more controversial than it is today, and they were sort of just onboarding it, and the Senate want to sort of check to see you know how things were going.

So, those minor edits got delayed because I was working an overload in teaching in the fall of 2019, and then I never got back to it before the pandemic hit. So, what we would be voting on right now is on document number 08.20.20.01. and do we have a motion to move that for approval.

Motion by Senator Nikolaou, seconded by Senator Blum, to approve the Academic Impact Fund ad hoc committee report.

Senator Pancrazio: Thank you. Yeah, I was reading through the section as specifically related to Languages, Literatures, and Cultures. I have some… the comment I want to make just about the issue of program building. And I think that when… at Illinois State when we talk about program building, we have a couple different ways in which we approach it. For example, we talked about… recently we've had the discussions about a College of Engineering, and we talk about market studies of interest. We look at plans for capital investment. We look at collaborative planning. We look at hearings, and open forums, and senior hires, and collaboration (obviously further down the road) be looking at collaborations between Admissions with Preview and with University College to direct students into these programs and provide ample support also for faculty on the way. When we look quite often in things that are international especially, the response, and especially with something with languages, the response is, how do we build a program in Mandarin, our response is inevitably: an assistant professor and a web page. And I am expressing some serious doubts about how that would actually work out, because I've seen it happen before, and I've expressed this to my department as well. It's not the first time I've said, wait a second. I think if we are talking about an interest in developing programs, we need to look at many different components, just the same way we would with an Engineering program. But I think to create a program based on one faculty member, and I've seen this done before, I think that the results are already in the cards, we already know. And I don't think that the administration will embrace a “if you build it, they will come,” because in fact we know what the numbers will be. I think after all of the work that, you know, I have been involved within Latin American and Latino Studies for the past 20 some odd years, we've seen that if we don't have that type of collaboration, the programs don't grow. And the collaboration for something like Latin American and Latino Studies is available, precisely because we have large amounts of heritage speakers. We have Latinos. We have Spanish speaking Latinos. We also have a qualified faculty already on campus, and I would like to ask the committee to include Spanish among those recommendations as well. I think that is where we have our strength, and I have a definite fear that if we create a one-person program within one or two years, they will be right back trying to defend their very existence. And I think that that is too much to ask an assistant professor to do. I think their primary responsibilities are to build a credible research and teaching profile to get to tenure, and ask an assistant professor to build a program in Mandarin, which was one of the recommendations is… places too much of a burden on that individual, and not enough of the burden on the institution. And as a result, I think we will either burnout or encourage a current faculty member to go, which is what we did last time back in the 1990s. Thank you.

Senator Horst: Just a point of clarification, is Senator Pancrazio suggesting that we strike some language or what's the proposal? Because we're in Action Item phase, I believe now. So, is he proposing… what are you proposing?

Senator Pancrazio: Actually, I would propose some deep reflection among faculty. If they're going to be supportive of languages, they need to keep in terms that they're built from the bottom up. That if you're going to be helpful in creating long term programs, you have to have many sections, and that means graduate students. So, it's a point of reflection. I think that we should probably question the idea (as another point of reflection) question the idea that we can have a one-person department or one-person program. I think that the, numerically, I can show you how small that FTE will be. And, thirdly, if we are making a recommendation for hires, I don't think we should exclude Spanish, and that I think I would say, yes, please include Spanish on that list as well. Because that is where we do have the faculty. We do have the student population already on campus.

Senator Kalter: So, Senator Pancrazio, your comments seem to be consistent with what's in the document. So, in other words, where it says Asian languages would be best served by one additional tenure line higher. In other words, the committee was assuming that the staffing that's already in place, and that Asian languages and Italian needed more.

Senator Pancrazio: I disagree with that. We have a non-tenure line faculty teaching one section of Mandarin per year. And that's been the sustainable… one section of Mandarin per semester, and that's been sustainable. What has been sustainable is Japanese because we have two positions for that Dr. Thomas and his wife Michiko Thomas, and that does present. And again, I don't think it's… So, adding another language, an Asian language, which could be a, you know, the logical one would be Mandarin, does not, I don't think we have the numbers to sustain that. Second, I don't think there is a mention of Spanish. I think that that is a notable omission.

Senator Kalter: So, you want to overrule your chairperson at the time who was Dr. Lynd…

Senator Pancrazio: Wouldn't be the first time.

Senator Kalter: …who approved the language that we put in?

Senator Pancrazio: It wouldn't be the first time, and I did mention this with Dr. Burningham, and his response was (and I did bring it up with Dr. Lynd as well) I said flat out that programs are built from the bottom up. And that the notion of just hiring a… that “you build it, they will come….” Yeah.

