**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, October 19, 2022**

**Approved**

***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.

***Public Comment: All speakers must sign in with the Senate Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.***

None.

***Information Items:***

***ASPT REVIEW and other ASPT items from the University Review Committee (Members of the University Review Committee and interim Associate Vice President for Academic Administration Craig Gatto):***

* [***10.05.22.05 ASPT Review Appendix 2\_Teaching\_Comments for Consideration***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/10.05.22.05%20ASPT%20Review%20Appendix%202_Teaching_Comments%20for%20Consideration%20.pdf)

[Issue with the recording. Below are notes taken by Chairperson Horst and Secretary Nikolaou.]

The Faculty Caucus resumed discussions of the ASPT Appendix 2 at line 131. We discussed the new requirement of three or more types of teaching performance. URC member Edwards stated that URC did not want to put so much emphasis on teaching evaluations anymore, so this was a way to do that. Senator Nikolaou asked whether the URC discussed if teaching evaluations should capture different groups of teaching activities as reflected in lines 66 to 129. Senator Pancrazio argued that we should leave this determination to individual departments/schools rather than giving too many specifics. Senator Peters stated that we might want to have different items based on the categories, but departments/schools should have the flexibility to decide how to evaluate their teaching. Members of the URC and Caucus were in favor of requiring three or more types of teaching contribution types.

Senator Nikolaou asked if student reaction surveys are required for all courses. He said the language was not clear on this point and offered an example of a department that did not require evaluations for every semester. Professor Gatto stated that student reactions to teaching are required for all courses and for both semesters.

Senator Blum discussed the clause in line 138 about biases and limitations of student reaction surveys. The Caucus then discussed Senator Blum’s comments about the biases in teaching evaluations. Senator Nikolaou suggested deleting this clause because it is subjective and not necessary for a policy document.

Senator Horst asked if the URC considered doing away with teaching evaluations. AVP Gatto said they are an important way to maintain a check on basic functions of the class such as: are instructors attending class, are they handing back quizzes in a timely manner, etc. AVP Gatto also stated that this is the reason for adding professionalism and engagement item 1 on line 144.

Senator Smudde talked about work he did as a member of a provost working group on the biases of teaching evaluations. Senator Horst requested that Senator Smudde share these documents with the Academic Senate office for distribution to the Faculty Caucus. Senator Smudde indicated he would share this material with the senate office.

Senator Horst emphasized that “systematically gathered” needs to be included in line 143.

Senator Blum pointed out that items 4, 5, and 6 use the word favorable instead of the word evidence. The Caucus discussed why evidence might be applicable to more situations. For instance, a peer evaluation could provide evidence but may not be favorable.

[Recording begins]

Dr. Gatto: Which number was that?

Senator Nikolaou: That was 15, line 169.

Dr. Gatto: I mean, you’re absolutely right. That’s quite nebulous. I think that it’s really up to the faculty member to provide something that’s compelling for the FSC to evaluate, and if they can’t then it’s not going to really add much to their evaluation. So, again, whether that’s something we can govern from above, I think we’re just laying out the idea that those are nice values to have, and if a faculty member can make a case with some type of evidence, they should go for it.

Speaker: The thing that comes to mind that I’ve seen was CTLT, now it’s CIPD, you can invite them into your classroom, like mid-term and they’ll do an assessment. And that’s just between you and them, but I have had faculty do that and then turn that in as evidence halfway through. I have them come in and do this survey and then give me suggestions, and I’ve changed due to that. That’s the only one that comes to mind right now.

Senator Nikolaou: But then these would be under 5, I’m assuming, where it says, “teaching assessment by peers through classroom observation.”

Dr. Gatto: I always assumed that was someone in your department. So, a lot of this can be redundant. We can remove that one.

Senator Horst: I could see growth mindset just in terms of when we assess studio teachers. They might have a student for four or five semesters. And we talked about growth as an artist. Certainly, you could document the growth of the student in terms of their technique.

Senator Pancrazio: That’s different than growth mindset.

Senator Horst: But growth as an artist. I’m just going to throw that out there.

Senator Blum: I would just say in that sentence with growth mindset, I think growth mindset is jargony and trendy. I don’t really think that we can say that’s an established educational practice. Actually, I would say the other one is a self-regulation and empowerment, actually, are concepts that are more rooted in the basic ideas of higher ed. So, you guys can take that or leave that.

Dr. Gatto: So, delete everything after the semicolon?

Senator Blum: I would say the URC should consider that. But there might be disagreement about the context.

Senator Webber: I just thought of this as—and we frequently do this in my department and I sometimes get these in our classroom—a student will self-assess and give you some kind of document at the end of the semester or sometime during the semester saying, you know, this aspect of the course really changed me in this way, where you find evidence of self-regulation or empowerment or something like this; and we’ve always been allowed to submit them in my department. And it just says evidence. So, it doesn’t necessarily say that you have to measure every student in the classroom. I just think there are things that you add that show that you have some kind of impact, but the students put that forward. They self-promote that, which I think is good too. They want to say something to you about what happened in your class, and somehow, we need to be able to see that.

