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***Call to Order***

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

***Roll Call***

Academic Senate secretary Dimitrios Nikolaou called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Information Item:***

***ASPT Review (******Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Administration Roberta Trites and University Review Committee members)***

Senator Horst: Welcome everyone and thank you for coming to this special meeting. Thank you to the members of the URC. Welcome to Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Administration Roberta Trites. Today we are going to start the process of reviewing the ASPT document that is coming from the URC. We will conclude our meeting at 8:00 p.m.

We are going to start with a presentation by Chad Buckley, chair of the URC.

Dr. Buckley: I’m going to start off and give a brief presentation of some of the issues that the URC considered. We also have Kevin Edwards here with me as well as Roberta Trites. These were based on feedback we received from Sam Catanzaro in the past, as well as Susan Kalter, which was feedback from Faculty Caucus five years ago, I believe, when the process restarted again. Some of the issues that we addressed based on recommendations are dealing with clarifying AFEGC process complaints, dealing with appeals, confidentiality, conflicts of interest, faculty assignments, having common standards for promotion, dealing with service, and external peer review for tenure. We came up with hiring with tenure on our own and addressed that. Mid-probationary review for tenure. Those were some of the issues that had carried over from last time that needed to be addressed.

We started in on Appendix 2 revisions as well. These were primarily based on the work of Sam Catanzaro and the Provost’s planning group last summer. One of our goals was to incorporate civic engagement and service learning in those. At this point, teaching is the only section that we’re presenting tonight. We should have scholarly and creative activity and service at a future meeting. But teaching is the only section we’ll be presenting tonight.

There were some additional suggestions in one of the documents that I sent out. One was dealing with the time it takes for faculty to compile their annual activity reports, and we felt that was best addressed at the department/school level, possibly at the college level. So, we don’t have anything to present on that tonight, but that needs to be addressed as well. And then, one other possibility was trying to streamline the process in the spring so DFSCs and CFSCs have a little more time and flexibility with getting their work done so it’s not all so concentrated early on in the spring semester. One proposal was to perhaps extend the deadline for completion of tenured faculty members reports, and we can present the details on that as well. That was in your packet as well. That does need to be checked against the appeals calendar, so that is not firm yet.

Some other issues that were on our list that we did not quite decide yet - we’re dealing with clinical professorships, salary incrementation and equity review, and then step salary system for professors. We did discuss those, but we have not reached any decisions on those yet. And that is the extent of the formal presentation, so we’re ready to turn it back over to Faculty Caucus.

* [10.08.21.11 ASPT REVIEW\_OVERVIEW](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/02%20-%2010.08.21.11%20ASPT%20REVIEW_OVERVIEW.docx)

Senator Horst: We’ll start with the Overview discussion on page 4. We have a summative review for tenure. Are there any questions regarding this change? Perhaps you could walk us through the language you are adding.

Dr. Edwards: Sure. So, in response to the idea that you could read the ASPT document, and its somewhat contradictory way in that hiring someone with tenure could be allowed based on some language, but that wouldn’t fit with other language which requires a pre-tenure period and a summative review; and there’s no exception given for that summative review, which would not fly in a case of someone hired with tenure. We acknowledge that hiring with tenure would be a rare case, but if it’s allowed it should be clear that you can bypass the summative review. So, this line is just added to clarify that where that review is first described. So, it just says a summative review is not required in cases of hiring with tenure; in those cases the assessment of the qualifications would be by that hiring committee. So, we would assume that hiring committee has vetted that person to the extent that would be the same as anybody going up for tenure internally.

Senator Horst: Could you clarify what you mean by summative review, so we all understand?

Dr. Trites: The summative review comes as someone is earning tenure. So, a summative review is looking back on a period of time. Right. So, I believe what Kevin was addressing was if someone has experienced a summative review at another institution that we can accept that. Am I speaking correctly for you, Kevin?

Dr. Edwards: That would be the typical case, yes.

Senator Horst: So, it doesn’t necessarily need the review to be sequential. It says that it’s a sequential process, but it’s actually just the summation of evaluating everything that they’ve done?

Dr. Edwards: Summative Review, referring to page 3, that’s the overall description of guidance for tenure.

Senator Meyers: I’m curious how this has been handled in practice up until now?

Dr. Trites: I believe, up until now, typically, when we’ve hired someone with tenure it’s been very rare. I believe our Provost is encouraging us to think more creatively, especially in light of… we don’t need to be as risk adverse as we were about appointing people with tenure before we had a disciplinary policy. But now that we have one, it’s not like we’re going to hire somebody on everybody else’s good word, tenure them, and then be stuck with somebody who’s not doing their work for the next 20 years. We now have a really nice mechanism to be creative and to begin to hire at the associate professor level and even at the full professor level, when funding allows it. So, that’s part of the rationale. Did I misquote you, Senator Tarhule?

Provost Tarhule: No, you didn’t. There are two things to consider here, and I brought them up in other places before. If you don’t have process to allow you to hire people with tenure, you’ll never be able to bring in senior faculty. So, imagine if we want to bring in a distinguished named professorship. Somebody who, we have some of these, not many, but we do have a number of named professors. If you said that someone should leave a position at a distinguished university and come here without tenure, you’re not going to be able to get those people. So, I think there is an advantage to creating a mechanism that allows us to hire people with tenure.

The other example I’ve given is that we do get people who leave our university. We hire very young people, they prove themselves, they show that they are outstanding scholars, and then other universities poach them. A lot of those get poached with tenure. This is something universities do as a means of attracting people, because nobody wants to risk their tenure to go to a situation where they have to start all over with uncertainty. So, if we don’t have a mechanism to also attract outstanding faculty from other places, we’ll be just like a farm school. We develop the faculty that prove themselves, other people poach them, and we go back to the market and hire unproven faculty and begin to develop them for other people to poach them. So, for those reasons I would encourage us to think about opportunities. But when the opportunity arises to hire people with tenure.

My final point to make is we do this for administrators. I came here with tenure. Lots of administrators get hired with tenure but we don’t do it for faculty. If someone is at an R1 institution and have already gone through the process, or at a comparable institution, has already gone through the process, why don’t we trust that they can make it here? And even then, we can give departments the option to look at that person’s record again, then decide. So, when I went to Binghamton, the Geography department there had to look at my record and say, yeah, we think this person will make tenured professor of our department before even being hired. Same thing here. And we can do the same thing for faculty. We’ll say, how does this person’s record compare to people who have recently made tenure here or promotion, and if their record is clearly above what we would accept, why not. So, those are some of the reasons.

Senator Horst: Thank you, Provost Tarhule.

Senator Cline: May I just ask a question for the sake of clarity? So, this not requiring a summative review at the time of appointment with tenure, this does not apply to promotional reviews. Right? Because someone can be hired as associate professor with tenure and would still have to go under a summative review if they were asking to be promoted to full professor, correct?

Dr. Trites: That’s right.

Senator Cline: Thank you.

Senator Horst: I noticed that it said, “…at a minimum, the hiring Department/School’s DFSC/SFSC.” So, you’re not necessarily recommending a review by the CFSC, is that correct?

Dr. Trites: At a minimum means that if the college process would normally include the CFSC, yes, that would be guided within the college level. So, trying to do the opposite, by not precluding the CFSC but not necessarily requiring it.

Senator Horst: So, would we have to do anything for Nursing? Nursing does not have a DFSC.

Dr. Trites: That’s one of the reasons we left it just like this.

Senator Horst: I see.

Senator Stewart: I suppose in a way this is just a general question. Is it better to save editorial comments until later?

Senator Horst: No.

Senator Stewart: So, I received a bunch of comments from a constituent, and at least, one suggestion is that we replace the word “their” with “that individual’s” qualifications.

Dr. Trites: Yes. That’s acceptable. That’s friendly.

Dr. Edwards: So, I just want to make it clear, it’s not a policy change. In H 21, “Ordinarily faculty are appointed on a probationary basis but on occasion can be appointed with tenure.” So, that was the basis saying that it’s allowed but there’s no detail in there on how that might happen, and it might contradict page 4, so that’s why we made that change.

Senator Horst: Thank you for clarifying.

