**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, August 26, 2020**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***University Curriculum Committee faculty elections***

Megan Leonard, CAS, 2020- 2023

Jean Sawyer, CAS, 2020-2023

***Parking Advisory Committee election***

Bibek Adhikari, ECO, 2020-2023

***Council for Teacher Education elections***

Caitlin Stewart, MIL, 2020-2023

***Athletics Council elections***

Doug Hatch, COE, 2017-2023 (Second Term)

Christy Bazan, CAST, 2014- 2021 (one-year extension granted by Executive Committee)

***Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Murphy, to elect the above committee nominations by slate. The motion was unanimously approved.***

***Campus Communication Committee Faculty Caucus representative election (2)***

Senator Nikolaou and Senator Torry volunteered to serve on the Campus Communication Committee for a term of 2020-2022. They were unanimously elected.

***08.21.20.01 Faculty representation on the engineering planning committees***

***Endorsement of Faculty Senators on the Executive Planning Committee for Engineering:***

***Tracy Mainieri, CAST  
David Marx, CAS***

***Vishal Midha, COB***

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. Thank you so much. And we move finally to the last vote. Deans Zosky and McLoda have been working this summer with the consultants that were hired to continue our planning for potential engineering programs. They are now at the stage where they're ready to invite some faculty to join both the executive planning committee to work with those consultants, and also, they will be eventually appointing some Dean's appointments from the colleges that are not represented. So, we have three Senators that have volunteered to serve on the Engineering Executive Planning Committee, Senators Mainieri, Marx, and Midha.

Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Nikolaou, to move as a slate. The motion was unanimously approved..

***Discussion item:***

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

***Caucus and URC recommendations to departments regarding tenure/promotion—criteria, timelines, and other considerations—for 2020-21 and subsequent pandemic-impacted years***

1. ***General***
2. ***With regard to teaching productivity***
3. ***With regard to scholarly and creative productivity***
4. ***With regard to service productivity***

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. Thank you so much, everybody. And now we move to the main event. Let me get back to my agenda so I can make sure I don't have anything to say here. I guess I'm going to simply hand it over to Drs. Tarhule and Catanzaro to sort of set up this discussion. The reason that I was calling this urgent in the Senate was because we're talking about tenure and promotion. And actually, now that I think about it, I do have some comments that I need to set up sorry, they're on a different sheet here.

This is just a reminder that we're only discussing the portion of the questionnaire that got sent out that's about tenure and promotion. So, they are happening or will be happening within departments in schools and their DFSCs more primarily than in the Caucus. So, any pandemic related exceptions to the departmental policies are going to be voted on by the departments as a whole, and then reviewed and approved or negotiated for revision by the CFSC of the college. So, in general, those changes always go into effect on January 1 of the following year, so would not be going into effect until January 1, 2021. So, that means that they would not really be impacting people who are going up for tenure this year. And those deadlines are November 1. However, those individuals who might be going up for tenure this year will be making their stop the clock decisions by that date. So, Dr. Tarhule wanted us to talk about this very early in the fall because of those discussions. And because those individuals are going to be following the discussions in their departments very closely. And we are here to advise them and to advise the URC. So, they had the aim of working with us and in more detail with the University Review Committee to formulate guidance to departments and colleges by early to mid-September, so that departments can complete discussion and any votes by November 1.

You may remember that when we did this in the spring, we already had a letter that we were talking about that we're kind of doing the reverse process here instead. And we're going to be giving our advice to the URC to formulate a letter. So, our discussions here are basically advisory to the URC. And we're going to attempt to collect the widest feedback possible, raise any issues that may apply across the university, and also inform one another of how the pandemic has sort of differentially hit pre-tenured faculty in different disciplines. So, after we have our discussion, and after the meeting, I would request that you forward any feedback that you've received from constituents to acsenate, and also to the Provost, and Dr. Catanzaro. And also, don't forget to put your own position in there specifically for the tenure and promotion part of that. Make sure to anonymize any feedback that a constituent requested to remain anonymous. Once the URC has crafted a memo based on our discussion and their discussions, we're going to get a brief window, maybe a day or two, to comment on that memo in writing before it goes out from the URC and the Provost office, so it can be released in a timely way. And so, in a minute, I'm going to go to Dr. Tarhule and Dr. Catanzaro to see if they have anything to add. But we're going to try to structure the discussion tonight to start with the pros and cons of stop the clock, then go to the pros and cons of changing any local criteria in departments, then asking about how long exceptions might need to be in place and then going to anything else that we haven't thought of. So, Drs, Tarhule and Catanzaro, did I miss anything? Did I forget anything? Anything that you want to add?