Senator Horst: So, I think it’s just in terms of toning down the jargon, as you were saying.

Senator Blum: That was my suggestion. Maybe come up with a slightly different word that is more… growth mindset, I mean there are books about it. It’s a very trendy idea. I just think if you could come up with the same thing but less relying on that kind of vocabulary, I think it would be…

Senator Novotny: Would self-reflection work, or do you think it’s a different concept?

Senator Horst: I think that’s what Senator Webber’s talking about. Evidence of promoting growth-mindset in their students through documented self-reflections.

Senator Blum: I think that would be more clear than a mindset for cognitive.

Senator Horst: Just something to think about.

Senator Pancrazio: Lines 180-189 are talking about things like advising, supervising. Didn’t we deal with those already in line 85-97? There’s a whole section on advising and supervising.

Senator Horst: Oh. So, there’s a whole category, Advising, Supervising, Guiding, and Mentoring.

Senator Pancrazio: Exactly, and then it goes back to…

Senator Horst: “Credible advising and mentoring of students in support…”

Senator Pancrazio: I’m just curious why the repetition. Is there something different about this? Is there some reason for the repetition or is it just my perception of it?

Dr. Gatto: If you can help me… 21 is mentoring research projects. Can you point out a specific redundancy there?

Senator Pancrazio: For example, there’s a section entitled Advising, Supervising, Guiding, and Mentorship. In the PDF, that’s line 85-97. And then we kind of have a repetition of those items in line 181-189.

Dr. Gatto: As I understand it, those are two separate sections. A list of activities that you are referring to and then the content of what can be considered in an evaluation of teaching. It’s part of a definition of teaching and then a list of things that can be evaluated.

Senator Horst: So, there are activities and then there’s contribution documentations.

Dr. Gatto: In some ways its restating the same things.

Senator Pancrazio: Isn’t this an indication of overkill in our own deliberations here?

Senator Horst: This is in the contributions, what you can contribute to document the teaching, and the other one is describing teaching activities. Do I have that right?

Dr. Gatto: That’s my understanding. So, we didn’t change the structure, it’s what we inherited.

Senator Horst: That’s the way the document is laid out. Senator Nikolaou, do you want to follow-up on any of your comments over on the side of the document?

Senator Nikolaou: No. More about clarification for item 24, because I could also see it as part research or part service. It talks about development of teaching material. So, is it that I’m developing the material for other people to use and I’m not really using them, so why does it really count towards my teaching? Is it that a publisher asked me to review a section of a textbook which is more about service and it’s not really about teaching? It might be one of these cases where at the beginning we say it might overlap across different areas like service or scholarship.

Dr. Gatto: Yeah. That’s where I would say that we’re not trying to tell everybody something has to be shoehorned into a given category. I mean, reviewing a textbook, it is what it is. There is some service, there’s a teaching component, you bring your expertise as well. So, I think it’s up to the FSC in that department to place it in the right category.

Senator Horst: Or count it proportionally.

Dr. Gatto: Right.

Senator Horst: Any other comments to line 193, all the way through number 25? Any comments on that? (Pause) Okay. Turning the page. Lines 194-207, I do note that Senator Nikolaou said that “Service as a master teacher to other,” he suggested that could be service, and I thought of the rewording, “offering peer instruction as a master teacher to others.” Would that alleviate your concern? So, there is a rewrite. Are there any comments to the rest of this document regarding the evaluation of teaching?

Dr. Gatto: I just want to remind that the preface to this is that it’s not all-encompassing. So, departments can still, if something is unique to your department, clearly you can allow faculty to submit it for evaluation.

Senator Horst: The appendix is illustrative rather than prescriptive and not exhaustive.

* [***10.13.22.12 ASPT Review Appendix 2\_ScholarlyService\_Comments for Consideration***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/10.13.22.12%20ASPT%20Review%20Appendix%202_ScholarlyService_Comments%20for%20Consideration%20.pdf)

Senator Horst: Okay. Now let’s start with Appendix 2. Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Productivity. Senator Nikolaou made a general comment at the top. Do you want to talk a little bit about that?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. At some parts of the ASPT we are actually talking about the activities, and then we are assessing these activities to determine your real productivity. So, that was the general comment, are we referring to scholarly and creative activity or scholarly and creative productivity? Because it’s not always the same.

Senator Horst: And in other documents it says creative activity.

Senator Nikolaou: In some it says creative activity and that’s why I had the comment on the side, that we might want to try and keep it consistent, depending on which way we want to go, to just apply it across the board.

Dr. Gatto: I think activities is good. You’re evaluating these things for their productivity. I think keeping activities makes sense. I’ll take that to the group.

Senator Horst: Okay. Are there any comments regarding the addition? Professor Edwards, can you at all recall the motivation in adding some of the verbiage in the beginning paragraph?

Dr. Edwards: Last year, Dr. Trites suggested that we have a strong emphasis on diversity and add that right at the top there just to provide more emphasis.

Senator Horst: I see.

Dr. Edwards: And I think that’s the only major change there.