Senator Kalter: So, what we need, what Senator Horst is asking for, is specific line item changes that you're asking for in that section, which I believe is on Page 11.

Senator Pancrazio: At this point, I would just say add Spanish.

Senator Kalter: So, that the line that currently reads right now, “Currently, the language department is most in need of tenure line faculty in French, German, Chinese, Japanese, and Italian,” you would just want to add Spanish into that.

Senator Pancrazio: I asked for much more. I asked for a deeper reflection. But I think in the practical terms, yes. Spanish

Senator Kalter: Okay. Um, let's see. So, the people who were motioning and seconding, and I think it was Dr. Nikolaou and Dr. Blum. Do you accept that as a friendly amendment, or should it go to a formal motion?

Senator Nikolaou: I think that that would be fine as a friendly.

Senator Blum: Yeah. I am not quite understanding, okay. I mean, I sort of got the gist of what Senator Pancrazio was saying. I feel a little uninformed. All right. So, I mean, I wish there was, is there a better way to… I mean, does someone else have some comment, or maybe Senator Pancrazio could… do you have anything else to add? I feel like we're just adding Spanish. I mean, that…

Senator Kalter: So, I'm going to, for the sake of time, Senator Blum, it sounds like you're not agreeing to that as a friendly. So, Senator Pancrazio, will you make a formal motion to add Spanish to that line.

Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Marx, to add Spanish to the sentence in the report that reads, “Currently, the language department is most in need of tenure line faculty in French, German, Chinese, Japanese, and Italian.”

Senator Cline: Okay, sorry, we can't have a debate if we can't unmute ourselves.

Senator Qaddour: You can’t have a comment, you know, because you can’t unmute yourself.

Senator Cline: Yeah, I'm sorry. I've been trying to unmute myself for like…

Senator Kalter: Oh, I apologize. I didn't realize that was going on because nobody was raising their virtual hands.

Senator Cline: Yeah, I am not ready for our vote, I would… Could you please tell me what document we are on?

Senator Kalter: Yep. I did that at the top. It's 08.20.20.01. And I believe that I said we were on page 11.

Senator Cline: All right, I had dogs that had to go out, so apologies.

Senator Kalter: Senator Qaddour, did you have something that you wanted to say about the motion?

Senator Qaddour: I was trying to second the motion but you can’t unmute yourself.

Senator Kalter: Okay, sorry about that. Make sure that if you need to unmute yourself, you raise your virtual hand. I can see most people on my screen, but if you are simply waving at me, I might miss you, but I'll ask Cera and Senator Horst to also look at their screens in case people are motioning this way instead of through the virtual hands.

One of the things I will say, just as everybody is sort of looking at the page there. I think the second thing that Senator Pancrazio brought up is very, very important. I agree with him very wholeheartedly that we do need to do introspection as a campus about this issue. However, it's sort of beyond the scope of an Academic Impact Fund report to ask for campus introspection, I think that needs to come out of our Provost Office. But I just want to second him on that in spirit.

Alright, so we have a motion on the floor right now to add Spanish to the line in page 11, under the title Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, second paragraph, and it's the sentence that reads “Currently the language department is most in need of tenure line faculty in…” The motion is to add Spanish to that line.

Senator Cline: Okay, I just, I mean, it's not that I disagree with you, Jim, about… you know, in theory, but as the Senate Chair just said, I'm not sure what the impact is, and I feel a little uncomfortable overriding the report writers and overriding chairs in something like this. So, maybe it's just my limited understanding of what the effect of this report would be, but, yeah, I feel, I don't know. Did you, Jim, did you get feedback from your area? Did you get support from your area? Because I feel a little uncomfortable overriding a chair in this way.

Senator Kalter: So, at first, Senator Cline, I was going to congratulate you on perfect debate because you were basically taking a position against the motion, then you asked a question. So, I'm going to go first to Senator Mainieri for debate, and then back to Senator Pancrazio.

Senator Mainieri: I echo Senator Cline’s concerns about altering the report at this stage. So, I would be against the motion.

Senator Pancrazio: I think it was very clear that they saw the point I was making. That bringing in an assistant professor to do program building really was not something that was going to be very viable. And then, I think, the… and then with some reflection, I think, with some reflection they saw the point that I was making, and that would be Dr. Lynd. And she also took it humorously, because I did not… I think that the standard approach to program building is start with an assistant professor, get a tenure track position, and I would say that that does not build what are known as the lesser taught languages. I think we need a lot more groundwork to be done, and it needs to be done by some senior faculty. And I'd say the same thing about Italian. I say the same thing about French, and things like that. People who already have tenure need to be working on those things, rather than bringing someone in. Right now, that a one-person program is 10 or 15 people per section, is really what you're going to get. One, I don't think the administration is going to support it in this financial climate anyway. So, if that's the impact… I think that this is specifically… I think that the Senate, I think we need to speak our consciences, and this is something I feel strongly about. And even if it means telling a department chair and they're used to it. And they know me by now, when I like something, I say I like it. And I think Professor Burningham went along with it.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you. Do we have a debate on the motion to amend? (Pause) All right. I’m seeing none.