Dr. Tarhule: No, Susan, I think that's a great summary. Thank you all so much for taking on this. As a student said, and as I think as we all know, from our own experiences, people coming up for tenure and promotions are under considerable pressures, even will under normal circumstances, because this is going to influence their careers and their economic status. So, it's a very understandable type of pressure. There are two levels of decision making, typically one at a department and one at a university level. So, there's a considerable amount of discussion going on already. All of the deans, I believe, have already initiated discussions about this in their schools. I have talked to the chairs and directors and there's a plan to have the leadership of the chairs and director’s forum, and there's a plan to have additional conversations going on. So, I just wanted to let you know that there's considerable thinking and discussion about how to handle promotions and tenure given the pandemic that we're facing.

So, Sam's going to be giving you some of the thoughts, and some of the framework, some of the things that we're thinking about. And given the significance or the importance of this, we felt that bringing this to all of you and getting some of your ideas and thoughts as we work to frame this in a way that will be beneficial and supportive, both to the individual who will be coming up for tenure, as well as for the departments and units that are trying to craft policies to support that process would be helpful. So, I'm going to pass it over to Sam, to give you the specifics of the discussions and remain available if you have any questions or need elaboration.

Dr. Catanzaro: Okay, thank you, Aondover. And good night everyone. Good to see you all. And thank you, Senator Kalter, for that very thorough sort of overview of what we're looking to do. I think what I would elaborate on at this point is not an awful lot. Just to sort of highlight some reminders that the URC is the ASPT committee that develops and interprets ASPT policy at the university level, and most of those provisions tend to be fairly general. And most of the more specific provisions are set in a departments and schools. So, particularly with promotion and tenure, which is our topic tonight, I would note that the university criterion for tenure, apart from things like, you know, the length of the probationary period and having a terminal degree etc, is continuing high quality, professional performance. And if you reflect on that, you get a sense of just how general that is. So, in one department, it could be, you know, a particular number of peer reviewed publications in a, you know, in some journal in our particular list of journals, recognized in some way. In another discipline, it could include a certain threshold of grant funding as a hypothetical example. In another, it could have to do with the number of performances or exhibitions or other kinds of creative works, or the kinds of venues, right. So, departments and schools do that, and that's in the hands of department and school faculty. But what we can do, and what we're asking the Caucus to do to provide input to the URC is think through how that might look. If departments and schools were to say, well, given the current context and the way teaching assignments have been transformed or disrupted or whatever verb you want to use there. The way research and creative agendas have required agility, adaptation, pausing, reconsideration, does continuing high quality professional performance (let's say for someone who comes up for tenure in 2021 or 2022) in terms of the details we've specified in our department document, is it fair to maybe think that that could look different than for someone who came up in 2019? Those are the kinds of questions that we're inviting department and school faculties to consider, and where we want to develop guidance and get a sense of the faculty through you as its representatives. So, I think that's all I would add at this point. I think what's most important about this meeting is to get all your thoughts and inputs. So, we'll start with that, unless anyone has any particular questions that I might or Provost Tarhule might want to answer at this point.

Senator Kalter: Let's try to go (since it's so late) try to go first with the pros and cons that people collected, or that people are thinking of in terms of the stop the clock.

Senator Pancrazio: Yes, I just want to let people know that I think we received the initial message soliciting input around the 19th and send it out immediately. We may be at a point where people have not had time to really reflect on that because of their preparation for the courses and putting out the individual fires. So, we look for a little bit more. So, I hope we have additional opportunities to provide input. I think, Senator Schmeiser re-sent the message this afternoon, but at this point, we have not had a department meeting and we've not had the opportunity to draw on any of this feedback just yet.