Senator Horst: Okay. Anyone have any comments on the Definition of Research or the Preamble? There’s quite an expansive change to the Definition of Research in lines 43-55. Dr. Gatto, can you talk us through that? The scholarship of teaching and learning, is this material that’s being added at the suggestion of the Civic Engagement…?

Dr. Gatto: Yes. for the Carnegie classification.

Senator Horst: Are there any comments on that section?

Dr. Gatto: There was a line about some redundancy, but I believe that line is talking about something different. So, I didn’t quite see the redundancy there. “Community-engaged scholarship involves critical reviews produced by discipline-specific peers, community partners, and/or the public, peers, or community partners.” So, I think that would be different than the other line.

Senator Nikolaou: My point for this one was that we did already specify what is the scholarship of application, and that’s what the beginning of the paragraph says: “The University recognizes the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and the scholarship of application.” Since we stop at the scholarship of application, that stops it with community partners, which already talks about community-engaged scholarship. My point is that in these extra sentences it says what it includes, but when we go to the next items, it states what is the community-engaged scholarship. That’s why I’m saying that it’s redundant, because we have specified that community engagement scholarship is included, but now we are going into more details, which is not in that sentence of the next section.

Dr. Gatto: So, you are specifically referring to the last sentence there?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Dr. Gatto: To me that is saying that if you are going to make the claim of productivity in that area, that it should specifically have reviews from the partners. So, I don’t think that’s part of the definition, I think that’s part of how you would want to evaluate it. I could provide some review from the community partners that say, yeah, we were doing something.

Senator Nikolaou: But my point is that this is a specific aspect that could count. It is not the definition of scholarship of application, which is what we were defining in the first paragraph. And because we have, for example, in 19 and 20 where it says, “19. Producing policy documents for community partners or legislators that apply disciplinary knowledge to the proposed policy; 20. Production and presentation of research or creative works via outlets/media used by community members, practitioners, or policy makers...”

Dr. Gatto: I think we might want to check back on that. So, is it that they are trying to emphasis that feature of it more to make it more evidence based right at the top? I understand that if it’s in the list below, then it would be redundant; but being at the top is highlighting that it has to be evidence -based. I think that’s what they are probably getting at, but I think we can check with them on that.

Senator Horst: That’s a little stronger, community-engaged scholarship must be evidence- based and involve critical reviews, etc. Then it’s not so descriptive. Right now, it’s descriptive, is that what you are saying?

Senator Nikolaou: I’m just saying that because the paragraph says list three items for scholarship. And we define what is the scholarship of education, and that ends in the sentence, “with community partners.” And it says, “the scholarship of application can include community-engaged scholarship that involved the mutual benefits of community partners,” etc. But then we continue and add another sentence where we say, again, “Community-engaged scholarship involves…” this and this and this. So, it is repetitive with the previous sentence. Again, it seems that we are putting emphasis on one specific type of scholarly activity in an introductory paragraph.

Senator Smudde: In the sense of the paragraph, it just doesn’t fit. The organization of the paragraph is that it’s about four different types and then there’s this last one that’s add in there that really doesn’t belong, unless it’s somehow going to be broken up, and it looks like it’s added on to help define what the scholarship of application is. But it’s unnecessary because it’s going to be talked about later. I agree that it should be deleted. If not deleted, then it should be moved and somehow incorporated where it really belongs later on.

Dr. Gatto: I think we’re going to have to get their original intention on that, and make sure it’s more clear.

Senator Horst: In general, there’s a lot of expansion to include these principles and I don’t think anybody has a problem with that. It’s just this still is an ASPT document that belongs to the university, and it’s defining everything at the macro level. I think that’s what there is a general issue about.

Okay. Let’s move on to the Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for Scholarly and Creative Productivity. Let’s jump to Deb Garrahy, who is not able to be here, but she says, “’Reviewing, refereeing, or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts’ Does this mean it should be counted in both Scholarly and Service activities? In my personal opinion, it should be counted only in Service Activities.” So, is this the kind of decision that a department would make, and you’re just giving it broad application and then it be up to the department? And would they have to outline that in their documents?

Senator Reese-Webber: That’s how I’m reading it, yes.

Speaker: I would have to say that I totally agree with that. But I don’t know that I speak for all departments thought.

Senator Horst: So, it’s up to the departments to define in their own guidelines how they count things, or if they can double count things, what proportion, and how that would be. All of that process is at the department level, and we’re just creating a situation where things can be counted as the department sees fit.

Dr. Gatto: Or not counted. So, that’s another important thing; if your department is recognizing this as scholarship, then a faculty can’t make the argument, “Oh it’s in the ASPT book, so it is scholarship.” No, your department has already decided it’s not. It is service.

Senator Horst: Thank you.

Senator Blum: I just wanted to comment. My department counts it as scholarship, but I think because they do, it never gets its day. We do, but we value these other things as you mentioned for tenure, promotion, other types of products rule. You can count it as scholarship. I think sometimes in an effort to be inclusive you are not necessarily helping anyone.

Senator Reese-Webber: I actually know of one department that includes being an editor as scholarship but reviewing manuscripts as service. So, there’s lots of variations as to how this list of things gets counted, even within a department.