The motion was approved 14-5, with abstentions from Senators Hockenberry, Hollywood, Lahiri, Lucey, Meyers, Midha, Seeman and Tranel.

The motion to approve the Academic Impact Fund ad hoc committee report was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right. Wonderful. So that will be obviously sent to the Provost for consideration. And I do think, by the way, that because it's been about a year that some of the stuff has already been discussed in the Provost Office, and they're taking that under consideration.

***Continued Discussion: Proposed pandemic-related ASPT exception regarding the timing 2020 annual performance evaluation***

***Discussion:***

***Third in a series of pandemic-related ASPT discussions and/or information items (see tentative schedule on the next page):***

***Pandemic-related ASPT information item: Toward Caucus action on Appendix 2 teaching productivity wording with respect to annual performance evaluation for 2020: “Departments/schools must use two or more types of factors to evaluate teaching performance, one of which shall be student reactions to teaching performance.”***

Senator Kalter: Okay, so next thing up is the discussion about…. going back to the discussion about ASPT. Our discussion, as you remember last time, took place in pretty cramped conditions because we took almost an hour to have to vote on other things, due to the need to do that by law as roll call votes. The Caucus Executive Committee gave you in your packets several motions that might be placed on the floor. We didn't actually want to put any of them on the floor. We wanted to make sure that all of you decide that, and we can actually decide not to. So, I'm wondering if anybody… this is essentially continuing our conversation from last time about the timing of annual performance evaluations for the calendar year 2020, and whether or not there should or could be any postponement. So, the motions that we came up with had to do with individuals opting to change the time that they turn in their reports. Departments deciding that individuals within their departments could change those times. And the last one was basically we wouldn't have to vote on it because it would be maintaining the status quo that everybody turns in their faculty productivity reports for 2020 on January 5, 2021. So, do we have any discussion or any motions that anybody wants to put on the floor with respect to those, to that question? Or do we want to just continue discussion of that question?

Senator Peterson: Yeah, I guess at this point, I'm a little leery of taking and making a motion on any of these until we get a clear sense of where we're going to be a little bit down the road. You know, the ASPT document has requirements for the faculty when they go up for promotion and tenure that if these small changes are made now have ramifications in the future. And we almost have to be, again, looking at this long term in addition to the short term, to make sure that we don't put people or departments into positions that make it difficult down the road. I mean, I know we want to alleviate some stress now, but there's still going to be ramifications later on.

Senator Kalter: Okay, thank you for that point. And just to clarify the one motion that gives departments the autonomy to make that decision, you're also uncomfortable with that one?

Senator Peterson: Yes, because in the end, when it goes to the college level or even up to the Provost Office, those are specified by the ASPT document. And, you know, that hierarchy says that certain things are required. And if they're not there, because one year the departments… you know, it's essentially, you've got to make sure that the groundwork’s laid to ensure that we don't create any problems down the road. I mean, that's how I'm looking at it as well.

Senator Blum: Yes, I was just… For me, I was kind of wondering if… I think there should be some kind of uniformity. I read those. And it felt very chaotic. All right. When, you know, like if those were… There were a couple different options. If any one of them was to come to fruition. But at the same time, I mean, after listening last time, you know, there were sort of pros and cons to pushing it way, way back. But I was sort of wondering if there could be some kind of rethinking of the calendar. So, for example, allowing a few extra weeks for people to be able to… That may not be the same as pushing it to May or August but allowing some extra time. And then I also think that it, particularly for the large departments which is not something we haven't discussed, but the timeframe in which large departments have to evaluate faculty, and I think that evaluating faculty is going to be more complex than it has been. And so, a sort of rethinking of the calendar. I mean, maybe, allowing people a little bit more time. Allowing D/SFSCs a little bit more time to do their job, and pushing that without… You know, just even like some departments are reading, you know, massive amounts of portfolios, you know, within four days. And all the complexities, and I think we've discussed in a variety of forums, that there's going to be even differences between individual faculty, right. That it's not…. all this, how it affects people is not going to lay the same way. And so, maybe not a radical change in the calendar, but some change in the calendar.