Senator Tranel: I will say, I did get a little bit of feedback from a couple of people in my department in Geography and Geology, and, you know, a couple of people mentioned kind of they liked the idea of the potential for a stop the clock. But I did get some feedback kind of talking about that there are also some challenges with the stop the clock too that using the stop the clock does not necessarily always help the people that it's kind of intended to help, because some people may take advantage of that to kind of boost their productivity, whereas other people are going to be impacted differently with their needs during this time of COVID-19, especially women, people from underrepresented groups, that are being hit more, or the people with more childcare or family care that they have to take care of. That the way that this gets used might be different and impact different groups differently.

Senator Hockenberry: Hi, thank you. I want to kind of reiterate Senator Pancrazio’s point about perhaps there not have been adequate time for faculty to respond to that questionnaire sent out due to the overwhelming amount of emails that have been sent out, and correspondence, and departments at the beginning of this very crazy year. I did get some feedback from faculty just today saying that, you know, they totally missed the email but really want to respond and want more time to have their voices heard and put their input forward. The response that we did get from the School of Music was a little bit mixed, kind of some for, some against. I do want to say that as a pre-tenured faculty myself, this topic is very important to me, and I would hate to think that my clock would be negatively altered, potentially due to a pandemic and nothing to do with my own productivity. And I hope that whatever procedures are made going forward are procedures that give people options and input into the choices in their clock that's going to best reflect well on them.

Senator Cline: Hi. Thanks. So, I echo the desire to have a bit more time, but I did get quite a few responses from faculty. And I think there is… first of all, there's kind of a philosophical concern that some of the younger faculty had, that in the sense that if you have to put on and… if you have to do a stop the clock, that implies in some ways that the work that they were doing in the spring over the summer and into the fall was somehow deficient, somehow not what they're expected to do. I understand that, you know, the ASPT documents are written in a kind of a world that did not know about COVID, right, and so, have kind of a prescribed path, but one particular faculty is just sort of horrified that, you know, all of this work that they have put into converting classes and working through the summer that might have been spent on academic pursuits, on research pursuits is lost, and that somehow by doing that, the university is then judging their progress insufficient. Right. And so, I think there's kind of a philosophical question with some people that if you are asking me to stop the clock, what you're saying… you're introducing this new option, what you're saying is that what we were doing was not correct in some way, right? Putting everything aside to be able to handle the students and deal with the students and their needs was not the right decision. So, I, you know, this is not my opinion, I'm simply expressing the concern there. And I think it's something to think about, that our jobs as faculty changed in that time, and so we need to give credit for that work and that effort. There's also concerned that a lot of this talk has to do with junior faculty, but there are senior faculty who are kind of pushing towards full professor and this affects them as well. So, you don't want to kind of throw them out with the bathwater, I guess. Yes. I understand the vulnerability differential between the assistant professors and associate professors… issue, right, it's a progression issue. And in terms of income and advancement in their own field that's equally important. So, I got several comments that I'll forward on to you. But many people are really interested that the work that went into spring, the work that went into summer does not somehow get downgraded in some ways because it doesn't look the way that our normal progress looks.

Senator Mainieri: Hi there, and I need to apologize I have to have my video off because my internet connection. I received a few responses after reaching out again. Again, I echo the previous comments and I feel like we'll probably get some more responses for the next discussion that we have.

Senator Kalter: Am I the only one that lost audio on Senator Mainieri? Other people did too?

Dr. Catanzaro: I did too.

Senator Kalter: So, I'm going to pause Senator Mainieri’s comments and go to Senator Avogo.