Senator Nikolaou: I had a clarification question based on what we said. Even if it is listed in one, someone cannot come and say,”/the university ASPT says it is counted towards my scholarship.” And it is up to the department how they have defined it. So, for example, that specific item editor is explicitly listed under scholarship and service, and it’s exactly the same wording. So, if, let’s say, I see it and my department says, no, it is scholarship. And I say no, the university ASPT dominates the department ASPT, and it is listed under service. Do we need to clarify that part? That even though they are listed in different areas, the departments can actually not include it in one of the contributions? Because right now, we say the lists are not exhaustive, which means we can add stuff. But can we actually take away items and say, okay, that doesn’t count for service, but it counts for scholarly?

Dr. Gatto: In my perception on how these things are used, it is totally subject to the DFSC. So, if we wanted to say that it’s there, so it counts. Okay. My DFSC says 150 manuscript reviews equals one published manuscript, so I’m counting it. So, you can argue that it’s counted. Yeah. You better review a manuscript a day to try to equal publishing.

Senator Horst: Should we have some sort of general comment that says, items might be listed in different parts of the appendices and the department has the discretion to decide…

Senator Nikolaou: not to include one of the items in one of the categories. Because I can see the case, where you might have someone saying that this counts for scholarship, and we say no this is service. And then that person is going to come to you when we could prevent it in the first place just by adding a short sentence.

Senator Reese-Webber: But does that mean each department will need to have an exhaustive list themselves to say these are the things we count as scholarship; these are the things that count as service? Of all these listed things here we have to pick and choose which ones we want to count in our department?

Senator Horst: If you have a particular viewpoint on reviewing manuscripts, for instance, and they list it in one place, and they don’t think it counts for the other, then they should have the right to clarify that in their ASPT processes. Professor Gatto, do you have any perspective on that?

Dr. Gatto: My only perspective on that is it’s never been a point of confusion in 22 years. So, I don’t know if it needs to be articulated. Until this discussion, I’ve never seen it a point of confusion.

Dr. Edwards: I think the relevant line is “Many faculty contributions in a grade two or all three areas, therefore contributions may be recognized proportionately in each relevant area.” So, we could add that it’s the FSC doing the recognizing there, but I think that covers it. That’s at the very beginning of the appendix, introduction to the appendix. “Contribution may be recognized.” So, it’s not saying you must use all these things in these anointed categories. I think that’s why it hasn’t been a problem. Now that’s a new formulation, that line, but I don’t think it’s ever mandated FSCs to put something in a category. I view it as a toolkit, and you can pick and choose the tools that you need. So, if you want to count reviewing manuscripts as scholarship you could say, well logically, you’re contributing to science by giving your expertise to help enhance a research product that’s coming from somebody else. It’s still part of the research enterprise. You could use that logic. Or you could use the logic that, well, that’s just what we call service. Leaving that up to the FSCs, I think, is the way to go.

Senator Horst: They may be recognized or recognized proportionally, to make it clear that they can… they might not be recognized, or they might be recognized proportionally. So, there’s those two possibilities.

Dr. Edwards: I think it’s good to look at that line and we can try out some language.

Senator Horst: We are at the bottom of page two. Is there anything else in this section, through line 82? (Pause) Provost, are you doing okay?

Provost Tarhule: I’m doing okay. Some things are universal. The prestige and standing of our university is going to be determined by where we rank in relation to our peers and our aspirational peers. Scholarship to my understanding is what create. It’s the creation of knowledge. If you are reviewing a manuscript or a book, you are not creating knowledge. You are performing a service. So, as I sit here and listen to things that departments can decide what they decide as scholarship. I’m okay but I’m not okay. We don’t live in a bubble. I’ve used that statement many times. Regardless of what we think of ourselves, other people will evaluate us based on something that they generally, fairly, commonly accepted with no controversy, which is scholarship is what you create. You do something original and new; we count it as scholarship. You review a manuscript; we count it as service. So, I would actually, if you ask my opinion, think this body can actually help the entire university move forward by clarifying some of these concepts at that level, and not detail how you count it. What is scholarship? New knowledge that somebody creates and leave it at that. What is service? Contributing to advancing… The other details, to my mind, I worry that we’re… I don’t know that it really advances us very much. I think it’s a lot of detail that actually leads potentially to more confusion. So, if I’m reviewing scholarship productivity and one department is counting people who are doing manuscripts and are writing and publishing manuscripts, and another department is counting people who review things…

Senator Horst: But on the other hand, you can sway the departments in another way by having a dialogue with the chairs and shaping the argument that way.

Provost Tarhule: I think it also depends on what this body aims to accomplish, right. If it is to clarify concepts and then let departments work from that framework of the concepts, that we have clarified. Let’s say, what is research. What is service? How should it be counted? They can work on that. But if we go to the details of saying some departments can count this or whatever, we start putting ourselves, I think, in an alternate reality that is different from how academia in general understands these concepts. These are fairly well established. Scholarship is what we create. Service is how we contribute to the discipline and to the profession. There shouldn’t be any controversy about this, and it should be fairly simple to just articulate that. Anyway, that’s why I was a bit… I didn’t want to chime in.