Senator Kalter: I like the creativity of your way of thinking, Senator Blum, and I think putting it together with Senator Peterson's comment just know he's right that we don't have to vote on anything tonight, we can sort of, if we wanted to go in the direction that you're suggesting, we could wait and plan a little bit more, and think about that. I saw Senator Mainieri’s hand up, but it just got put down. Senator Mainieri, did you have something that you want to say?

Senator Mainieri: I put it back down as I was listening to Senator Blum’s ideas here. Because I’m still a strong proponent that we not shift the timeline too dramatically. In fact, before Senator Blum started talking, I was going to say or reiterate the fact that I feel like for a variety of the reasons, echoing Senator Peterson that keeping the timeline at the same… Just there's a lot of dominoes that are impacted by the timeline. Right. And so, I would be interested to think a little bit more about Senator Blum’s idea about adjusting the timeline a little bit as opposed to giving full, you know, another year for folks to turn in their productivity reports, because I just worry about the long term dominoes that that might cause.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Senator Blum’s coincides more with what we have been doing with our students, sort of giving perhaps some leeway but not total looseness, so to speak.

Senator Cline: To follow up on some of that, I spoke to a couple of my colleagues about this again asking how they felt, and the overwhelming response was, please don't change the date, because I think there's so much change, and so many factors that that seems like one more ball they have to chase. And so, they were kind of anxious about that. But my question, for me is what are those dominoes? Right, if we shift the date, what are the dominoes that get affected? And one of my colleagues asked about the awards. The awards structure through the college and then on to the university wide, you know, service initiative, teaching initiative, those sorts of things. That if we don't do evaluations, do those just not happen? Or if some departments choose not to do it, do those faculty just not get to compete? Or, you know, if we push the date back, does that then have effects to the ongoing deliberations in that regard?

Senator Kalter: Yes, thank you. So, I'm going to turn in a minute to Dr. Catanzaro to address some of that. I also wanted to remind people that part of the first motion is not just about the timing of the performance evaluations, but that sort of the nature of what is turned in, and that may also impact what Senator Cline is bringing up, in terms of awards. Right. So, in other words, if instead of turning in a full-on productivity report, like we do most years, we only said please write an essay or something like that, that would potentially impact some other things. Dr Catanzaro, do you want to talk a little bit about what those dominoes might be. You might not be completely comprehensive tonight. You might not think of all of them, but what are some of those?

Dr. Catanzaro: Sure. Thank you. So, the one that comes to mind first is the whole appeals process, right, and making sure that those processes have sufficient time to play out without bumping into other things, right. So, we've got… And there are tenure and promotion processes that are happening downstream after they leave that department or school. And actually the calendar is kind of set up so that, you know, they each flow, that the tenure and promotion flow through the system, and then the annual evaluations flow through the system, at least in terms of School/Department and then CFSC. So, that's one of the dominoes to consider. And not having like actually mapped out the weeks for this purpose, I’m not sure, but there's probably some space for some flexibility in there, in terms of when the deadlines might be, but not in a lot, right, because we do have the end of the semester that comes up.

I think Senator Cline noted to the degree… Now it's interesting, you know, the awards programs, like Outstanding Researcher or Research Initiative, etc. don't have a formal connection to ASPT. Right. It's not as though any of those awards require the ASPT evaluation. But candidates get discovered through those review processes, for the most part. So, I do think that that's an interesting possible domino.

I think getting, especially for probationary faculty, feedback on progress toward tenure usually, again, it's not necessarily coupled by policy with the annual evaluation, but that's where it makes the most sense because that's where you get a chunk of the work in a meaningful time segment. So, that can still be done, but one of the dominoes would be then figuring out how to do that. And if, you know, if you're going to the trouble to do that, then figuring out the cost benefit of not doing it.

And then, this isn't a domino, but I think it's very important to remember, you know, clearly… Let me back up a little bit. One of the sort of nuts and bolts practical issues here that hasn't been mentioned yet tonight, but has been mentioned in other conversations, is sort of at least raising the question in some people's minds, what is the value of going through all this evaluation work if there's not likely to be a raise connected to it? And I understand that concern. Because that’s a tangible real-world outcome that's connected, intimately connected, with this process. That said faculty peer evaluation is one of the primary correlative responsibilities that goes along with academic freedom and tenure system. And it is not just an opportunity to identify those who are not performing well, which is which is a very small percentage in any given year, the number of faculty who are evaluated as having had unsatisfactory performance for the previous year is in the single digits, and typically there are between 650 and 700 faculty evaluated in the ASPT system. So, it's a very small percentage. But it's also an opportunity, and this point has been raised in the previous discussions, it's an opportunity to recognize the work that's being done and document that, so that when there are raises, that can be considered because the policies are written so that long term contributions can and should be recognized. So, I think making sure they're done, maybe a little bit of flexibility around the deadlines could work logistically, but there are a lot of interconnecting pieces. So those are those are my initial thoughts now. Thanks.