Senator Avogo: I received a few comments and in informal conversation with some of my colleagues, turn the clock off doesn't really, it's not a popular decision in our department. It has inequalities related to not only gender, but so many things. But then the message does turn, says we cannot really reflect on what actually we did to be able to continue to teach or do our research while you are in COVID. So it's like we are not placing enough priority or providing opportunities for teaching our faculty, or faculty want to go for promotion to really think about or to reflect on what they did, you know, all the work that we did in teaching to be able to put our classes online and so on and so forth. And I think the best thing one faculty said was that everybody should just, you know, instead of turning off the clock, we should just be able to reflect on what we did within the spirit, and that should count for something towards tenure and promotion.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Right before the meeting, I received a very eloquent email. What I'm finding in the feedback that I'm receiving (because I receive it from both the English department, the Communication department, and then also from all over for people who are sending it just to the Senate chair or also to the Senate chair) and what I'm finding is that people who are already tenured tend to have a more, halfway, yes, stop the clock is the solution, half of them seem to be in the sort of change the criteria camp. It seems as though more of the pre-tenured faculty are saying that stop the clock is not a solution. And I'll read a couple of lines from this. The person says, “Offering extra years before tenure is not a reasonable solution to the impact of the pandemic on pre-tenure faculty. Instead, adjustments need to be made to expectations in teaching research service and credit needs to be given for increased efforts that pre-tenure faculty have given to ISU in the past six months and will be expected to give in the coming year. Offering it is common in circumstances you know, when you have like a child added to the family. This is expressly not the case in pandemic impacted years, rather ISU’s administration has asked more of all faculty including pre-tenure faculty. Our Dean,” (because this is coming out of my college) “has said teaching online is just more work than teaching face to face. Last spring,” the person says, “we were suddenly faced with students that required far more email, Zoom, and phone interaction to retain ISU’s commitment to individual attention, in addition to having to revise course material. This has remained the case in the fall. Not to mention that we were asked to design courses that could be easily pivoted, in other words, design all new classes during the summer when we would normally be doing research. In summary, pre-tenure faculty have been asked to sacrifice more than their initial job description included to help ensure the long-term success of ISU and its students. But ISU has made no long term commitment to these faculty members. Offering extra time before tenure is not a reward or a kindness, it is a punishment. We are asked to spend more time insecure about our jobs and at lower salary, because we had to spend more time on teaching and teaching related duties to help ISU. This is not only insulting, it is a nonsensical argument.” So, I thought that was interesting to get that sort of impassioned kind of argument from somebody who is pre-tenure, and I think in a field where there are pretty intense interruptions to the research that's going on.

Senator Torry: I raised my hand before I heard you read your memo. I think that, in talking with my pre-tenure faculty, that's their sentiment primarily, and I won't speak for Tracy. The pre-tenure faculty do believe that stop the clock kind of hinders their process when in fact they've worked harder as a faculty member in general. Right. And I think there has to be a redistribution at the department level of how faculty is graded in their performance. We were asked, everyone was asked to do more, to put the classes online while maintaining the current teaching, as well as research load, and something had to give and it's going to be research. And our university is a teaching institution. I think my comment is a little bit of talking with tenured faculty versus pre-tenure faculty, and there is a little bit of a difference in how they approach this. I believe it's almost irrelevant, and I will actually echo what, what James (Senator Pancrazio) said last semester. I think it's vitally important that at the department levels, the people who are going to do the evaluations for tenure be cognizant, trained, and I'll say veterans in knowing what's expected to take those classes online, as well teaching, and balance them. And I think if that's understood, because we're all in this, some of the angst might be gone from a pre-tenure particularly. But of course, this is a contract, and there needs to be language that specifies this very clearly. So, I just want to comment, your comment that you just read, Susan, pretty much typifies what many of my pre-tenured faculty had told me, in terms of not supporting stop the clock and seems to be penalizing them.

Senator Kalter: Yep. And I will just add also that I forgot to read the part that Senator Avogo basically went over already, right, that a number of people are saying this differentially, it's very inequitable because it will differentially hit primarily female parents and faculty of color, and also people, I think, in various disciplines that are more hard hit.

Senator Nikolaou: Yes, so a few comments that I got were similar to what Senator Cline and Senator Avogo mentioned about the perception that… or the misperception that pre-tenure faculty are going to have that they were not productive during the pandemic because they were not able to do their scholarly productivity, publish, or do their creative work. From within my department, the comments that we got were more about the penalty that we’re going to impose monetarily, because if you're delaying the clock, you're missing this bump, and if you translate it over your lifetime, this is significant amount of money because we had to put more emphasis on teaching instead of research which, you know, it's going to suffer the most for most of the, again, assistant to associate and associate to full.

Senator Jenkins: I would say ditto. Stop the clock was not seen as a positive option. One person called it punitive. I did not, at the College of Nursing, see a difference really in attitude between the pre-tenure people and the tenured people. I didn't really get anybody who thought it was an acceptable thing to do.

Senator Mainieri: Hi, can you hear me now? I'm on my phone.

Senator Kalter: Yes, wonderful.