* [10.08.21.12 ASPT REVIEW\_ Section I.](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/03%20-%2010.08.21.12%20ASPT%20REVIEW_Section%20I.docx)

Senator Horst: Moving on. Section I.B. page 5. Conflicts of interest clarification. Could you walk us through your thinking for this one?

Dr. Buckley: This was recommended from past review that conflict of interest needed to be expanded. As written, it was only those individuals “…of spouses or other relatives by law or by consanguinity”. So we recommended expanding that to deal with other situations, and also leaving that fairly open for other sources of conflict of interest as examples.

Senator Stewart: Again, comments from a constituent. As written this policy applies to anyone you’ve had a relationship with whether it’s declared or not. So, there might be an issue there about a person maybe who’s been hiding a relationship, etc. It seems like the policy can only really be enforced in cases where a person has declared their relationship.

Senator Horst: Then if you look at the Amorous Relationship policy, it talks about a power differential. And it says that they have a supervisory responsibility over an individual. So, you’re saying that even though this is a peer-to-peer evaluation, that this policy would apply. Can you walk us through that logic as to how 3.1.44 applies even through there’s not necessarily a clear supervisory responsibility?

Dr. Trites: Because financial involvement, litigation, grievance procedures also involve, frequently, power differential.

Senator Horst: So, what’s the power differential here?

Dr. Trites: If I’m a business owner and you’re my junior partner and I default on something and you don’t ever want to work with me again because I screwed you financially, but you’re my peer-to-peer at the institution, there has been a power differential there. So, what we’re arguing is to keep everything as above board as we can.

Senator Blum: One of my questions about this is why “should” and not “must?” It seems like if you have one of these conflicts of interest “must” ought to be required. While I recognize that recusals can get quite complicated about how and whether they are enforced or not, it seems like the text ought to just say “must.”

Dr. Trites: I would consider that friendly.

Senator Horst: However, what if you had a chair who was involved in an AFEGC case with the person going up for tenure? And the AFECG case was instigated by the person going up for tenure? And then you’re going to say the chair must recuse themselves?

Dr. Trites: From the evaluation in that situation?

Senator Horst: Yeah.

Dr. Trites: It’s happened before.

Senator Horst: So, the chair would recuse themselves if there was an AFEGC case.

Senator Nikolaou: To take it to a bit more extreme case, if someone has filed an AFEGC case with their DFSC. Because it says, “…should then recuse themselves.” So, from that point onward all faculty that were on that DFSC should recuse themselves when they are evaluating that specific person? So, instead of filing a grievance with my chair, I have filed an AFEGC case with the whole DFSC committee in my department. So, based on that, in my case for example in my department, five faculty would need to recuse themselves. But then if I don’t have many members in the department that are assistants and they cannot maintain that 50% conversation that needs to be tenured faculty, how would that work?

Dr. Trites: I understand the scenario. I think all of us would welcome insight in how to address the basic problem of allowing people who have any type of conflict of interest, not simply amorous relationships or familial relationships. What would be some alternatives that would help us all stay on the high road in these decision makings? What would the Senate propose would be some ways that we could address this?

Senator Horst: Well, the Code of Ethics talks of conflict of interest. That would be an individual responsibility as opposed to mandating it with absolute language. So, an individual would assess whether or not they would have a conflict of interest. But this language is getting very specific as to how it must be done without considering any of the nuances of the particular situation.

Dr. Edwards: So, from my perspective, I did a little reading about what we have in our policies and I didn’t see a strong definition of conflict of interest. So, there was the amorous side, but all the other types of relationships that we’re talking about here were not addressed in the ISU policies. I think it would be better if it were there and then we could simply refer to that because that would apply to things even outside of ASPT. I didn’t see anything there strongly defining what those types of conflicts would be, or how to resolve them. I think that the word “should” is kind of important and does provide that flexibility in those extreme cases where it is a whole FSC that’s in conflict there. I think that it may not be practical to do it. The problem with conflicts is that you have levels. Right. So, it’s a little bit hard to be really cut and dry there. I think you want to lay on principles, that people should address those conflicts as best as they can; but, it’s a little hard to define every case. We can take a stab at trying to do that, but it might be better in overall policies than in ASPT.

Senator Blum: Yeah. I agree with some of the scenarios that were laid out here, but I think the other side of it is the problem with “should” is that it leads you to believe that there’s a choice when you have a conflict of interest that doesn’t come under that umbrella. And that was really where I was coming from. When you have a grievance procedure that’s instituted in the middle to try to manipulate that, that’s really not a conflict of interest, but I see how it’s listed here as that. So, I don’t really know that there’s a great solution. The language “should” is softer than “must”; no matter what, it’s going to be an individual decision. Right. Rather it’s “should” or “must”, it would be up to the individual to decide.

Senator Horst: Except for the way its worded. The Amorous Relationship policy would apply in all instances. Correct. I’m going to go back to the questions. Is there a power differential as it is defined in the Amorous Relationship policy? Because it talks about a Conflict Management Plan. The person with the power is the one who initiates the Conflict Management Plan. So, potentially everyone on a CFSC in CAS would have to have a Conflict Management Plan with anyone they ever had a relationship with because there’s that potential. But what is the power differential between two faculty? That’s what I’m trying to figure out. It’s clear if it’s the chair, and that person is a supervisor of a faculty. But if we say that anytime a faculty is evaluating a faculty, there’s a temporary power differential, then for instance any time the Senate votes on anything with faculty, is that instituting a power differential, that the Amorous Relations would apply?

Dr. Trites: I’m not tracking what you’re saying, Martha. I’m sorry.

Senator Horst: That policy 3.1.44 talks about conflicts of interests that exist when a power differential exists in a relationship, such that one individual evaluates, right, that’s what you’re going for, right? And then it says they must address the conflict of interest created if they have supervisory responsibility over an individual with whom they have, or have had, an Amorous Relationship. And then the second half it talks about Amorous Relationships outside of the instructional context and it talks about developing the Conflict Management Plan. The Conflict Management Plan is instigated by the person in power, I believe. Right. The person with the power status advantage shall notify the immediate supervisory chair, develop a Conflict Management Plan. So, the question is, when the Rules Committee wrote this we were thinking about teacher/student, we were thinking about chair/faculty. But now it’s being applied to faculty/faculty.

Dr. Trites: So, I’m curious why, the second sentence doesn’t have in my mind anything to do with the policy and procedures of 3.1.44. If you take out the parenthetical, it’s just an acknowledgement that we all know as human beings other sources of conflict of interest can occur, and faculty should or must then recuse themselves. So, I don’t know that all conflicts of interests automatically involve a power differential. And I don’t think they all need to have a mitigation plan. This policy as stated does not require that.

Senator Otto: I appreciate what was just said. Would a possible solution be making a paragraph break between those two sentences, so that it’s clear they are separate ideas? The second sentence is not referring to 3.1.44.

Dr. Trites: I had been thinking just that as you were saying it, Senator Otto.

Senator Horst: But you’re still including people who have past or present amorous relationships. Right? That’s a mandatory one?

Dr. Edwards: So, I think that in writing this we were not thinking that anything else in 3.1.44 would apply here. It’s simply referring to that as alluding to the fact that amorous relationships had been defined and essentially redefined a little bit broader than they had been historically. So, this is just in reference to that, not to bring in any of those other policies. Because it’s just simply saying that if you have something that would fall under that then you should recuse. It’s hard to see any place were there would be an exception to that that would make sense to me. I don’t think spouses should review each other.

Senator Horst: It’s not spouses, it’s relationships. So, you’re lifting the definition of amorous relationships, not necessarily all of the conflict of interest language that arises.

Dr. Trites: I do believe that Senator Otto’s suggestion that we put a space after 3.1.44 (period, space, paragraph break, “Other sources of conflict of interest…”), I do believe that that helps separate these ideas out such that it does not appear all conflict of interests involve policy and procedures 3.1.44.