Senator Peters: Interestingly, being in the Physical Sciences I think, I too agree, that this is more of a service, but I get the feeling that if no one has ever published any manuscripts or submitted proposals and got funding, it’s highly unlikely they’re ever going to become an editor of a journal or do 150 evaluations of articles. So, I think, in some ways they go hand in hand, right. If I’m incredibly productive and I’ve published 50 articles, I’m pretty sure I’m going to be getting a lot of manuscripts to review. And if I publish nothing, and I’ve submitted no grants or received any funding, it’s highly unlikely I’m even going to be getting any of this kind of service. While they do go hand in hand, I do believe it’s also service. I would like to bring that exact question to the URC, is this body okay with bringing that—article review and such—as service?

Senator Blum: My only comment is that you prefaced the whole thing by having these choices and selections. It just seems hard to parse out, well, this is the one thing that has to be in this area or has to be in service. I don’t really know how the URC addresses that, but the premise of the appendices is department or school centric. We have these basic, activities and values of the institution, but disciplines decide. As I said, my department counts it as scholarship, but I don’t know why.

Senator Peters: I guess the more important question is does your discipline everywhere count it as scholarship?

Senator Blum: I would say no. It probably depends on the institution.

Senator Pancrazio: Looking back at the definition of research that’s in this document, I’ll read just a couple of lines. “A formal procedure that contributes to the expansion of basic knowledge or applies such knowledge to the solution of problems…” It sounds like there could be an element of dissemination, and under that sense a person could make an argument that editor and being an editor of a journal and things like that does participate. However, nothing in here says how much a department is going to weight all that. I think there are items that routinely appear in our annual reports that someone lists, and people go, yeah, okay, right, let’s move on. Show us the articles that have come out. So, I think what we are, again, kind of beating this into the ground, and I think there is some strong arguments for saying that this is a service, I think that with the definition that’s already here that one could make a case. I think that disseminating new information is also part of that expansion of knowledge that’s in the first line of our own definition. So, in that sense, I would say we could leave it in and let departments make their own choices about how they are going to weight each one of these things. And I think the vast majority of departments are going to weight those printed/published articles, peer-reviewed articles, and books and there will be some debate over multi-authored and all this other. We’ve heard all that before. But each department do make those decisions on their own.

Senator Webber: I just wanted to add that even under authorship here at line 65, it doesn’t say book reviews, published book reviews. I would assume that would be under peer- review, because they are peer reviewed and they are refereed. But, you know, in my field—I’m a sub-field within a discipline, that’s Political Philosophy within Political Science, which is a Social Science, but I’m basically a Humanities sub-field within a Social Science—a book review essay is considered scholarship. There’s a lot of work that goes into it. There’s a lot of creation that goes into it. So, that wouldn’t be counted. But I just bring this up because my only concern is that publish book reviews aren’t here. I would think History would be very upset about this.

Senator Peters: That would be counted because there’s a product there. Right. You created that review. So, you do have a product that you created there.

Senator Webber: Right. But aren’t we having a discussion about that being considered service?

Senator Peters: No, no. I think that would be considered scholarship because there’s a product there.

Senator Webber: Okay.

Speaker: That may fall under journal article.

Senator Webber: But it doesn’t say book review there. Do you see what I’m saying? The review part is what concerns me.

Speaker: I think this review question, when I review a manuscript, I’ve done this service for my field. There’s no one beside the editor of that journal who knows I’m the one that reviewed it. My name isn’t associated with that anywhere. With your written critique of something, you’d be credited with that piece of work, and it definitely would be scholarship.

Senator Horst: So, to her point though, could we add it to number 1.

Senator Webber: Yes.

Senator Horst: Formal book reviews.

Senator Webber: I’m just doing this on behalf of myself and History. They do a ton of book reviews I know, and they craft them, and so that not being there would be very disturbing to them, actually.

Dr. Edwards: I will say that’s preexisting language, and I would say anything like that would be an article and there could be many different types of articles, and we can’t necessarily list all the different types. I don’t see any problem. It is a large list already, so I don’t see any problem with adding book reviews. But I would just point out that it says articles in number 2 but journal articles in number 1. So, maybe we should just leave it as articles and it can be of any types, and the FSC can judge.

Senator Horst: But you added reviewing in number 6. So, I think that’s kind of where the confusion is with that statement, “reviewing, refereeing,” now is it sort of lumped in with all of that lesser stuff, I think, is what Senator Webber is trying to say.

Senator Webber: Right.

Dr. Gatto: I think reviewing and writing a review we would understand is a different thing. In our field, a review article of a certain subject is just as good as an original research article.

Senator Horst: Perhaps a review article, or something like that.

Senator McHale: It seems like 2 may address that. “Authorship of published materials such as editorially reviewed… professional and technical documents;”

Senator Horst: Does that work for you, Senator Webber? Does that address your type of work? “Editorially reviewed books.”

Senator Webber: No, because those are edited volumes.

Dr. Gatto: Right. That’s the books themselves.

Senator Webber: You’re an editor of a book.