Senator Mainieri: Okay. I'm so sorry. I heard from a few folks, pre-tenure folks, and there were a couple themes that I noted from their responses. And one was that they didn't want a change in the process that they experienced. They still wanted a full review and a full annual review because that helps them as they move forward even in the current circumstances. And they talked about the need, and I think it emphasizes what Senator Torry was saying earlier, that really the need is going to come in the guidance given to the DF and CFSCs, as well as guidance given to pre-tenure faculty members on how to craft their portfolio and their letters, and their portfolio to tell their story, to say here, here are the specific impacts and then providing guidance to the folks reviewing those packets to take those circumstances into account. And so there seemed to be a call for and a desire for more flexibility, depending on the circumstance in ways that wouldn't be punitive. And I also heard the word punitive used with stop the clock with pre-tenure. So, those were some of the thoughts that I heard. And one of the pre-tenure folks says I don't want anything to change. I want that to be my choice. I don't want to be told that all of a sudden, my expectations are changing. And the final comment that I saw, that I echo, was in regard to handling of teaching evaluations and guidance in regards to teaching evaluations and the need to continue to incorporate them starting with fall semester moving forward. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. I don't see any further hands raised to the stop the clock. So, let's go to talking about pros and cons of changing local criteria. Did anybody get specific feedback about that? (Pause) Obviously, the two questions are intertwined. I'll start actually, I got a very wise suggestion from a member of my department, who said… so in my department, you need to have either four peer reviewed articles or a book that's peer reviewed, or if you're in the creative fields, they need to be editorially reviewed, either for artifacts or a book. What this person said is, you know, if you had three articles up until this year, and you were on your way to the fourth, basically, that the person should be able to get tenured on the condition essentially, that the fourth article would eventually be published and when it was published, it would not be counted towards the next promotion, it would be counted towards the tenure, right? That was a very interesting concept. So, that essentially a continuing pattern of productivity, which is something that our department has always emphasized ever since I was hired to our pre-tenured faculty, that's what's being measured in tenure. That you don't get tenured and then suddenly stop researching, or doing creative, events, and productivity. You are essentially, you know, expected to continue this pattern throughout your entire career. And so, you're demonstrating that you have sort of regular progress towards that. So, I thought that was a very smart, you know, kind of solution. That essentially the person is expected to do that, and then it's going to be banked retroactively. It didn't answer the question about the financial penalty, but I think Dr. Blum back in the spring had offered one solution to that, that financial penalty as well, even if stop the clock is invoked.

Senator Horst: You know, I like very much this idea of looking at the trajectory as opposed to the bean counting. But I would just say, you know, picking up on what Rachel was saying, you know, the fine arts, and Music in particular right now is at zero. There's no performances happening at all. So, there's certain fields where it we're just going to be devastated. And it's just going to be very difficult. You know, Music is very good at looking at trajectories. But I know there's a lot of faculty out there in specific disciplines of … you know, I remember, Senator Topdar talking about her travel requirements. And just having a way to explain that to the SFSCs. In my particular field, I'm a performer, and I do symphony orchestras, and they're going to be closed for two years. There's just going to be nothing. So. But I do like, I just want to echo the idea of looking at the trajectory as opposed to the counting.

Senator Tranel: Yes, I had one comment that kind of talked about… it gave like the, basically, the requirement be 50% of what would originally be required, but kind of the communication that… and kind of echoing to what Senator Horst mentioned, is that the impact of having to stop doing the research, and then the availability of resources, so materials, libraries being closed, and those faculty who need to go to the library to access those materials, and possibly travel physically to those libraries for materials that are not accessible, the field work, or just the resources to be able to work in labs, that those types of things were completely stopped for some period of time. And that changes, so not only do you have to, necessarily… there's also the energy, the time, and focus on something that has to go into either redesigning the research projects, or changing the research projects or trying to find completely different research projects to work on. I guess so… One person suggested that that amount be cut by 50%. Another person suggested kind of something like you mentioned from the response that you got Chairperson Kalter that, you know, basically, if the requirement is one publication per year, instead of making it like a five year period, five publications, to make that four publications instead.