Senator Harpel: I understand both sides that have been said, but I just think that reading this, and I understand what you’re saying peer-to-peer relationship in that other sources of conflict of interest, but I don’t think that’s clear when I read it. If we’re saying amorous relationships, according to this policy, involve a power differential and then I go on to read these other situations, I might be led to believe, well, I’m in a relationship with a peer, we’re at the same rank, it doesn’t look like it’s in here. I just don’t think it’s clear. If we’ve had enough confusion in here about, does that include if I’m dating another faculty member, is that a conflict of interest? I’m not convinced that it’s portrayed in this. Does that make sense? I think it’s getting at what you were talking about earlier, Martha, where’s the power differential if it’s peer-to-peer?

Senator Horst: Right. The logic of the policy is that there is a conflict of interest and it creates a power differential.

Senator Harpel: And I’m not sure if separating paragraphs is going to solve that problem. Maybe just in the parenthesis just say something about a relationship with a peer, I don’t know.

Dr. Trites: I don’t want to imply that friendship always creates a conflict of interest, would be the one reason we hadn’t gone there yet.

Senator Harpel: But a romantic or…

Dr. Trites: I would like to believe that everyone in a romantic relationship would have the sense to know that they should recuse themselves.

Senator Horst: Well, the thing is it is the past though. It brings in the past. So, let me just read the definition so everybody can hear it. This is 3.1.44: “An amorous relationship exists when two individuals mutually and consensually understand the relationship to be romantic and/or sexual in nature.  For purposes of this policy, a conflict of interest exists when a power differential exists in a relationship such that one individual: evaluates…” and all of that. And then in the end it states, “If an amorous relationship of this nature exists or existed, the employee must take steps to mitigate the conflict.  This policy directs employees how to do so.” So, you’re bringing in the definition but you’re also bringing in the past and the present part. Correct? Because the definition just says “…romantic and/or sexual in nature.” But do you also want to bring in the part that says, “If an amorous relationship of this nature exists or existed…”

Dr. Edwards: Right. So, we didn’t discuss, you know, is there a statute of limitations on this if it was 20 years ago. We didn’t discuss that.

Senator Horst: Not according to 3.1.44. Right.

Dr. Edwards: So, we would go with that definition. To my mind, a power differential exists in that document for its own reasons and is not really related to this. Anything in ASPT there’s inherent power differential between the evaluating person and the person being evaluated. So, this is kind of implicit throughout the document. So, we haven’t really talked about it in that sense. Just the definition would be an automatic recusal, I think. In my mind, there’s no statute of limitations on it. So, again, it may be better to have the policy in this one be both rewritten to bring them in line so there is no confusion, but that’s not in our purview to rewrite that one. We can only just say – well, there’s a definition that the University has already, we can use that. I guess we could flesh it out more based on this discussion and that would be fine. We’d be happy to take any language suggestions and we can discuss it further in our group.

Senator Nikolaou: If it is about the definition, and it’s not about everything else in 3.1.44, shouldn’t we then just include the definition in the ASPT policy, and say that the definition is consistent with policy 3.1.44? Because right now, as Senator Horst mentioned, it means that everything included in that policy immediately applies over here.

Dr. Trites: I think the problem with that is… let’s say that I’m dating a peer that was hired the same year as I. But there is a conflict of interest because we are romantically involved. So, the reason I don’t want to bring in the definition of 3.1.44 to the second portion is because there are times when the power differential is not the source of the conflict of interest.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And I’m not referring to the second part. I’m just referring to before we even move to the other sources.

Dr. Trites: I see.

Senator Nikolaou: I’m referring only to that sentence. Because I’m thinking, let’s say I was in grad school and I was in a romantic or sexual relationship with one of my classmates. And then we end up getting hired, so we break up or haven’t seen each other, and then we end up getting hired at ISU. That means that I would have to disclose it, and let’s say that this person ended up getting married and the spouse is in that committee. Or let’s say that I was in a relationship with a same sex individual and I’m not out, he is not out. The policy is forcing us to come out. So, for the past relationships. For the present amorous relationship, it’s clear, but if you’re not now in the relationship, yes you should probably disclose it. And then the other part is how do we know? Because we say, “have had.” So, are we talking about cases where I have disclosed it?

Senator Horst: And that’s Senator Stewart’s question about the hidden relationships.

Senator Harpel: This may be a simple solution. It says, “as specified in the policy,” could we just say, “as defined in the policy,” then I would understand, oh, that’s where you defined amorous relationships. When you say “as specified” it might lead one to think you’re referring to that whole policy, which was not the intent here. I do concur with your concern about if it’s a same sex couple and suddenly they are forced to come out, or someone who was in the past. But I’m not sure how we would… I mean that would still be a conflict of interest. They would somehow need to recuse themselves maybe without coming out if they weren’t at the point where they wanted to come out.

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Seeman: From earlier, we were talking about 3.1.44. It seemed like we were talking about two things there in that first sentence. And we’re talking about 3.1.3, we’re not just talking about 3.1.44 there. So, that one is the Family Relationship policy. So, it seems like we’re just referring to the policy for Amorous Relationships but there’s also the Family Relationships policy that covers that as well. So, when you look at the amorous one, it refers you back to the family policy. I don’t know if you want to refer to both of those there, not just the Amorous Relationship policy, but actually Family Relationship policy too.

Senator Horst: Refer to the Family Relationship policy which is 3.1.3?

Senator Seeman: Yeah. It tells you to refer to it in the Amorous Relationship policy, and deals with children, spouse, domestic partner, parents.

Senator Horst: Right. That’s the first part of the sentence.

Senator Seeman: Right.

Senator Blum: I was going to suggest that any language, if it’s going to refer to a definition and it’s reasonably concise, to lift that language and put it in here. When we read the policy, it goes right into defining what a conflict of interest is in the Amorous Relations policy. And so, I’m not sure which language part of that actually applies, even if you put “define.” It might make it clearer if there was a part of that that you were going to use, then just state that and then we would know.

Senator Midha: I have a suggestion actually. If I read the second sentence that starts with “Other sources of conflict of interest…” it tells me that there are conflicts of interest, but that’s not explicit in the first sentence, and that’s the gist of this point that we want to talk about conflict of interest. So, bringing in a definition or language, but say something like “no person at any level may participate in situations of conflict, for example, listed below but no limited to,” and list the points so that everything is clear, that the main point is conflict of interest and not the points that are listed here. Those are just examples where conflict of interest happens. So that it comes up clear in the first sentence, I think that would resolve all these situations.

Senator Horst: And the conflict of interest definition in 3.1.44, again, “a conflict of interest exists when a power differential exists in a relationship such that one individual evaluates another individual,” and you can just quote that as well, perhaps.

Senator Meyers: I’m not sure that the power differential is all that you want to get at if it’s conflict of interest. Because like, having financial interests that are aligned might make somebody bias in how they evaluate somebody else. Not because of a power differential but because of a self-interest in that person to get a good nomination. So, to me, to take the definition of conflict of interest from the Amorous Relations policy focuses the attention on the power differential which is already (the power differential) evident, because it’s the evaluator situation. But I do think it would be helpful to define it for this purpose up front.

Dr. Edwards: Historically, that comes about because we were asked to bring this document and align it with that one. So, that’s where the reference comes in. Now, that I’m hearing your comments, I think it could certainly be written to get a clearer fashion. It would be very easy for us, I think, to integrate all these things into a rewrite. So, that’s great. The thing I would have a problem with integrating are the issues that you brought up in terms of this being voluntary and intentionally bringing up disclosure to things that people don’t want to disclose. There I think we would take everyone’s comments on how to deal with that. If you think about it, those situations are happening, and they were happening under the current book but there’s not guidance on what to do. So, it’s not that they’re not happening. Right. I think it’s better to have something in there that’s guiding concepts for people, then it’s going to be just up to people whether they want to follow that or not. You know, we’re not going to snoop around, or whatever. So, these are all going to be self-identified. I looked at a lot of other institutions to see what they were doing and there was no common theme that I saw along those lines, that’s why we left it a little bit vague so that it could be handled at the department or college level as appropriate. But we’ll be happy to take in any language that would deal with those kinds of issues. The rewrite is clear, those deeper issues about conflicts, that’s why it’s a problematic issue. So, if there’s any language, maybe you can find some at another institution that would address that more cleanly. We’d be happy to look at that.

