**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, March 23, 2022**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

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

***Public Comment:*** None.

***Approval of Faculty Caucus meeting minutes of February 16, 2022, and March 2, 2022***

Motion by Senator Cline, seconded by Senator Stewart, to approve the minutes. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Oral Communication***

***Textbook Affordability Committee***

Senator Stewart: I’m seeking a volunteer faculty senator for the Textbook Affordability Committee. Senator Meyers’ term in the Senate is going to be ending this spring, and she is also on the Textbook Affordability Committee. Her term on that committee would end in 2023. So, we need a faculty Senator to finish out Senator Meyers term. Are there any volunteers?

Senator Tom Lucey was elected to the Textbook Affordability Committee to serve the remainder of the spring 2023 term.

Senator Horst: Before we go to the ASPT material, I did want to talk about the composition of the College of Engineering’s dean search committee and what the Executive Committee came up with. It was a little bit of a logic puzzle because 3.2.13 has language for having a search committee for a college dean, but it talks about faculty and civil service people from that college serving, and there’s nobody in the College of Engineering right now. So, that didn’t work. We then turned to section I of that policy, which talks about electing University Administrators. The Executive Committee interpreted that as the language that could be used for electing the founding dean. It had a University scope, and we thought that was important since this currently doesn’t have any local bodies. The other thing we did is we took some of the aspects of part F regarding dean searches and we added them. For instance, we have the NTT faculty member elected by the NTT faculty. We also specified that there has to be one. The Academic Affairs Committee has now agreed that there will be two students, and they will be selected from ten students provided by the Student Government Association. These students should be majoring in programs related to Engineering, ideally. We specified that it would be a current or former department chairperson or school director, and that’s the language over in the dean’s search. And an important addition, there are two additional tenure or tenure track faculty at-large that we added. And again, that’s something that’s in all of the deans searches but not the academic administrators. We thought this was important for the Provost to have the ability to potentially add diversity and/or expertise in this search in particular. So, that is how we constructed the committee. Again, it was an unusual case because it’s searching for a dean which has no members in the college. So, we had to do some creative thinking. Are there any questions about that? Alright. Seeing none.

***Information/Action Items:***

[***ASPT Review***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/) ***(University Review Committee chairperson Chad Buckley and Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Administration Roberta Trites)***

Senator Horst: I would like us to start article VII, which we have reviewed before. I conferred with our two representatives from the URC, and I wanted to announce some word changes that the Faculty Caucus agreed to but weren’t included in this copy. In B—and remember this is the language that is currently part of the ASPT booklet, and they just decided to add it back in—the language will read, “B. The Chairperson/Director shall communicate to all faculty members in writing and in a timely manner, prior to the start of advanced course registration, the courses they are expected to teach…” and then we will strike everything else.

Senator Blum: For clarity, the one I’m looking at says, “…the start of course registration.” So, it should be, “advanced course registration?”

Senator Horst: This was a dialogue we had where Senator Otto brought it up, I think. Senator Cline was involved in that discussion as well, clarifying what course registration meant, because you can register for courses, for instance, in the fall. So, we wanted to specify we were talking about advanced course registration, which was a term that Dr. Trites came up with for the spring event, for instance, for the fall. And not the registration that happens right before.

The proposal to strike the reassigned time is to make it match the language below, that we’re no longer describing reassigned time. We’re going to specify teaching, research, and service.

I believe we’ve gone through all of the language here. We’re in information stage.

Senator Cline: This is just for a point of clarity before we move anything. What we are looking at here with the section of that one change you just articulated, is what’s on the Senate website? Because sometimes you put them on our agenda. I just want to make sure I’m looking at the right thing.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I’m looking at 02.25.22.05.

Senator Cline: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Nikolaou: In the second to the last sentence, where it shows that we are striking out, “that are pertinent to the faculty members professional duties.” I was wondering why we are deleting it? If it is about service activities, informal or unassigned, shouldn’t they be related to either my professional duties or to my field? Because that’s also what the addition in the middle of the paragraph says. It says, “e.g. civic engagement or community service in the faculty members field.”

Dr. Trites: If I’m recalling correctly, this is when we got off on my example of scouts, which is pertinent to me in Children’s Literature, it’s still children’s studies, but might not be pertinent to the person who teaches Beowulf in my department. So, I think we thought rather than trying to define what’s pertinent and what’s not, it would be easier to allow people to report whatever they want. And if I want to report that I have miraculously learned how to play the viola and I want to report that on my faculty assignment that I’m playing for the Chicago Symphony, miraculously, if I want to do that, nothing should prevent me from doing it. I think that’s where we left the conversation, but I might be misremembering.