Senator Blum: Yeah, I just wanted to, sorry, agree with you, Senator Kalter, about the idea of the trajectory I think is a good one. All right. The notion of that there is a trajectory. I think it's also important because one of the things that I'm thinking about is, well, not just, I mean, obviously, tenure is a big event in someone's career, but if that trajectory continues, for whatever reason, to falter with a faculty member, they may actually lose opportunities at the next level of promotion. So, I mean, most people think this is going to be a two to three-year deal. Right? So, there could be quite some time before, certainly for some kinds of scholarly activity that things return to normal. And then the other thing is, I just wanted to… for those of you who might not remember from last spring about what I talked about when we sort of talked about this before, was that if there was a delay of any kind for any reason, there would never be a financial penalty for that. So, then the idea would be if like you were delayed because of the pandemic, say for a year, you would get your retroactive promotion. And there could be many ways of configuring that depending on where all this lands. But yeah, I mean, I don't think there should, absolutely any financial penalty because it's related to the pandemic, should be removed.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, thank you, Senator Blum. And after talking to the Provost, and I think Sam was in on this conversation as well, there could be tax implications, apparently for kind of a lump sum of that, but I think there would be potentially ways to defer the compensation and still give that one year of promotional increase sort of spread out over several years or something like that to sort of accommodate that suggestion that you made last spring.

Senator Cline: Thank you. So, on this particular issue, I think we need to… the respondents that I had, were interested in concerned about departments like ours, in which there are academic types. That is to say, paper writers, library nerds, archivists, and performers, and producers. So, in the School of Art, this lockdown time has actually been in a lot of cases extremely productive. They're not able to show as much, but they're able to make a lot because being confined to your home is a perfect time to do that kind of work. And there are people like the art historians who cannot travel to Europe where their work is, they cannot access archives where their work is, they cannot get into the field where their work is. So, there are departments where there is massive differential. And one of the respondents actually suggested changing the composition of the CFSC for fear that their concerns won't be fairly judged at the school level, right, that they wanted to have a better appeals process. So, there's at least some concern in these departments that have very different paths for different types of faculty within the school. And so whatever decision or whatever advice is given, it needs to reflect the fact that this pandemic has disproportionately affected certain people, even within the same school, that there is not uniform response or impact within the same school.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, thank you so much for that. That's really important.

Senator Nikolaou: Actually, the comment that I received is similar to what Senator Cline just mentioned, where they argued that the changes should be focused at the department level, not even at the college level. And they were recommending that the DFSC or the CFSC should have this final say, and if there is an appeal to the decision, it should be to the whole faculty within the department, not to someone outside of the department, because there are too many intricacies for each department that other departments are not going to be aware of. And one recommendation that I received, which I guess it applies for pre-tenure or post-tenure was that because some faculty as Senator Cline also mentioned, they may have more time to spend towards the research. Some faculty may have had more time to do art, or they may have spent more time towards the teaching, that we may consider asking those faculty to adjust the weights that we assigned to their duties. So, if I'm, for example, 40/40/20, you know, 40 research 40 teaching 20 service. If I spend considerably, much more time towards my teaching, I may be able to do 20/60. 60 for my teaching, 20 for my research. Or if I was able to focus more on the research instead of the teaching, you know, it might be that I had my semester off, then put more weight towards other research. But then this would be at the department level at the DFSC. That it wouldn’t make sense to have a university wide change.

Senator Peterson: I will kind of build off of what Senator Blum said a little bit ago. And our DFSC met for other reasons earlier this week, but we did get into this the subject a little bit. And I guess we started to look at it as it's not just a short-term problem. This is going to have implications that go beyond this year, and into subsequent years. And as we move forward on this, we have to be aware and cognizant of the changes we make now and how those changes have implications as we move down the line. And so, that's really all I'm going to say at this time.

Senator Kalter: Actually, that's a perfect transition, since I don't see any other hands raised for the changing local criteria question, because we're going to move to, how long would exceptions need to be in place? And how will we know? Because, of course, we're hiring people on right now who are just starting their first year, who are obviously being impacted by the pandemic, and we will be hiring on people who may be impacted by the pandemic in various ways. Or our, you know, obviously our hiring this year has been held, right. But there may be ways in which people in future years are also impacted by this. Does anybody? Did anybody get any feedback? Or does anybody have any suggestions about or thoughts about how long exceptions might need to be in place?