Senator Cline: To go after what you said, Professor Edwards, I suppose my question about conflicts of interest are that they are inherently perceivable. I mean everyone perceives a conflict of interest differently. I suppose when reading this, if I were the person being evaluated and I believed that there was a conflict of interest by someone on the committee or panel, I’m not sure I’d know what to do. Because my perception of a conflict of interest might be different than someone else’s. So, what I don’t find is any step of what I should do. I understand that we’re not going to investigate people, you know, do background checks and all those sorts of things, but there doesn’t seem to be a pathway for differential opinions on conflict of interest. I understand we can’t define them all. We can’t go through all those. But it might behoove us to have some sort of pathway, or some sort of recording mechanism, or instruction on how one can handle that, short of going to a higher-level dispute.

Senator Horst: So, you’re saying for instance you could suggest that somebody could step off?

Senator Cline: Yeah. How does one do that? Are you allowed as the person who’s being evaluated to raise that issue? Or if you have concern, raise it with the chair? If there’s some sort of pathway. Because you might know about a conflict of interest that isn’t being disclosed and you feel like that might be detrimental to you. How does one handle that?

Dr. Edwards: My feeling is that would go the AFEGC route. So, that’s one reason we didn’t address that here. It could be something that the department/school or college level that there could be more specifics there because that could vary across disciplines, across fields.

Senator Horst: Yes. Conflict of interest is mentioned in the Code of Ethics.

Senator Cline: Right. So, if I’m in this situation, if I’m the individual being evaluated, my only recourse is to contact AFEGC? Do I stop the proceedings? I’m just saying there’s no information for me as a person about what I should do if I understand that there is a conflict of interest that I think might be deleterious to my face.

Senator Horst: You could file an AFEGC case. It says conflict of interest is one of the Code of Ethics.

Senator Cline: But does that stop the URC process in its tracks? Does one have to wait for that process to play out?

Dr. Edwards: AFEGC has an entirely separate track than ASPT is.

Senator Nichols: Would you think that being co-PI on a grant in which one or more of the individuals receive salary would rise to the level of a financial involvement?

Dr. Edwards: That’s exactly why I think that “should” is better than “must” there. That’s going to be a very department, discipline specific thing. If everybody in the department is together on grants with each other, you can never form an FSC. So, I think there has to be some leeway there, and it would have to rise to the level where somebody would think it’s really advising an evaluation for this person or the other people. And it’s going to be someone on all of their team. That’s why we decided in our group when we passed this out, I wanted a little bit more specificity, other folks wanted less, and I think this was sort of a compromise, just because at the university level I don’t think they can be, for example, you can use the NIH guidelines for who can review a grant. To me that would be a perfect policy here. It’s already established but NIH doesn’t apply to what other departments do routinely. So, we couldn’t find a way that we could specify for everybody to that level. So, that’s the issue. I’d be happy to take any comments on how the language could encapsulate that or make it clear. Where’s the bar on conflict where you really have to recuse yourself from an evaluation? There are small conflicts all the time, but it has to rise to a certain level.

Senator Vogel: I just wanted to clarify under this proposed wording, a person who is recusing themselves can just say I have a conflict of interest, they do not have to disclose what the conflict is.

Senator Marx: There is no requirement for anyone to provide reason for recusing themselves.  The policy is more of a reminder that individuals are required to consider whether conflicts of interest are present and that they have an obligation to recuse if such a conflict exists.

Senator Reese-Weber: I would just like to reiterate the comment about maybe adding some language that indicates that not only do you not need to specify what the conflict of interest is, I would even go so far as to say you should not indicate what the conflict of interest is. Or not require.

Senator Horst: Could you elaborate on that?

Senator Reese-Weber: Sure. We had a case where a faculty member recused themselves from the CFSC and in doing so, pretty much said, “I’m recusing myself because one of these cases is really not very good. And I don’t think they are going to get promoted and I don’t want to be blamed for it.” So, in other words, giving their opinion on the case, while they were saying they were recusing themselves. So, I guess, I’m at a loss as to why you would ever need to say what your conflict of interest is. In many cases, everyone is going to know, well you’re married, right, or you’re dating or some of those other things. If it’s not an obvious reason, I’m not sure under what circumstances it would need to be stated. So, I would just say it’s not required. Some language that indicates you don’t have to, or even you shouldn’t say what the conflict of interest is.

Senator Bonnell: In the earlier language, it’s passive that people should recuse themselves, but in the new language we’re specifically saying faculty should recuse themselves. So, we’re putting a big spotlight on that. When I read that my mind immediately goes to the idea, I think going back to what Senator Cline was saying, is the idea that someone else might be reading this, the person who’s being evaluated, do they have that same opportunity? So, when I see that new language, I think oh, did somebody else have the opportunity to say there’s a conflict of interest here, whether they’re revealing it or not. And to me, before it was passive, but now it’s clear that the faculty member in the position of power, they need to do that, and what happens if they don’t. I almost wonder if that could just be not written, just period. Stop before it gets to that point.

Senator Horst: A period where?

Senator Bonnell: Just not include. It can occur. Could we make it passive again, with the understanding that if there is a conflict of interest the person should be recusing themselves. Again, rather than pointing it out. Or we give everyone the opportunity to say this person has a conflict of interest. That’s to me either or.

Senator Horst: That the person submitting the application would be able to state they thought this person had a conflict of interest.

Senator Bonnell: Yeah. Before it seemed really obvious, because, again, obvious examples, but now we’re using all different kinds of variables.

Senator Horst: Any further discussion on this particular language? (Pause) It just seems to be the one that really brings up a lot of new issues. So, I think it’s really something that we want to have some discussions about. And I appreciate you offering to flesh out some new language.

Moving on. We have some changes in I.D. “All deliberations and all results and reports of these deliberations by committees and officials having to do with personnel issues…” there’s a clarifying phrase there.

Dr. Buckley: Yes. Essentially these do specify that in the cases of personnel issues, personnel matters that’s when these would apply.

Senator Horst: Are there any questions about the changes in Section I.D.?

Senator Stewart: I’m just wondering why this exact wording was chosen? There might be good reasons, but why having to do with personnel issues, rather than, for example, having to do with specific persons or something else?

Dr. Edwards: Well, so there could be issues that are public, that are not related to personnel. By personnel I think of things that resemble things that HR would know, and HR doesn’t disclose something in that class of information, rather it’s generally public information. So, we thought personnel issues was sufficiently well defined, but perhaps we can flesh it out a bit.

Senator Horst: Senator Stewart, do you have an alternative term you’d like to propose?

Senator Stewart: Well, again, alternative language might have to do with specific persons which… I mean, I guess the difference is that one is about the type of issue, the other is whether you’re discussing specific individuals. There might be good reason for personnel issues, I guess I just wanted to get a sense of whether there was something at stake there.

Senator Horst: So, for instance, it could be that somebody’s up for an award.

Senator Stewart: Right.

Senator Horst: And is that necessarily a personnel issue.

Senator Smudde: My sense of what that additional language is is where you have situations where an individual employee has made some transgressions and has had to have discussions with his/her boss and then maybe the boss had to talk to the dean, and whatever else. So, there is, I think, a kind of HR related process that’s implied here, and as I understand it, at least based on my personal experience in my career is, when we talk about personnel issues, we’re talking about those kinds of things that are related to on-the-job behaviors and decision making and things that need to be considered as a matter of performance.

Senator Horst: Could you elaborate on what you were trying to encompass with the term personnel matters and personnel issues?

Dr. Edwards: I think that just about covered it. The idea was that before it was not clear whether they were some information that was covered by confidentiality. It’s just meant to be a broad term to suggest what types of issues those would be.

Senator Horst: So, if I were the nominee for the University Teaching Award, are you considering that, or is it more transgressions, as Senator Smudde said?

Dr. Trites: I think the best example I can think of would be the example of someone who’s received an OEOA accommodation for condition that is not allowed to be revealed. So, I think the idea of the phrase, and here I’m channeling my inner Sam, I think “personnel issues” does get at the heart of confidential personnel issues, as opposed to winning an award.

Senator Nahm: I have a question about the added sentence in the third paragraph. It’s about the phrase the “…CFSC/DFSC/SFSCs may openly talk about…” does this mean talk about this policy and other committee business outside of these committees?