Senator Horst: But we certainly talked about it. It might be something that you might want to propose an amendment to.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. Because I do remember the conversation. But because there are some from the other side, can we just list anything that we might be doing service on? For example, where it might be related to literature, it would be pertinent to the faculty members field that it’s on.

Dr. Trites: Right. I think we were presuming that if I report that I’m playing Viola for the Chicago Symphony that my DFSC is just going to ignore it. I can report it. Nothing says they have to praise me for it or count it.

Motion by Senator Nikolaou, seconded by Senator Stewart, to move article VII from Information to Action. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Cline: Point of information, do we have a quorum?

Senator Horst: (Pause while Secretary Nikolaou retakes attendance) Yes. We have established there is a quorum.

Article VII was unanimously approved.

* [03.24.22.11 ASPT REVIEW Section IX](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/03.24.22.11%20ASPT%20REVIEW%20Section%20IX.docx)

Senator Horst: Before we start Section IX, I want to ask of our guests something. In D.3 there’s language, “Each candidate for tenure will undergo a formative mid-probationary tenure review conducted by the DFSC/SFSC in the candidate’s third or fourth year as specified in the Department/School ASPT document in order to assess the candidate’s progress toward tenure.” The caucus asked that this wording be added, “The timing of this review should be stated in the Department/School ASPT document” and you accepted that? Okay. Very good.

All right. There has been some discussion amongst the Milner faculty and Senator Bonnell is prepared once we go to Action Item to offer an amendment to address their concerns.

I do also, again, want to emphasize that the statement about the gender language that’s used in the quote from 1940, the URC has agreed to do a large-scale editorial sweep of the entire document addressing all of those concerns, and we will see that in the fall.

I did have one more editorial thing, almost at the end of the document, it says, “candidate for tenure unless the evaluator has given prior written,” you need a space, and then “permission.”

Senator Nikolaou: Just a clarification under D.4, where we talk about “effective August 16.” So, the new language says, “and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. … Candidates for tenure and promotion…” So, I was wondering, do we… because the article is explicitly stating that we are talking about tenure… is the addition about the promotion and the rank to associate professor added on purpose?

Dr. Buckley: Yes. I believe it is since those two processes are tied together, that the language is added there, and then section VIII would address promotion in general. And depending on what happens with section IX, then we will go back and revise section VIII accordingly.

Dr. Trites: We also didn’t want to imply that you needed one set of letters for tenure and a different set for promotion to associate. So, if we only said, “letters for tenure” in this section, and then “letters for associate promotion,” that would possibly be confused as a different set of letters. So, although this does seem to be a slight redundancy, in terms of clarification and avoiding any undo anxiety over, “oh my god, I need two sets of letters,” I think this is cleaner this way.

Senator Stewart: Just following up on Senator Nikolaou’s questions, I know that in the distant past it has actually happened at ISU that sometimes a person might get tenured but not promoted. Is that possible anymore? Maybe that’s not a thing that can happen anymore. But if it can happen, then I do worry about the “and” here and what would happen in the weird case.

Dr. Trites: Oddly enough, just this very day, I reviewed that policy, and we have the word “ordinarily” inserted so that that would be considered to have been a very, very, very rare occasion.

Senator Horst: But you apply for promotion and tenure. Right?

Dr. Trites: Yeah. It’s on page 30 at the top of the page 5. “To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member should hold the rank of associate professor or professor, or be recommended for promotion to the rank of associate professor when tenure is recommended.” And addressing your point, Senator Stewart, “An individual who cannot qualify for promotion to associate professor at the time of tenure shall ordinarily not be considered for tenure.”

Senator Blum: There are certain parts of this that are more controversial than others. Can we break the book down?

Senator Horst: I’m going to suggest that if people do not support some language, they can make a motion to insert the language that’s currently in the ASPT document. And then that motion can go up for a motion and debate.

Senator Garrahy: I just notice that I am the only representative from CAST at the table. The other three senators are not here. And this was a big conversation in my college.

Senator Horst: So, you might vote against moving it to Action. But I will emphasize that the Caucus right now has a segment of time, and we have two other meetings, but April 20 is going to be dominated by voting. So, this is the agenda, unfortunately, and unfortunately members couldn’t make it tonight due to illness.