Speaker: I would assume the editor of a journal would decide to publish your review of the book. At least in our field that’s what would happen.

Senator Blum: I had a question earlier and we kind of jumped down. In the definition of research, and I know this is old language, it says “peer-reviewed process in a manner appropriate to the discipline,” on the first page in line 36. My question is for the URC. Is peer-review process inclusive of editorial review? So, a book that was editorialyl reviewed as opposed to peer-reviewed. I would say in our documents, editorially reviewed book would be a significant contribution, even thought it wasn’t technically gone through a peer review journal type process. Book chapter. Some of these things are pretty important research processes and dissemination practices that are significant contributions.

Dr. Edwards: I understand peer-reviewed to include editorial reviewed items. I don’t know if people feel we need to spell that out there. We can certainly do that.

Senator Blum: Maybe you can take that question to the URC. I will say that there are people that have an opinion about what peer-reviewed means. I think the URC can discuss it. I’m satisfied with that response, but somebody else is going to read this and interpret.

Senator Horst: Can we clarify that this is coming from the other University Research Committee? This is the standing definition that they have, and they decided to include the word peer reviewed. Is that correct? So, that is our committee on research, that’s their definition.

Dr. Gatto: Take it to the other URC.

Senator Smudde: I’m just wondering if we’re forgetting that this appendix is just illustrative. It seems to me that we are really trying to add things when all it is is a list of examples. I think the kind of minutia we’re getting into, although important, has a context, and the context is that in the DFSC/SFSC. All the appendix is supposed to do is to guide, and if it has sufficient, not exhaustive, but just illustrative sorts of examples it’s good. It might not be precise for a field, but in a sense, it is good enough because it points a direction for some good work to be done to help colleagues progress in their careers.

Dr. Gatto: Amen.

Senator Horst: I’m going to go on. I think the URC has stuff to talk about. Let’s now go to lines 83-114. Again, there’s the addition of community-partner reviewed/refereed presentations. Because I’m in the Arts and there’s been a lot of virtual events, purely virtual concerts, which nobody ever heard of those before 2020. I’m just throwing out the word virtual presentations.

Dr. Gatto: I saw that. I didn’t interpret that the modality changes. Like, if it’s virtual and people from Spain are part of it, I would call that international. If it’s virtual and people from Bloomington/Normal are in it, I would call it regional. So, just that it’s virtual, I don’t think, changes the scope of the meeting.

Senator Horst: I’ve also been to virtual conferences now, which is something I never did before. So, all things virtual. I just threw that out there.

Dr. Edwards: I agree. I think we’re talking about the scope of the attendees rather than the mode, because modes are going to change over time, and whatever word we put there is probably going to change in five years anyway.

Senator Horst: And this kind of thinking you never really would have done that before. Alright. So, thank you very much. Are there any comments regarding item 7-21 which goes through line 114?

Senator Lucey: Just getting back to the conversation of peer-reviewed processes and whether or not acting as a reviewer is a scholarly activity. We were talking about peer-reviewed and refereed presentations and papers; we don’t talk about being a reviewer for the papers that are being accepted for these conferences. That’s not listed as scholarly activity. I’m not sure if there’s different criteria for that or not, but it seems like if you’re going to have one as scholarly activity, then both need to be in there. I think there needs to be some consistency on that.

Senator Horst: Thank you very much.

Senator Nikolaou: I have a clarification question for number 16. Line 101. We say, “Providing evidence that scholarly or creative works has been submitted for review.” Do we need to specify “new” scholarly or creative work has been submitted for review? The comment that I have on the side is that I submitted a paper. It was rejected. I submitted it again. And I submitted it again. And I submitted it again. Can I count it four times? Because right now, it says providing evidence that scholarly work has been submitted for review. So, I can say, I have evidence that it has been submitted four times, so count it four times.

Dr. Gatto: I think after your second time it would be a negative.

Senator Pancrazio: Even though you could keep submitting something, that doesn’t necessarily mean that your DFSC would weight that the same as it would as an article that has been accepted or a book contract that has been issued or an article that has been out. I think that departments already have their own approaches to weighting, and I think as Pete mentioned a little while ago, these are just a list of possibilities. And in some cases, it’s an opportunity, because we work alone, basically it’s an opportunity to remind our colleagues that we aren’t just wasting our time. We are doing things. Nonetheless, it doesn’t mean that the department is going to say, well, two of these equals one of those or stuff like that. They just recognize that you are doing work and you are progressing, hopefully. And if not, they can provide that type of feedback. I don’t think my department would count that, they would recognize it, they would say we see you working, keep working, keep writing, publish like your hair’s on fire, but they would not weight that in any way that would give a person an advantage or disadvantage. They’re looking for published work.

Senator Webber: A clarification. If this is just illustrative, who is it illustrative for? Who’s the audience for this appendix? Is it people going up for tenure and promotion?

Dr. Gatto: It’s annual evaluations too.

Senator Webber: Is it faculty who are evaluating people for tenure and promotion? Because they have two distinct goals, in terms of evaluating things. So, when I look at that, I sort of see, why should it be there? You know what I mean. You would provide the evidence anyway. It’s not going to count. Do you know what I mean? That you’ve submitted it for review. So, why put it in here at all?