Senator Kalter: Okay, great. I do want to make sure we have time to talk about the second motion, or I should say, the last motion. But before we turn to that, let's talk. Do we have any other comments on either the timing or the nature of what's turned in about 2020 this year? Anybody want to share anything more on this?

Senator Horst: Yeah, I mean, I think a lot of people were saying this, but it's very tricky to fix the timing. But I think the nature of what's turned in we can make some suggestions. Just given the atmosphere that we're all going through, perhaps faculty can turn in something much more abbreviated that still satisfies what the ASPT committee needs. So, I would be in favor of suggesting something like that. But it's just, it's a little too complicated to change the timing I think, in my opinion.

Senator Kalter: All right, any other comments about that one. (Pause) I am getting some email from a couple people. I just want to make sure Senator Seifert and Senator Mainieri, does either one of you… are you sending us motions?

Senator Seifert: No. Just info.

Senator Mainieri: Yeah. I was just, I was trying to take pieces of some of the motions that were proposed in the document and also some of the comments here and from Sam and last time, to start to maybe craft some wording. And I didn't know if we wanted to do that here or if we wanted to move on to the next piece and bring this discussion back next time.

Senator Kalter: I'm thinking we may want to bring the discussion back next time after working a little bit on what's been contributed tonight, given that we don't have, you know, we don't have to do anything tonight. So, I'm thinking that we should take what you just crafted and think about it as Faculty Caucus Exec to put back out for next time.

Senator Mainieri: Sounds good.

Senator Lucey: Yeah, so actually we had a small group discussion in our school on Friday about ASPT, and one of the suggestions was rather than looking at the annual report this year as a burden, maybe looking at it as an opportunity, and encouraging the faculty to reflect about their performances, and how they were able to adjust their performances in the current environment, rather than looking at as a quantitative piece where their productivity has been interpreted. So, how does the performances here relate to adaptability to new environments, and how does that inform them about their professional practice.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Maybe we can have the psychologists on the faculty tell us whether the amount of labor that is put into looking at it on the bright side is helpful or not. Any other comments about the timing or the nature of the report, the sort of length, abbreviation, etc. (Pause) All right. Like I said, I wanted to make it to the other potential motion which is at the bottom of document 09.16.20.01 which reads, “Any changes that department/schools make to their criteria for evaluating annual productivity for 2020 may be made retroactive to 1 January 2020.” So, the reason I wanted to get to this is because the departments in this case may be waiting on us. And so, this is about, not so much when the productivity reports might be handed in, but whether or not departments can talk about, hey, you know, many of our faculty spent a lot more time on teaching and a lot less time on research, can we reward them for that and not penalize them for not working as much on research as they would be expected to in a given year. We realized that we needed to run this one by our legal counsel to make sure that, you know, to look at the advisability because in the ASPT university wide document, there's a very specific thing that says that changes to departmental level policies take effect in January 1 of the year after that change is made. And so, this, essentially, would be saying, well, you can actually turn that clock back, so that people who are evaluating 2020 productivity can evaluate it on different criteria. So, I'm going to read what Ms. Huson said, she wrote to Sam and I, and I believe to Dr. Tarhule saying, “Generally speaking, it is not advisable to change evaluation criteria in the middle of an evaluation period. It is not illegal to do so, though usually inadvisable. Given the times that we are in, I think it might be possible to change the criteria with some safeguards in place. Such safeguards could include such things as having the department vote on the new criteria,” and I’ll just give us an aside, that that's already built into our process, so we don't really need that safeguard, it's already there, “to ensure that any changes are well publicized and not setting the bar higher than it was in the initial criteria.” So, essentially what she's saying is that ordinarily, you wouldn't want to do this. This is a year where it may be possible, and even advisable to do it, as long as you're not saying, oh, you should do more than you were expected to do. That the bar is not set too high. So, let's start, before we suggest putting the motion on the floor, let's start with discussion about that. Again, I'll read, the potential motion would say, “Any changes that department/schools make to their criteria for evaluating annual productivity for 2020 may be made retroactive to 1 January 2020.” Any discussion about that?

Senator Nikolaou: So, I do think it makes sense, based on our previous conversations, because, for example, I think we mentioned that let's say there is a department that requires one publication per year. And because of what happened with COVID either the referees were slower or, you know, the whole journal is slower, so they are not able to have the publication, so they may say that, okay, instead of a publication, we are going to allow to count, you know, participation in conferences or submission or papers that are under review, but if we don't have such a change, they will not be allowed to just say, okay, yeah, we are going to count your submission instead of the actual publication. Because, in essence, last year, they decided about how they're going to be evaluated this year, so they cannot make any changes if we don't allow an exception for this year. And I'm assuming that the way that it's going to be phrased, it's also going to be, I mean, it includes 2020, so it's going to be specific to this year only, of what happened.