Dr. Trites: I understand your concern about the ambiguity of that and I do think we can, as a body tonight, figure out more precise language. Perhaps “within the confines of the CFSC, etc., may openly talk about…”

Senator Horst: This is referring to, for instance, if we’re proposing changes to our appendix as how we define research, then that would be something that wouldn’t be confidential and wouldn’t be a personnel matter and we could talk about that outside the confines of the committee with our colleagues. Isn’t that the intent of the language?

Dr. Edwards: Yes. This is something that we would talk about that are posted in our minutes, that are posted on the internet. So, it’s just to indicate that there are some things that will be open and other things that will be confidential.

Senator Horst: Does that clarify it, Senator Nahm?

Senator Nahm: Yes. May I suggest something like, instead of phrasing it as “may openly talking about,” maybe “may disclose information about ASPT policies and other committee business that are not of a confidential nature.” Something like that.

Dr. Trites: I like that.

Senator Blum: I just wanted to support that statement. What I will say, having participated in several CFSC/DFSC type meetings around things like this, things that happen are procedural discussions bleed into personnel issue discussion. And so, you end up talking about what procedurally is connected to particular personnel. So, I think actually making that distinction is really important because you don’t want to be talking about procedural issues related to a particular personnel case, except in the confines of the CFSC/DFSC/SFSC. That talking about, hey, what do you think about this new ASPT, that’s a different matter. I think making that distinction is really important.

Senator Nikolaou: Just a clarification. On the second paragraph, when we added “…legal or University inquiries…” what would be another example of beyond AFEGC? Because right now it might seem a bit too broad, “other University inquiries…” because if we open it to, okay, if the university inquires, we can disclose this confidential information. So, is there another example beyond AFEGC?

Dr. Edwards: I don’t think we could think of one, which is why we said AFEGC.

Senator Horst: OEOA.

Dr. Edwards: We don’t know that that’s exhaustive, so that’s why we made that an example.

Senator Horst: Roberta’s example, the accommodation, for instance.

Senator Nikolaou: But that would be more on the legal inquiry, right?

Dr. Trites: That would go in the opposite direction, Martha, because the DFSC/SFSC is never going to know what the person got. So, I think what we’re trying to say here is that internally we couldn’t think of anything that’s not covered by Illinois and federal laws, that’s internal to ISU, other than AFEGC.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And that’s actually my question, because if it’s only about AFEGC, shouldn’t we say AFEGC instead of making it general “University inquiries?” Because then, my department would count as a University inquiry.

Senator Horst: Could 1.8 policy investigation be an example?

Senator Nikolaou: I don’t know. I don’t know if the committee had other cases in mind. That was just for clarification. And then if we use AFEGC, maybe we want to say an AFEGC investigation or AFEGC hearing instead of saying AFEGC in general.

And then I had a couple smaller things. At the end of the page where we say minority report, minority report is not defined until page 10 in the ASPT, so we might want to bring the definition of what a minority report is in the front. Because right now we say file a minority report, but we don’t know what this report is about.

And then the other one is at the very end of Section I.D. Do we have an Office of Diversity and Affirmative Action, or is it the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access? If it is the OEOA, we would want to update.

 Senator Horst: Thank you. Any other questions on Section I? (Pause) Looks like we’ve completed the discussion of Section I.

* [10.08.21.13 ASPT REVIEW\_Section IV.B.1](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/04%20-%2010.08.21.13%20ASPT%20REVIEW_Section%20IV.B.1.docx)
* [[10.08.21.04 ASPT REVIEW\_Section V.B.1.a](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/05%20-%2010.08.21.04%20ASPT%20REVIEW_Section%20V.B.1.a.docx)](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/05%20-%2010.08.21.04%20ASPT%20REVIEW_Section%20V.B.1.a.docx)

Senator Horst: We can now move on to Section IV and the proposed changes there. I did note a typo in IV. A Membership of the CFSC. At the end of A it says, “…unless these deliberations involve them individuals…” That’s just a typo. Can you walk us through the changes proposed in IV.B.1?

Dr. Buckley: I believe this is in IV.B.1 and then also it appears in the next section that we’ll be looking at. This clarifies the process and dates going both directions. This direction is coming from the DFSC/SFSC going forward. And I think the next section talks about going the other direction.

Senator Nikolaou: I just have a small correction in IV.B.1, it has “performance- evaluation.” Sometimes in the document it has a dash sometimes it doesn’t. So, just to keep it consistent, either keep the dash across or just have “performance evaluation” across the board. And then just spell out November and January. Again, because everywhere else in the document we spell out the months. And then we are missing a space under 2 “School,but the CFSC…” before the comma.

Senator Reese-Weber: I just had a question. This says if it’s received by May 1. My recollection was that if a DFSC/SFSC sent revisions to a CFSC by November 1 they could be implemented by that next January 1. So, is this a change or am I mis-remembering the deadlines for these things?

Dr. Trites: I believe that it’s a leveling thing, Senator Reese-Weber. I believe that that’s the CFSC’s date; they either approve it or return it to the DFSC/SFSC with comments so that they can go forward on November 1.

Senator Reese-Weber: So, if my department makes changes to our ASPT document in September, I read this to mean that I have to wait until May 1, the next May, to give it to the CFSC, who then has until December so that it doesn’t go in until January. So, it’s a 15-month process, before it goes into effect.

Dr. Edwards: Yes. This was done to ensure that new policy coming from a department in spring could be implemented immediately that following year, so that there wouldn’t be a long wait. It could go to the college and come back and be implemented by the next January.

Senator Reese-Weber: Okay. But it can’t be later than May 1?

Dr. Trites: I think that is the idea.

Senator Reese-Weber: And that is a change?

Dr. Trites: I do believe that is a change, yes.

Senator Reese-Weber: Okay. In the past it’s been November 1.

Dr. Trites: That’s right. I believe that the thinking is that then puts tremendous pressure on the CFSC, who then does not have enough time to get back to the DFSC/SFSC.

Senator Bonnell: In the library we have 12-month contracts, so we typically have our DFSC sessions after classes. So, we might be meeting in May, and we can do that because we are there in the summertime. I understand the word “should” that is there, but this would mean that we would have to work in April. This would be counter to what we usually do.

Senator Horst: We will all adjust. My department is actually doing them right now, as you were saying Senator Reese-Weber, because they are due soon.

Senator Cline: Just a typo or editorial issue. You have D/SFSC in this new addition and throughout the document it is written out DFSC/SFSC. I understand the desire for brevity but in the sense of consistency.

Dr. Trites: Duly noted.

Senator Horst: Did you consider adding a new schedule at the back with this timeline? Because you have other timelines in appendices. Did you consider adding this now as an appendix with the timelines?

Dr. Trites: Yes. The same thought had just occurred to me, Senator Horst, because that would be helpful.

Senator Novotny: I just would suggest adding at the end of the first sentence where it ends with “by Nov. 1” “by Nov. 1 of the same year.” So, it wouldn’t go a whole year after that, or two, or three.

Senator Nikolaou: There is an extra quotation mark (inaudible) at the end of that sentence.

Senator Horst: Are there any further questions? (Pause) Okay. So, we have discussed IV.B.1. and V.B.1a.

* [10.08.21.05 ASPT REVIEW\_Section VII](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/06%20-%2010.08.21.05%20ASPT%20REVIEW_Section%20VII.docx)

Senator Horst: Now on to Section VII. Could you walk us through the language change in A and VII.B please?

Dr. Buckley: Our goal here was to change this to more positive language. And then in part B more exhaustively talking about faculty assignments and enumerating service responsibilities and communicating those to faculty members. And then later on in part D we addressed faculty members including and specifying what their service responsibilities were for that year.

Senator Horst: So, we can start with those. Any comments on VII.A?

Senator Nikolaou: It’s more of a clarification question, and it has to do with the change “to support the ability of.” Should we specify somewhere here that the assignments are also in consultation with the affected faculty members? Because let’s say my chair thinks I’m doing well with service and he assigns me 90% service, and then 5% teaching and 5% for scholarly activity. Would this be something that is going to benefit me? Or similarly, if let’s say, (I’m going to use my department, where we currently only have one female faculty member) would it make sense to keep assigning this female faculty member to all the committees because (inaudible) but that proposes an extra burden on that specific individual? So, if somehow, we could incorporate these aspects. Because we say “…support the ability of faculty members to contribute…” but we still don’t want to impose an additional burden of these faculty members. So, I can see why we are changing the language to be more positive but then “to not inhibit” also has a role in there in the first place -- at least it seems to.