Dr. Gatto: I think it gets to Senator Smudde’s articulation.

Dr. Edwards: I’ve thought about this comment a lot. I think in reality, Craig would say the submission’s not going to count for very much compared to the acceptance. But on the other hand, for example, in our field, first submission of a paper to the final, it appears in print, could be several years’ long process. Think about what the purpose of all this is. This is for merit-based raises, they are supposed to provide some incentives, right. So, I think it’s more effective to incentivize some of those early steps if it’s going to be a five-year process to get it out in the end. I think if it earns even a little bit of credit, well it provides some incentive for those early steps of publication. I don’t think it’s a terrible thing if it gets slightly double counted. The end goal is to incentivize publications. I think the general principle is fine. I think FSC can figure out if something is being double counted or not and alleviate that. I think having those incentives there is valuable.

Speaker: In our discipline, everyone lists manuscript in preparation, submitted, in press, published. And that’s the order they rank in meritorious review. So, in preparation could be in your mind. So, we’re glad you’re thinking about it, but you’re not getting much credit for it.

Senator Nikolaou: That one kind of relates to the next part of service. In item 19, “Producing policy documents for community partners or legislators that apply disciplinary knowledge…”etc. Do we need to specify unpaid policy documents? So, is it that the community partners hired me to produce the document because of my expertise, so obviously I’m going to use my disciplinary knowledge but that is outside employment?

Dr. Gatto: I think that was left vague because the compensation in these things is variable. Right. So, I get invited to serve on an NIH grant review panel and I get an honorarium for that like $200 a day or something, which comes to about $0.30 an hour. So, I wouldn’t want that to not be counted because I was compensated. But I think if I got a $5,000 contract to come up with some things, then that’s more employment than an honorarium. So, then that gets to how in depth do you want this thing to be.

Senator Horst: I’m just going to interject. We were having a conversation beforehand, composers/artists all the time receive commissions for works, they’ve always been counted as research and creative activity. It would be quite a change to say if you got any sort of money for creative activity it no longer could count, and it’s delusional to think that you’re actually getting money to think you are actually getting money for your hourly work.

Dr. Gatto: There are some departments where people get paid to write letters of recommendation, which is unbelievable, but that does exist.

Dr. Edwards: I’ll say on the fee-for-service thing, we really considered this quite extensively, and we couldn’t really disentangle all the things we’ve talked about here. So, you’ll notice that that’s typically fee-for-service is considered outside employment. So, that’s listed under the consultation and service to various outside organizations. It’s not listed everywhere where you might get a fee-for-service.

Senator Horst: Okay. You’ve moved ahead just a bit. Now, lets move to Criteria for the Evaluation of Service. Not much on the first part, but now in line 139, “(Typically, service provided for a fee is considered outside employment and therefore not included in the evaluation of a faculty member’s performance in the ASPT system).” So, Professor Edwards just described the process of thinking or the URC. Are there any comments about that language?

Senator Nikolaou: I was wondering if it should go at the top, because number 8 it says, “Serving as consultant.” So, if you are a consultant and you are paid, I don’t see how that’s different from consultation and service. So, that parenthesis doesn’t really only apply to item 2. So, it might not apply to all of them, but it applies to more than just number 2.

Senator Blum: I feel like this is going to exclude some important service to our discipline. Right. Even though its compensated. We’ve all talked about exactly how much that compensation really is, but we’re compensated for service by the university. Our service essentially is compensated work and so I’m not sure the distinction of compensation I quite understand.

Senator Horst: Can you describe what you’re talking about? Extra compensation. Extra.

Senator Blum: Yeah. Service is part of our job. It’s part of our job description. So, I’m required to do a certain amount of service.

Senator Horst: So, I think the word fee here is denoting something outside your salary.

Senator Blum: Right.

Dr. Edwards: This says, “consulting services to organizations” not like scientific societies. So, they’re not on the list.

Senator Blum: I’ll stick with what I want to say, you can roll with it how you want. I do think that there are certain circumstances where departmentally wide that there are important contributions to our field that someone would get a fee for, and I guess I’m not sure.

Senator Horst: Senator Blum, can you give an example?

Senator Blum: Yeah. A consultant to a school district. They’re doing some really important work to help that school district. We really value, departmentally, the kind of work that they’re doing. They’re doing unique things to help children here in the state, and they’re paid for it sometimes.

Senator Horst: So, for instance, we had a PIE Grant and there was going to be an expert in Hip Hop who was going to come out and talk about the curriculum at ISU and they were going to receive a fee.

Senator Blum: Yeah.

That was one of the PIE Grants that we funded with that kind of consultation to provide innovation to a college curriculum. Would that be secondary employment, or would that be considered service, if that faculty member is coming in? URC do you have a comment on that?

Dr. Edwards: This is what we decided as a compromise. If we’re talking about consulting services that are paid as summer pay, that’s outside the scope of employment that’s being evaluated. That was what our interpretation of looking at what other universities do, what we got from the Provost’s office.

Senator Horst: And where’s the summer part you mentioned?