Senator Cline: I would just sort of second that. I will be voting “no” to move it to Action tonight because I’m concerned about lack of CAST representation, and I’m not sure how many Business senators are here. That concerns me because these are major changes to colleges I don’t represent. My only question is if there are other…

Senator Horst: Can we have a motion on the floor first.

Motion by Senator Nikolaou, seconded by Nahm, to move section IX from Information to Action.

Senator Cline: I would just, as to repeat what Senator Garrahy said, that I feel like there is a college for whom this is standard practice, there are other colleges for whom it’s not, and I think we are lacking the representation from those. I understand that people are ill, but I also think that maybe some people didn’t realize that this was the vote we were having tonight, because the agenda only said this discussion. And even at Exec, we didn’t leave knowing what was actually going to be on the table this time. So, my hope is that we can move to other parts and get other things approved and come back to this most controversial thing when we have all our people.

Senator Horst: Before I move to Senator Otto, I would say that if we go to Action Item, that doesn’t mean we conclude the vote tonight, we just start the debate process.

Senator Otto: I wanted to offer my support of the concern of my colleagues. I would wish us to delay as well.

Senator Nikolaou: Just a clarification, the other reason we are moving it to be in Action is because Senator Bonnell has language that she wants to propose, and she wouldn’t be able to do it without us being in Action. And as Senator Horst said, we don’t need to vote on it tonight.

Senator Cline: So, procedurally, we could pass it to Action, get Senator Bonnell’s text amendment, and then Table?

Senator Horst: Table. Yes.

Senator Cline: Are there other sections that are ready for votes?

Senator Horst: No.

Senator Cline: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Bonnell: Can you explain that one more time. I feel like I’m being put on the spot, which I don’t really want. That makes me uncomfortable.

Senator Horst: One way that an item can become an Action Item is by a decision by the Faculty Caucus Exec, but we did not make that decision, frankly, because we were not quite sure what documents we would receive. The URC did go on Spring Break, so we haven’t been receiving documents. And so, right now we are in Information Item, but we need to move this Action Item before we can receive new language from somebody other than the URC. And because you have brand new language it can’t just be like a friendly amendment. It would be a motion to amend. That has to happen in Action. To go to Action, we need a vote of the body, because the Executive Committee did not make that decision. So, the body would have to vote to move this from Information to Action Item and it would require two thirds. If we don’t do that, then we are still in Information Item, and we can ask more questions of our guests, or make a motion to adjourn. So, that’s where we are.

Senator Bonnell: Thank you.

Senator Pancrazio: Call the question.

Senator Horst: All in favor of moving article IX from Information Item to Action Item, please signify by saying aye.

The motion was approved.

Senator Bonnell: I do want to start off by saying, because I feel like I have a smidge more time than I normally would in this case, but I want to mention that Milner faculty met, and I presented to them two types of language. One is Milner-specific and the second was more general. I support the general language. I presented that to the Milner faculty. And I did so for very specific reasons. And I just wanted to go back to what Senator Stewart asked about, because let me tell you what I really dream about. And this is what I was asking for last December, and I think I did a really bad job of communicating that. I was talking about the inten,t and that’s one of those things that I wish we had. So, what I dream of, and I’m really serious when I say this, like, I love ASPT. I love our book. I love this living document. I love that it’s changing. But what I really wish you had was, and I’m serious, I wish we had an annotated ASPT. I would love that. And when I think about that, I think about it in the glorious fashion, and this I’m going to point to AVP Trites, I wish it were something like Martin Gardner’s *Annotated Alice*, like this glorious thing. Because it matters. I was hired in 1999 and what you were just pointing out, Senator Stewart, I was part of that cohort for the book in 2000 when that change happened. So, I have a very vivid memory in my brain of what happened there, because I didn’t meet those standards. Anyway. So, I wish there was something that would help to explain, year by year or every five years what’s going on. I think this section, the external review, is a big deal, and I would hope that we are all here and we are all experiencing this, but five years from now will anyone remember? Just like will I remember back to 2000 when that change to tying going up for promotion from assistant to associate, you had to have that in order to go up for tenure, and that’s something that affected me, so it’s stuck in my brain to remember that. So, anyway, what I’m wishing for, the language that I’m proposing, this general language, not the Milner language because I think it’s better that we introduce language that matters to everyone. And if you’re ready, may I read this language?

Senator Horst: Yes. Why don’t you read it and then we’ll get a second.