Senator Kalter: Yes, that's correct. We would not be making it for any other year at this point. Yeah.

Senator Blum: Yeah, it seems like it would behoove to add a little specificity to that. In terms of, it says any changes, alright. I mean, you know, I don't know if I should say any changes related to responsibilities because of COVID-19 or I don't know. But if it says any changes you can change it in any direction. And I think that's not the intent here. The intent is for the D/SFSC to make changes appropriate to their discipline that adjust and address the impact of COVID-19 and the pandemic upon individual faculty. And so, I don't quite have the words right now, but it seems like that would have to be worked in.

Senator Kalter: OK, so maybe as I'm calling on other people, Senator Blum and others might be able to craft some wording that would take that into account. I think that's a good point.

Senator Torry: So, I think, I'll be honest, I actually have changed my view on this a bit. And I was always initially saying we should be more lenient and taking into account that people put extra time into their teaching, and I sort of changed my mind in that I agree with legal counsel that ultimately you're going to get these ratings on your letter. Exceeds, meets, or does not meet expectations, right, that that's kind of the end goal of these categories that we get from this assessment. You start messing with that in terms of, well, I taught more, I had more office hours. Okay. This should be reflected in your teaching evaluation. We have ways to evaluate the individual. We start changing the perception by which those are both portrayed in the letters in evaluation, in terms of exceeds, meets, then that person now has an adjustment. And we can say, oh, it's just for a year. In a three-year tenure review process, that year is one third of the time. I kind of agree with legal counsel that, you know, we cannot change the process, nor should we change the actual criteria. We might be able to take into account this is a COVID year and be more lenient, but I think if departments, and this is by departments, they have a number of publications expectation. If I didn't publish anything this year, but my teaching evaluations didn't go up, what argument do I have that this was COVID-19, and I did better, and met expectations. Because my teaching evaluations may have went down, even though I did work harder, and I still didn't publish a paper. Do you see what I'm saying? It's like, it becomes a mixed bag because teaching evaluation, student evaluations, IDEA, plus faculty evaluations are subjective and in there, and I can look at my number of publications and make that case. But if it went down because I'm teaching harder, it took me more time, but that didn't go up, I'm kind of stuck. So, if we start playing with how we weigh each one of these at our level up here, I think we're in trouble, because it has to be weighed at the department, and they have to look at the teaching, and if they didn't have a good publication year, did the teaching excel. Okay, then maybe it made up for it, but that doesn't mean they get some sort of a pass if they're teaching evaluations stayed the same, they didn't publish, yet they're arguing in their letter that, well, I spent so much time teaching, well, that didn't go up either. So, I'm kind of playing devil's advocate that if we start playing with this a little bit, it becomes, like legal is saying, a mixed bag that you might have to deal with in the next year on the third year of this person's review with the COVID-19 year.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Senator Torry. I just want to clarify, and I can clarify this also with Ms. Huson, but she's actually saying this is a year when she would say, it could be advisable. So, she's saying, in general, it's not advisable, but she was, as far as I could tell, she wasn't necessarily taking a position because that's not her role, but was saying this is one type of time when it might be advisable. The other thing, what we would do here is not dictate anything to the departments, it would only allow departments who had these conversations and decided in a certain direction to change things, right. So, we wouldn't actually be telling departments to change things. We would just be allowing them if they wanted to, to make things retroactive. I will say, I agree with you wholeheartedly that we shouldn't change criteria, we should make exceptions to criteria, if anything, but that's…

Senator Torry: Let me word it another way. Let's say this year I published five papers, where last year, normal situation, I published three papers. But this year because it's COVID-19 I published five, I should get exceeds expectations. Where if it was not a non-COVID letter year, I would have got meets expectations. But because teaching took so much more time, and I still got five publications, that's the argument I’m kind of making, like, I'm not talking about the person who doesn't meet, I'm talking about the person in that middle ground, who did everything. Are you going to give them more of a bonus to take into account they spent more time teaching and got publications? When any other year it would have just been, well, meets expectations.

Senator Kalter: Point very well taken. I just wanted to make sure to clarify for everybody what the General Counsel said, what she was advising us. And also, that this is not telling departments what to do. Every department could decide not to do anything. So, just wanted to clarify that.