Dr. Edwards: So, include “in consultation with the faculty member,” that’s what you are suggesting?

Senator Nikolaou: That would be one. It could be that we still keep the “not to inhibit and to support the ability of the faculty member…” without inhibiting their ability to be productive in all three aspects.

Dr. Trites: Great principle. I agree with you. Policy 3.3.6 Academic Department Chairperson/School Director Responsibilities, Appointment, Compensation, and Evaluation specifies that it is the role of the chair to assign and assess the distribution of faculty workload, including instructional research and service responsibilities. Now if the chair, who did not consult with the faculty member would be a fool, and we all know that, right -- especially if they put someone as good as you in 5% of this and 5% of that. Right. But I want to ensure that the ASPT policies do not exist in conflict with University policy, and that would be my only concern about adding that there, unless we add it (Senator Stewart) to the list of things the Rules Committee is considering as well. It has to be both places, or nothing.

Senator Horst: It might be the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Senator Otto: I have a question from a constituent who asks of the sentence that begins “Appropriate efforts shall be made to achieve flexibility…” and that person asks, “What are the consequences when a department or school doesn’t actually live by this? And what is the recourse for that or those individuals?”

Dr. Trites: I would assume that the normal recourse of department chair or director annual evaluations would be the current site of recourse. I’m not sure that ASPT evaluation allows for anything beyond appointment, salary, promotion, and tenure policies.

Senator Otto: Thank you. I’ll communicate that.

Senator Smudde: I was just thinking about Senator Nikolaou’s point which really seemed to me flipping what was there, from “not to inhibit” to follow the more positive language so it would be “to support and not to inhibit the ability of faculty members.”

Senator Horst: So, have both of them. Do you accept that change? You could discuss it.

Dr. Buckley: So, I believe we were kind of changed with making this stronger and to not inhibit seemed to be the weaker language, and to support would be more active and stronger language. So, we believe that we strengthened it and I’m not sure adding back “to not inhibit,” it sounds redundant to me; but we can consider that, and I’ll take that back and we’ll talk it over. I’m not sure what that gets us exactly.

Senator Nikolaou: Because the support and not inhibit might actually address the issue that we talked about earlier. It might be that while my chair gives me these specific weights against the different categories, it’s because he wants to support me; but it doesn’t mean that the support that my chair thinks he is giving me is consistent with what might inhibit my performance in the three areas. So, it depends from whose side we are evaluating.

Dr. Buckley: You’re saying support is in the eye of the beholder and if that’s the chair, yeah, it would be not in your interest. We didn’t think of it in those terms. We thought of it as the faculty expectation of their chair. So, I guess we can look back at that language and consider that.

Senator Nahm: Just a minor suggestion. In VII. B., the two times that research is used I would suggest changing that to scholarly and creative productivity.

Senator Horst: Thank you. Any more comment on VII. A.?

Senator Beucher: I appreciate the revisiting the language around support and adding inhibit to additionally add that. A chair could be suggesting or encouraging a faculty member to take on additional assignments with the intension of being supportive, however the load might then prohibit or inhibit the faculty member from being successful in other areas.

Senator Horst: All Right. Let’s now move to VII. B. and could you just clarify your intentions with these proposed changes?

Dr. Buckley: This was to clarify in writing what service responsibilities are and to make sure they are documented as they change throughout the year. Professor Edwards, do you remember any details about that?

Dr. Edwards: We were basically asked to expand on service and there was a large basket of issues there. An example is service you are being paid summer pay for and how should that be dealt with relative to uncompensated. There’s a variety of things there and the problem that we ran into early is that service is so diverse, especially so diverse across different units, that it’s very hard to spell out in categories there. This was an attempt to make it a little bit more clear and make sure that the chair can spell out what’s happening there with regard to service.

Senator Horst: And also, there a desire to have more specificity as to the allocation of teaching, research, and service to the faculty.

Senator Reese-Weber: I have a question about what percentage we’re supposed to use in an assignment letter. As chairs we’re asked to fill out one report that says for most faculty, they do 75% teaching and 25% scholarly and creative activity, and nothing is said about service. But we all have in our ASPT policies the way we do salary incrementations, which is very different from department to department. So, I’m envisioning the way I would write this as a chair is to say for my department of Family and Consumer Sciences, teaching is 60%, scholarly and creative activities 30%, and service is 10%.

Dr. Trites: I think you are 100% right. I can’t remember the name of the form but it is an internal form. And I do believe that you are right that we need to change that form. I will take note of that and if Provost Tarhule would want me to take that to the PRPA office, on behalf of the Senate, and ask for that form to be changed, I think that would go a long way toward addressing the discrepancy between the current assignment letters and the ASPT policies. I think that’s a very good suggestion.

Senator Reese-Weber: Yes. The other thing that I wanted to comment on about this is it does say that these letters should specify their teaching, research, and service assignments. Does this mean that as a chair I need to list their service assignments? And if I do, do I only need to list the service assignments I have given them? So, within the department, not the service assignments they have volunteered to be elected to or serve on at the college level or the university level?

Dr. Trites: That would be the norm, what you said. Only the departmental service would be normally listed. Often times, I discovered I didn’t even know people were doing university level service until January.

Senator Reese-Weber: Correct. Okay. Thank you.

Senator Stewart: I suppose two comments. One, in a way relating to what Senator Reese-Weber just brought up, but I wondered if the very first sentence, right, says, “The Chairperson/Director shall communicate to all faculty members in writing and in a timely manner courses they are expected to teach and how much time is reassigned to research.” Maybe we could add “or other activities that do not involve direct classroom instruction.” That was a suggestion, but I can imagine a person, for example, being assigned to do advising or other kinds of positions that might very much be worth mentioning. Final sentence of B,” Certain exceptional service activities or non-classroom work with students may qualify for a course release.” I guess the idea there is to suggest that this only happens very rarely. I’ll make this a practical point, it’s not clear to me how obviously correct that is. Many faculty members engage in significantly time-consuming service and to suggest that only in exceptional cases could there be a course release. I guess I wonder about maybe whether time-consuming may be better than exceptional there.

Dr. Trites: And I’m going to point out that no service activities on the planet ever qualified for anything. We mean that either the faculty member qualified or that certain types of activities warrant. So, forgive me for being an English professor on that one. I do think the word exceptional is perhaps something that you might well do without.

Senator Horst: Is there any way you could get a course release for research?

Provost Tarhule: I’d like to make a few observations and maybe suggestions for your consideration. The first sentence here it says, “The Chairperson/Director shall communicate to all faculty members in writing and in a timely manner courses they are expected to teach and how much time is reassigned to research.” I know this phrase reassigned to research is a standard usage here, but I wondered if this group might think about that in a different way. If you go back to VII.A. it says, “Because the University expects from all faculty consistent high-quality performance in the mutually supportive areas of teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, and service…” So, those three things are expected. But if you come here and you say you’ve been reassigned time to research, to me it suggests that this is what you’re supposed to do teaching, and we’re going to give you some separate time to do research. Well, you’re supposed to do teaching, research, and service. We don’t reassign faculty. We don’t give faculty reassigned time to teach because they are expected to do that. So, why do we reassign time to faculty to do research if they are expected to do that? Wouldn’t it be clearer to say you are expect to do teaching, research, and service, and this is expected? I really like the way Marla explained it. This is the expected time commitment mix. This much percentage for teaching, this much for research, this much for service. So, that phrase “reassigned time” from the prospective of somebody who is not very used to this system, to me, puts research is a subservient position. It’s like something we give you time to do, as opposed to something we expect you to do. So, I’d like to raise that for your consideration.