Dr. Edwards: I haven’t done that type of consulting for a fee, but there would be rules concerning overload during the 9-month period, right, if you’re taking on a significant job during your 9-month, but that’s a separate issue. But that would fall under the same category of doing something above and beyond your employment that you’re being evaluated for. I think we see that as a separate thing that’s laying outside of ASPT. That’s our understanding.

Senator Schmeiser: On line 139, where it starts, “Typically, service provided…” has that been amended or changed?

Dr. Edwards: That’s an addition.

Senator Schmeiser: Okay. In my field, one thing we do a fair amount of is textbook companies will contact us and they will ask us to review a textbook and give our opinion as to whether our likelihood of taking on or adopting this text, and they will pay us a nominal fee, let’s just say $200. I guess my concern is consultation and service. In my situation here, I’m assuming that would not apply to this case. Because that is service to a business.

Dr. Edwards: We were strictly talking here about consulting services. So, I think if we said consulting services that would clarify. This is a narrower category than I think a lot of the things that are being brought up here as small review duties and things like that.

Senator Horst: Can you explain what you mean by consulting services? Like I have a business, I’m a consultant? Independent consulting services.

Dr. Edwards: One of these types of organizations pays you a substantial fee for a defined consulting process. Again, I haven’t done it, so I don’t know the details. But to us that would essentially be a separate employment.

Senator Horst: Consulting services is different from consultation and services.

Senator Nikolaou: So, the URC had in mind explicitly things that we do that fall under outside employment. Because, if that’s the case, then we can just add at the beginning that any type of activity that falls under the outside employment policy does not count under service for the ASPT. And we don’t have to talk about fee and consulting services or this or that. If it is outside employment, it’s clear that it is ASPT.

Senator Horst: But what about the $100 to review the textbook.

Senator Nikolaou: We don’t do outside employment on that one, correct?

Dr. Gatto: In that case, it’s not employment, correct?

Speaker: This would be a Geologist is hired for three months in the summer to evaluate where their going to put a dam or something.

Senator Schmeiser: So, that’s what I mean, I would suggest consultation services if I’m understanding this correctly instead of consultation and service.

Senator Horst: And then also bringing in the idea of employment and looking at the definition of that policy.

Speaker: If I taught summer school at Wesleyan, I wouldn’t get credit for it in my annual eval.

Speaker: I think there could be other services that you would call consultation that would still be outside employment.

Senator Horst: Any comments about number 2? The policy is 3.3.7, by the way. (Pause) Okay. Going on. There are just some nominal edits here. Any observations between 142 and 167, number 3-15? (Pause) Okay. Going on? Are there any observations about 16 and 17? (Pause) All right.

Now let’s go to Senator Bonnell’s comment. Senator Bonnell, it seems to me that you’re proposing a new concept, and traditionally new language goes to the URC first and we typically react to language that’s being proposed by the URC. But do you want to flush out what you were getting at with this comment?

Senator Bonnell: thank you. When I submitted this to the librarians for feedback, one of the librarians whose part of the Scholarly Communications Team, that person sent me the idea that they were wishing language like this would be included. So, that’s why I forwarded it. this language is actually included in Milner’s criteria, our DFSC document. They’re an advocate for open access resources and inclusion, diversity, access, equity. So, that is why this was added. Somebody suggested it. I submitted it. Yes, I understand completely. Like I said, Milner already has this in our documents, so this is what we were aiming for. So, thank you for entertaining new language.

Senator Horst: Would it be more appropriate to go back and get a fuller discussion with the URC for the next round? Because we’re under a time pressure here. We only have a couple more meetings and this has to go into the periwinkle book. Right. We’re trying to finalize the addition of the periwinkle book, and everything has to be done by December. So, the URC already has not a lot of manpower as it is, so we don’t want to force a new topic on them with not a lot of time for discussion.

 Dr. Edwards: Can I suggest that open access might not belong in ASPT but rather in the university policies somewhere?

Senator Horst: We can consider that in Exec. And the URC could potentially have a fuller discussion of 182-194.

Dr. Gatto: When you take it to Exec, I can have everything I publish open access it just cost about $3,500 more than what it cost to publish normally. So, if the university wants to instill that I would hope it comes with $3,500.

Senator Horst: It’s encouraged. But we can discuss that, and the URC can discuss 182-194. Please convey that to your colleagues. But we really need to just deal with what the URC proposed.

Senator Bonnell: Thank you again. That team really advocates for this. So, thank you again.

***Adjournment***Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Blum, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.
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| Smudde, Pete | 1 |  |
| Tarhule, Aondover\* | 1 |  |
| Torry, Mike | 0 |  |
| Valentin, Rick | 1 |  |
| Webber, Julie | 1 |  |
| Vacant - 1 CAS SCI Faculty | 0 |  |
| Vacant - 1 COB Faculty | 0 |  |
| Vacant - 1 COE Faculty | 0 |  |
| Vacant - 1 Faculty Associate | 0 |  |
| Reese-Weber, Marla (chairperson rep) | 1 |  |
| **QUORUM IS 17 (\*=NV)** | 22 |  |