Senator Meyers: Yeah, echoing what some other people have said, I would say that the wording, as it is now, I think, is too broad. I'm not comfortable with any changes. And, I tend to agree that I think, I guess I would argue to make this as narrow as we can. I think that's some amount of leeway… I wouldn't be comfortable telling departments you cannot make any changes. That doesn't seem like the right place to land. And if the only way that departments can make any changes is for us to authorize it then I think we have to authorize it, but I think we have to do it very narrowly, because I do agree with the general sentiment expressed by Senator Torry that changing criteria is just risky business. And I think that these need to be done very judiciously and very narrowly and I don't…. And I think that what that means is going to look different in each department. So, that puts us in a in a difficult position as Faculty Caucus. So, I'm not sure what I'm recommending, but I'm just kind of echoing, the way it's worded now feels too broad.

Senator Kalter: Yes, thank you, Senator Meyers. The reason we are, by the way, discussing this in Faculty Caucus is what I said, that only Caucus can change the part of the university wide ASPT policy that dictates that it must be January 1 of the following year. In other words, that nothing could change about 2020. So, if we want to make this change, we are the ones that have to do that. We don't necessarily have to do it tonight, because we only have seven minutes left, but we would be the ones that are empowered to do it.

Senator Tranel: I guess, I kind of agree with some of the concerns about something being retroactive or like the concerns about making policy, changing something now, and then having to change it later. I guess one of the things that kind of came to my mind thinking about this is, well, what would happen if a tornado hit campus and knocked out half of the buildings on campus and hit people, you know, hit our offices and we weren't able to work, and that would impact some of us too. You know, what does… maybe something to consider is, do we have a policy or a part of… something to consider that is like when you have some extreme circumstances that can apply for kind of a longer term period that, maybe it's just as leniency. I'm kind of going completely in a different direction maybe here, but, what if this… something could happen again. I guess I think of like Hurricane Katrina and hitting the universities in Louisiana. What if there were a shooter on campus, and that had devastating effects too. So, and some of these things, like, you know, the pandemic is going to have multiple years of influence on us because, you know, even if there's a vaccine it could take another year before everybody in the population has the vaccine for us to be safe to go back to campus. So, this is not just a one-year thing but multiple years, right. So, I guess that's just kind of an idea or a thought that I'll throw out there to think about too.

Senator Kalter: Okay, thank you. Because we have five minutes left, I'm going to cut off the questioning after Senator Peterson. So, I'm going to go to Senator Stewart and then Senator Peterson and then we'll wrap.

Senator Stewart: Yeah, I mean, I suppose I'm generally sympathetic to the idea that we should allow DFSCs some discretion. Maybe this is really a clarifying question. It seems like DFSCs should be talking now about what they want to do. And I don't know if this retroactive clause means that even if they wanted to make changes now that would actually take place in 2021, or whether we're talking about allowing them to make changes, say, in February back to January 1?

Senator Kalter: Right now, if I'm understanding your question correctly, Senator Stewart, right now if DFSCs are debating making exceptions or changes to criteria they can only do it so that those changes go into effect starting January 1, 2021. So, the entire evaluation year of 2020 is what is the issue because it is obviously the one that's been first impacted, let's say, hopefully the worst impacted, so that we get better. So, it doesn't keep getting worse. In other words, they right now have their hands tied in the sense that any changes they make cannot apply to 2020 they can only apply to future years. Does that clarify?

Senator Stewart: Yeah, that does. Because it seemed to me that if that weren't the case that the best thing to do would be to tell DFSCs to start talking immediately about this. But the point is that can’t solve the problem, even if they're talking right now the changes need to be retroactive in this weird sense.

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Peterson: Senator Stewart's question kind of preempted mine as well. I have two things. One is a point of clarification, what is the timeframe that we would have to pass this in order for it to work correctly? And then another one would be, thank you for this discussion. Sitting as a DFSC member, we have had discussions like this. But one of the things that we keep coming back to is the direction that we would want from the Caucus, because we know that if, you know, exactly what you mentioned, we can make changes, but they wouldn't be effective, till 2021. So, something like this we're aware of that we need, and we feel kind of like we can't move forward until we have it. And I’ll leave it at that.

Senator Kalter: I'm going to put your question set to Dr. Catanzaro, perfectly timed.

Dr. Catanzaro: Yes, which is why I raised my hand. The timeline we envision is, yes, DFSCs should be starting those conversations, and having them with all faculty. DFSCs can bring sort of suggested motions and have this kind of a conversation, and then eventually the department faculty would vote on it, and the timeline would be to get that… What I would recommend is the department/school level changes be done by early November, end of October. Because then those do need to go to the CFSC for review and approval, and that's to ensure alignment and consistency with both University policies and the college documents, the college ASPT policies. In the event that the CFSC has any questions, or needs something clarified, or find something that needs attention then, you know, they'll have a tight timeline, but they will have time to communicate back to the DFSC, and then, you know, a two to three week window for the department to make those changes and get them voted on, because this would need to be done by the end of the current semester, is what is what we're thinking. And then that's in place, and if the Caucus allows whatever changes are made in this timeframe to apply to the current years’ work than it's all in place on January 5.