Couple others. The following sentence: “Each unit should also clarify and communicate in writing what service responsibilities are considered part of an administrative assignment, are remunerated through administrative pay, are given a course release…” From the point of view of my office, course releases assigned by a department can be problematic because departments designed to give course release and then they come back to the Provost office and ask for money to teach those courses that they have released people from. So, in a sense course release is a cost on the Provost office, and yet they are given frequently without consultation with the Provost office. I understand that there will be course releases, but I would suggest that maybe we find a different way of phrasing it here. Basically, I think course releases should be given if the departments have the money to pay for it. But if you give a course release and come to the Provost office and say, give me money to pay for this when you haven’t discussed that with us, this is part of what is creating some of the financial issues we’re seeing with the cost of instruction. The way that this is phrased in the ASPT should consider that fact.

And then in the third piece, the last sentence, “Certain exceptional service activities or non-classroom work with students may qualify for a course release.” Again, keep in mind, if you give a course release and come to the Provost office and ask for money to teach that course, unless it is approved ahead of time, we may not have the money for that. But my experience with course release is the following, we (in both of the schools I’ve worked at before) what we call distribution of faculty workload was very clear. In fact, it was stated in your appointment letter. If I showed you my appointment letter, it said you will be evaluated 40% for research, 40% for teaching, and 20% for service. You don’t get a course release unless you or your chair can show that you have exceeded your 20% expected service application. Otherwise, what am I doing if it fits in with the 20% service application, why give a course release? What departments sometimes did was to say there are some committees that are time-consuming, but in that case one of those committees constitutes your expected service. So, rather than say, you are getting a course release for being on this committee that is time-consuming, you are going to serve only on this one committee and that’s meant to constitute the totality of your service. Whereas if somebody who is on five or six committees, but they meet twice a semester, so six of these committees you are still meeting only 12 hours for the course and that’s still part of your expected service. So, in this way, by specifying service, teaching, and research, and the proportion of time commitment expectations, it was extremely simple and straight forward.

One last example I have when I was going over this, in my department, for example, one of my schools, we broke down service further. We said an expected level of service would be three committees you would have to serve on in the department, minimum. Then you have to be on at least two college or university committees. And then you have to be on at least one national committee. This expectation for a national service was because that’s how departments get note. So, the minimum level of service was one national committee, two university or college committees and three departmental committees. The chair could change this. The chair could say you are serving as the graduate coordinator. That’s a lot of work. So, instead of serving on three committees you serve on that one committee and that suffices for your committee service. Just some observations to throw out there.

The language of reassign time for research, I think, really puts research in a subservient position. I don’t know if that’s deliberate but I think that’s the impression it creates. And then the course releases are problematic for the reasons that I have explained.

Senator Horst: Thank you, Provost Tarhule. Do our guests have any further response or any further conversation they wish to have with the provost regarding what he just said?

Dr. Trites: I’ve been taking notes and, yes, duly noted. Thank you.

Senator Otto: I have a comment from a couple of constituents concerning the first sentence and the use of the phrase “in a timely manner.” These people say this needs to be a date or a number of days or months ahead. The way it’s written leaves way too much room for interpretation. So, that is a request to actually specify a deadline spring and fall.

Senator Reese-Weber: Would you like me to comment on that as a chair? It would be nice, probably as a chair, to have a deadline to know when I have to have this done. I will say that when you think about a deadline to keep in mind that, on the one hand, it seems really silly to give somebody their assignment letter in September when they’ve already been teaching for four weeks, whatever you’re telling them they’re about to teach. On the other hand, it may be September or October before you know what they’re going to teach in the spring. So, maybe it’s an issue of…and it says in here changes in writing. My chair colleagues will not like that I’m saying this, but it may be the case that we need to give an assignment letter for fall and an assignment letter for spring. Because I can tell you by August 1 what you’re going to need to teach in the fall. But I probably can’t tell you what I need you to teach in the spring. I can tentatively give you that. Or I can say three classes to be determined.

Dr. Trites: I think that’s currently how many departments handle it.

Senator Reese-Weber: Yes. And if that is acceptable, that’s fine. I’m okay continuing that way, saying it has to be done August 1; but maybe it’s not specific as to what courses you’re going to take -- just two or three courses.

Dr. Edwards: So, that language is preexisting. It’s the existing VII. B., chair shall communicate in a timely manner. We didn’t change that -- mostly because that should be in the DFSC/CFSCs because that’s something that can vary across units, like we just heard from Milner. So, I believe that “timely manner” was just meant to allow for that to be tailored at those other levels.

Senator Otto: I just wanted to add on to what was said a moment ago. We do have deadlines, notably the deadline that we have to have people’s names on courses so that textbooks can be on the website so students can see how affordable the textbooks are. So, those are deadlines that are dictated to us. And I think that these people are asking if there can’t be some external deadline. Even though things do change, I think there are a lot finding out what you’re teaching without any prep time.

Senator Horst: But I believe, Senator Reese-Weber was saying you could forecast that they’re teaching but not necessarily what they’re teaching. Could you forecast, for instance, by August 15, the breakout of what their teaching, research, and service would look like for the entire academic year?

Senator Reese-Weber: I think I’m speaking for most departments too; I think most chairs and directors in August could say this is what you’re teaching in the fall, and this is what I think you are going to be teaching in the spring. This would be my plan. But if somebody retires, if somebody goes on FMLA, if an NTT says I don’t want to teach anymore, any number of things can completely shift because you’ve got to move somebody to this, which means you’ve got to find somebody to fill that spot. It’s a house of cards, right. So, I can tentatively say this is what I’m planning you teach in the spring, yes, I have to turn my spring schedule in by whatever date it is (August 1 probably). So, I could say that, but I would want to make it very clear that it’s tentative. I mean even on August 1, fall can be tentative. Right. Somebody could not show up to teach and you’ve got to ask somebody to do an overload, or switch a class, or whatever that may be.

Senator Horst: But you could tell them their assignment in terms of the areas. That they are going to be teaching three classes. Right?

Senator Reese-Weber: Yes. Yes.

Dr. Trites: In terms of the 60%, 30%, 10% or whatever.

Senator Reese-Weber: Yes.

Senator Nahm: My question is sort of related. So, it’s about the documentation process for changes that do happen during the school year. What does that documentation process look like? Is a letter reissued? Is it just like an internal document that the chairperson or director keeps?

Senator Horst: Is that regarding service or teaching, research, service?

Senator Nahm: So, there is a sentence here that refers to changes in service but the same could be said about teaching assignments as well.

Dr. Edwards: So, that just needs to be specified how that is documented in some way.

Senator Horst: I am a bit nervous as a person who asks people to do service that if we’re constantly documenting what people are doing it might limit the amount of service that people volunteer for.

Dr. Trites: I think the greater issues in my mind, Senator Horst, is the issue of when my teaching assignment has changed, that is typically when I would want a reissued letter. Only if my service percentage commitment changed would I want to see a reissued letter.

Senator Horst: So, perhaps the language could specify that what needs to be documented is the proportion of the three areas.

Senator Meyers: Maybe more of an observation, it seems like we’re talking about adding a percent of service to appointment letters, and maybe that should be made more explicit if that’s the expectation.

Senator Horst: It seems like, in light of what Provost Tarhule mentioned and others, that this language needs to be reworked, so it’s really specifying the proportions and the communications of the proportions.

Senator Cline: I want to support Senator Meyers. Not to make anybody’s eyelashes curl, but in my college, we don’t have this breakdown at all. It’s not articulated to us in any way, shape, or form. So, I think stronger language here to ensure that that same sort of safety mechanism, because as I understand it these proportionalities are some safety mechanisms for the faculty that they’re not doing 70% service or something like that, and that doesn’t exist in all of the areas, is what I can tell you. So, I very much appreciate the Provost’s suggestion to reformulate this notion of reassigned times to make clear in this document that all units on campus must make clear a proportional breakdown of work. I’m less concerned about the letter but that there actually is a proportional relationship for everyone, because it doesn’t currently exist in reality.

The other thing I would say, for Senator Nahm, is perhaps maybe when you go through your annual evaluation a sort of addendum can be added to reflect the actual work as it reflects. The letter of assignment is at the beginning, but as you know we pick up assignments to service, we volunteer, and perhaps that addendum should happen in one total event at the end so that it reflects the actual work as opposed to incremental change during the course of the semester so that you can look at the beginning and the end where you actually landed based on your forecast.