Senator Cline: I think, you know, speaking for myself, there are a lot of projects that simply cannot get off the ground overnight. Right. And so, I think we have to sort of look at the pandemic period, however, that shall be defined as discussed earlier today in the meetings. But then to think about a two and three year rolling cycle thereafter, and some people will be able to recover more quickly. The kind of work that I do just simply cannot be recovered quickly. You know, theater people getting into the production part, that's going to take a lot of time. So, I think we have to be generous with the reentry process, understanding that it's going to be different for every discipline, but that there's going to be the pandemic period and then a kind of a rolling restart afterwards.

Senator Peterson: Yeah, I'll echo that as well. I mean, that was one of the discussions that we kind of had was, you know, it's going to ramp up, it's going to need to ramp up. But we also talked about one of the requirements we have on the annual review is that we asked faculty to kind of write their goal statement and kind of reflect on the previous year. And we've talked about having them incorporate how the COVID situation has impacted their research and what they're going to need to get back going, so we have an idea of how we can help direct them to give us some insight into, you know, it's probably not a one solution fits all. You know, we're a department where we have a variety of scholarly activity as well, and we can't have that one solution fits all, and so we have to have an understanding of what our faculty feel they need and how they feel they best can move forward.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, as we were talking in the spring, we seem to want it (specifically for this issue) to have sort of uniform standards, right. We had said, well, if you have three people going up for tenure, you have to do sort of a uniform thing with them to make sure nobody is favored. The more I listen to what's actually going on, the more I wonder if we actually need it to be completely individualized, because there are so many different factors, you know, from family, child care and elder care, you know, to the field that you're in to, you know, the sort of the subdiscipline and all of that kind of stuff, that it may be that we are going to have to simply coach all of the pre-tenure people in different ways through their tenure process somehow.

Senator Stewart: Yeah, I guess I just wanted to comment that I think it's very important, of course, we take local factors into account, you know, how long it takes to restart research. But I also suspect that it's going to take years for some external factors to clear out, I suspect that… in my home field, Philosophy, even in the best of times, it can take a complete year to hear back from a journal. I suspect that the journals are going to be clogged, it's going to be harder to find reviewers. And so that there's going to be a lot of things not in our control that are probably going to slow things down for years as a result of COVID-19.

Senator Kalter: Thank you Senator Stewart. Anybody else have any comments about the “How long,” before we get to the “Is there anything else we haven't thought of?” (Pause) You can't see it, but when I asked those questions I go 10, 9, 8, 7 just to make sure we take into account how long it takes to raise a Zoom hand or to get a Zoom microphone undone. But it looks like at 9:45, we’re 15 minutes past our usual hard stop time for Caucus. It looks like we're petered out and tired and we need to go to sleep. I don't know about… Luckily, my class is in the afternoon. Hopefully, not many of you have classes in the morning, but it looks like Senator Pancrazio is raising his hand to adjourn.

Senator Peterson: I just was curious, and if I've missed it in the emails, my apologies. What is our timeline? I mean, what is it that, you know, is kind of our progress Provost Tarhule’s looking for us to address.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. And Sam, I'm going to answer that one. Because I'm from New York, I speak faster. If you all… first of all, just to remind you, can you forward any of the feedback that you got from your constituents to us as soon as possible within the next day or two. Send it to [acsenate@ilstu.edu](about:blank), send it to Dr. Tarhule, and send it to Sam Catanzaro all at once. Also, don't forget to put your own position, your own opinions about the tenure and promotion part on that, making sure to anonymize any feedback that a constituent requested to remain anonymous. And then what we talked about Senator Tarhule and Dr. Catanzaro and I met on, I think it was Monday, the University Review Committee is going to be getting together next week to start looking at this and start crafting a memo that will go out from the Provost office, eventually, sort of like the ones in the spring did, in order to give some guidance to the departments as they're doing their conversations. So, we're going to get that memo. So once it's crafted, like we did in the spring, we're going to send that memo around and have people be able to comment on how it's been crafted, how it's worded, whether it's clear, you know, whether it's sort of giving the guidance that was in the spirit of the various conversations we've heard, etc, etc. But so, the timeframe as I understand it, and they can kind of nod their heads or confirm this is fairly short. I believe that I said before, we wanted to get... the aim is for the URC to get that to departments and colleges by around early to mid-September, which is not that far away. And so that’s what the goal is here. Does that help, Senator Peterson?

Senator Peterson: Yes, it does. Thank you very much.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Peterson, to adjourn.