Senator Kalter: So, it is 9:30 p.m. so, I would like to wrap, but I want before we wrap to let you know that Senators Mainieri and Blum have sent potential wording. You know, we could potentially vote on this tonight, but it seems like people are uncomfortable with doing so. I wish we could more easily call a quick Caucus, you know, off schedule. The Open Meetings Act constrains us a little bit with that, so, you know, unless people want to go more quickly. We will bring this back on October 7. Does anybody want to say anything about doing it more quickly?

Senator Cline: Would you mind simply reading those to us?

Senator Kalter: Absolutely. And I can even, I think Cera has at least one of them, and so she could send them around. And let me send Senator Blum’s to Cera as well.

Senator Kalter: So, Senator Blum’s suggestion is, “Any changes that departments/schools make to their criteria or exceptions related to the COVID-19 pandemic for evaluating annual productivity for 2020 may be made retroactive to 1 January 2020.” So that's Senator Blum’s. Senator Mainieri’s is fairly similar. It says, “Any changes that departments/schools make to their criteria for evaluating annual productivity to take into account the potential negative impacts of COVID-19 on faculty productivity for 2020 maybe made retroactive to 1 January 2020.” And, Cera, if you can send those both around to everybody, that'd be great. How do we feel about waiting versus voting?

Senator Qaddour: I would say to wait until next time.

Senator Kalter: Senator Qaddour feels that we should wait.

Senator Nikolaou: Thinking of it from the perspective of a person who is on a DFSC, if we vote on October 7, we are not going to tell the differences until the 8th at the earliest. So, we will just give them like 20 days to come up with any changes, vote, meet with the whole faculty, and then send it to their college. So, it would be too tight for the DFSCs. That's my only concern for waiting for two weeks.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so this is not, I was just going to do a non-vote, vote, kind of a straw poll, but, Senator Pancrazio, did you have something? Are you about to make a motion to adjourn?

Senator Pancrazio: No. Not this time. Not yet. That’s coming. Let me see. I was going to recommend that we add another seven minutes to… Actually, I think Senator Nikolaou’s made a good point. We're not approving changes, but we're telling DFSCs that we’re inclined to listen to what they have to say. So, I would move that we continue the meeting for another seven minutes and if we don't come to resolution, I think that one of those resolutions… That was the one that was written by Senator Blum and the other by, I believe, Senator Mainieri. I hope I didn't get that mixed up. I thought that these sound reasonably inclined, but going along with Senator Nikolaou, I think that really, if we're going to give people some time and that flexibility, then an extra two weeks… Always want to give them a little bit more so.

Senator Kalter: Great.

Senator Pancrazio: I hope we don't have to vote on that.

Senator Kalter: I was going to say unless somebody objects, I'm going to take the extra seven, now six minutes as a friendly amendment or a friendly friendly, so to speak, and I'm going to put Pancrazio’s hand down so that I can do a little bit of a straw poll. Anybody who is in favor of voting tonight can you raise your virtual hand?

Senator Kalter: Okay, I'm seeing with Dr. Garrahy and myself, I'm seeing 14 people, 15 with Dr. Midha. So, it looks like we do want to vote tonight, and, oh, I'm sorry. I'm also not looking at some of the, I guess some people do not have virtual hands. So, we have some reactions as well. Great. Terrific, thank you. You can put your virtual hands down. So, I'm going to just suggest, with all respect to Dr. Blum (Senator Blum) I think I like Senator Mainieri’s wording just a tiny bit better, and they are both now in everybody's email from Cera. So, I believe the first one she sent says potential wording for Blum’s thought. And then the second one that you got is from… Senator Blum, what do you think? I just want to not bypass you in this. Do you like your wording better or Senator Mainieri’s better?

Senator Blum: No, I thought hers was terrific. So, I’ll withdraw mine.

Senator Kalter: Okay.

Motion by Senator Mainieri, seconded by Senator Marx, to approve the exception for D/SFSC with the emailed amendment.

Senator Kalter: And can you just read that out loud?

Senator Mainieri: Yes. “Any changes that departments/schools make to their criteria for evaluating annual productivity to take into account the potential negative impacts of COVID-19 on faculty productivity for 2020 may be made retroactive to 1 January 2020.”

The motion was approved 24-2, with Senator Hollywood abstaining.

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