Senator Horst: Such as an actual.

Senator Reese-Weber: I want to ask a question and ask that it become clear if we’re going to say that these percentages need to be listed in the letter what percentage needs to be listed in the letter. Because if we’re talking about time that’s different than we’re talking about value and salary incrementation. Because I said 60/30/10 because that’s what we do in Family and Consumer Sciences. Having served as Associate Dean in the College of Arts and Sciences, almost all of their departments have a 40/40/20 split. So, if that’s going to be different by departments, it needs to be clear here that the percentage is based on your own ASPT salary incrementation.

Dr. Trites: Yes. And you’ve rightly hit on two things, Senator Reese-Weber. Salary apportionment is different right now. All the Arts and Sciences departments claim that the assignment of time as a base is 75% teaching and 25% research with no assigned time for service. Whereas their raise apportionment is 40/40/20. So, yes, I do think there is wisdom in stipulating here that we are talking about the percentage of time as opposed to a different issue, which is what we value more. So, it’s my hope that in time those two figures will grow closer and closer and closer. It’s frustrated me throughout my career to be told 75% of your time must be spent on teaching, 40% is going to be valued of your teaching. So, it is my hope that by articulating what you’ve just requested we can grow those things closer together.

Senator Blum: My question is, as I read this, and I sort of understand the role of the chair and the necessity of it, but I do kind of wonder what the role of faculty consultation in guidance of these percentages, for example? And that’s not clear to me at all. I realize I don’t have an answer for what it should be, but it seems like it’s not there at all right now.

Senator Horst: And just to further pick up on that, if a faculty does have no teaching, because, for instance, their teaching was bought out by a research grant, there are some departments where they, even though their time is not dedicated to that because of their circumstance, they’re still evaluated for teaching.

Dr. Edwards: The rest of it has been gone over so nicely here, I hate to have this one be lost in the middle here, but I think the most radical thing that we did here was the sentence that said, “Departments/Schools shall take measures to ensure that there is well defined and equitable assignment of service across the department/school.” That’s an entirely new concept here, and I just wanted to make sure that everybody has considered that and agrees with that. So, that came up because it’s possible for a particular faculty member could have a lot of service dumped on them for whatever reason and that’s not necessarily fair. So, this does impose a little bit of restriction or burden on the chairs to make sure that they really think about this. That service is equitably distributed across faculty. So, this is beyond just the individual personal assignment.

Senator Horst: Thank you for pointing that out, Professor Edwards.

Senator Reese-Weber: I just wanted to try to answer the question about where these percentages come from. And it depends if you’re talking about the time, that 75/25, that’s instructions from a form that we get as to how to divvy that up. If you’re talking about the 60/30/10 or the 40/40/20, that’s in each department’s ASPT document where they talk about salary increases.

Dr. Trites: As a correction, it’s in 50% of the school or departments documents. It’s not stipulated in more than 50%.

Senator Reese-Weber: Okay. Sorry. Didn’t realize that. So, for some departments, that’s in the ASPT policy, which is voted on by the departments. So, for instance, in Family and Consumer Sciences we spent a lot of time last year talking about if they wanted to change their 60/30/10, and they decided not to. So, it didn’t change. But they, as faculty, voted on whether or not that percentage should or shouldn’t be changed. If you have a percentage, it is in your ASPT document.

Senator Horst: Thank you for that clarification. Going to VII.D. Could you walk us through that addition?

Dr. Buckley: This addition is suggesting that faculty members include in their annual performance report all their service activities which they were assigned and any informal or unassigned activities as well. This does put the burden on the faculty members. I did here from the constituent that maybe the burden needs to be shifted some there toward the department or school director.

Senator Horst: Could you talk about the motivation behind adding this sentence about service in particular, but not other areas?

Dr. Buckley: This was all part of a large mass of suggestions regarding service, just because of that issue -- that it’s so diverse and some faculty member service could get lost through the cracks if they don’t record it. So, I think that was just encouraging FSCs to look for that, that people can spell out service. I don’t know that anybody doesn’t do that, but it’s good to have that encouragement in there so FSCs know to look for that.

Senator Nikolaou: But if service is one of three areas, then we shouldn’t just be encouraged; it should be within our record of activity process. It’s not that, oh, I just encourage you to tell me that you have been supervising all these students when they were doing their various projects, or that you did this non-departmental service that I was not aware of. It should somehow be built in our annual productivity process that it is going to be a part where you can indeed add other unassigned service that your chair didn’t assign to you.

Dr. Trites: Would a substitution of the word shall be a suitable way to address what you are saying, substituting “shall” for “are encouraged to?” “Shall include?”

Senator Nikolaou: I think that goes back to the part that is the burden on the faculty members or is the burden on the DFSC/CFSCs.

Dr. Trites: I’m not sure how the DFSC/SFSC is going to know what my contributions to the Children’s Literature Association have been, and I’m not sure they’re even going to know whether I sat on the University Review Committee or not. So, I do think some of this is on the faculty member because there’s not an office that generates a service report for the chairs.

Senator Horst: You could say the same thing about research.

Dr. Trites: And that is reported by the faculty, right. That is self-reported.

Senator Horst: Yes.

Dr. Trites: That’s why I’m suggesting that self-report is the cleanest way to do this, unfortunately.

Senator Nikolaou: And it might be, similar to Appendix II where we have guidelines for teaching, when we review the guidelines for service, that it’s going to be made clear there that all these not assigned by your chairs, it should be in there. Because that’s the official guideline for service.

Senator Horst: I see. So, we want to clarify that there’s this assigned service, but then there’s all this other service that you are doing potentially, the non-assigned, and there’s a responsibility on the faculty.

Senator Nikolaou: And it’s up to the faculty to say this, otherwise you wouldn’t know. It’s my responsibility to tell you I served in this committee, otherwise you wouldn’t know. But it’s going to be spelled out in the ASPT document that these are areas that you’re responsible for.

Senator Meyers: I have a question about the parenthetical informal mentoring or advising, because mentoring and advising are listed as teaching activities in a different part of the ASPT document, and here they are listed as examples of service.

Dr. Trites: Yes. That’s right. I will strike that because that will lead to confusion.

Senator Peters: I have a question about the last part, “service to the community or scholarly/creative field.” It seems that service to community seems a little vague to me. Are you referring to someone doing service to the community that might be related to their field, scholarship, or creative activity? Because I’m wondering if someone is doing, perhaps, Habitat for Humanity would that be something that would be warranted to be listed as service on our manual report? So, could that perhaps be more specific and what types of service to the community?

Dr. Trites: Yes. I think we can work on that.

Senator Cline: I was actually going to say the exact opposite as Senator Peters. I’m happy to see that community service has been added in the sense because of our campus’ investment in civic engagement and the desire to document that civic engagement, and civic engagement does not necessarily have to relate to your field of research. As a classic archeologist I can’t dig up anything in town to help anybody, but I can do other things. Right. So, I think maybe separating the terms in this sentence. “Community involvement and scholarly/creative field,” separating those a bit would be good. But I was actually going to thank you for including that because I think with our civic engagement this is an important aspect that’s growing on campus, and it would help for documentation purposes for the University if those things were listed explicitly in annual reports.

Dr. Edwards: I’d just like to point out that Appendix II has a lot of the enumeration of all the different things. So, that was not really the intent here. It was just to shine the spotlight of the three activities, the most overlooked I guess and that’s why we chose to put service in there. And that was the charge that we were given -- to make sure that service was more clearly in this section. But all the different types of activities are in Appendix II.

Senator Horst: Thank you for doing that. Senator Nikolaou, you have one more question and then we’ll have to adjourn.

Senator Nikolaou: I was actually going to say, opposing to Senator Cline, I wouldn’t single out a certain type of service in the main topic. Because if we are talking about the difference between assigned and unassigned service. And then when we go to the actual appendix where we list all the different new service activities, that’s why for example, for the teaching we see all these added items that talk about teaching related activities to community or civic engagement. So, if we say over here specifically about community and civic engagement, we’re sending out one type of service over all the other type of service, and I wouldn’t think that’s the purpose of that paragraph here.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Marx, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.