Senator Bonnell: Okay. Thank you. Okay, here’s the language that would go after the first sentence in 4. And I’ll say the first sentence comes directly from page 97 in our ASPT book. “Scholarly and creative productivity varies considerably from discipline to discipline. Each DFSC/SFSC and CFSC will be encouraged and given the latitude to develop governing documents consistent with their specific disciplines establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers.” That was the language that Milner library, that we approved.

Senator Cline: Clarification for the location in the document.

Senator Horst: I believe it’s D. 4. “Effective August 16, 2028, all Departments/Schools will require that two or more peer evaluators, external to Illinois State University, will review the credentials of each faculty member who is a candidate for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Scholarly and creative productivity varies considerably from discipline to discipline. Each DFSC/SFSC and CFSC will be encouraged and given the latitude to develop governing documents consistent with their specific disciplines establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers.”

Motion by Senator Bonnell, seconded by Senator Pancrazio, to amend.

Senator Holland: It appears to me that that particular phrasing, is it possible for DFSCs to have less or more strict requirements on letter writers than the CFSC? Because in the College of Arts and Sciences right now, the CFSC tells you what types of letter writers you have to have. They have to be at least at the level that you’re being promoted to, and you can never have published with them at all. But there might be some very small groups of researchers, for instance, who it’s almost impossible not to have published with them. So, at times I have a hard time getting enough letter writers for a particular faculty member who they haven’t had intimate contact with.

Senator Horst: So, do you support the notion that DFSC and SFSCs shall be able to establish…

Senator Holland: I do. I just want to know if from this wording, it’s not clear to me, whether the CFSC trumps the DFSC or vise versa.

Dr. Trites: University policy trumps CFSC. CFSC trump DFSCs. Typically. And when that comes to a head, there’s a policy in here that says the matter shall be adjudicated by the URC.

Senator Blum: I’m not completely clear how that’s different than f. F says, “how the external review letters will be considered and weighted in the tenure and promotion review process.” It seems like it’s a restatement of that, unless I’m misunderstanding something.

Senator Bonnell: I could see that that would be consistent with what you are saying. And that’s why I came up with two. The Milner language is a lot longer and it’s a lot more specific. This language is just meant to kind of emphasize that more. I don’t have that right in front of me, but I’m not surprised that you’re saying that, knowing that when I crafted the language the Milner language that was the piece that is a lot more specific.

Senator Horst: F says how the letters will be considered. This talks about the qualifications for the reviewers.

Senator Blum: Okay. So, this is more for clarity. Right. So, we’re talking about who the qualifications for the reviewers are, not how they will be considered?

Senator Horst: Yes. So, the example that we were discussing is, for instance, a professional conductor may or may not have an academic degree, but they are professionally qualified to assess performance of instrumentalists; that’s what they do. So, you might have a job or a position in an orchestra, and you might seek a letter from a conductor who is not an academic employee but has a professional aspect to his job where they evaluate your research, which is your playing. So, that’s the example from Music, where Music might want to consider establishing the qualifications for external reviewers that would go beyond academia.

Would you like me to read it again? “Scholarly and creative productivity varies considerably from discipline to discipline. Each DFSC/SFSC and CFSC will be encouraged and given the latitude to develop governing documents consistent with their specific disciplines establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers.” That’s the amendment that’s being debated.

Senator Nikolaou: And then we continue with what is already in the paragraph or do we go to ABCD?

Senator Horst: “Candidates for tenure…”

Senator Nikolaou: So, we continue. Okay.

Senator Bonnell: Yes.

Senator Nikolaou: I have a similar comment. Because then two sentences below we say, “This requirement must be stated in the Departmental/School policies and procedures document.” Which is partly what we have in the proposed language. The new language says there should be governing documents consistent with the discipline, but then we already have the language where it says that these requirements are going to be stated.

Senator Horst: But this one is establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers. So, is it the placement that you are concerned about? Or the actual text?

Senator Nikolaou: I can understand the point of the new language, especially the first sentence. Because I don’t think we have something right now that says that the productivity varies considerably from discipline to discipline specifically for that. But then the next part, I can see that it’s somewhere in there, so it might be that equals to, so we might need to think were it might be better.

Dr. Trites: I’m wondering, because I perceive what Senator Nikolaou has raised, I wonder if what was just proposed adding, if we then broke into sections starting, “Candidates for tenure and promotion will provide…” because this is now the procedural part. It’s gone from the definitional part to the procedural part. So, what if that then became subsection 5, and everything else below it got renumbered. Would that help with the clarity so that it doesn’t seem quasi redundant but not really?

Senator Horst: Or just a new paragraph?

Dr. Trites: A new paragraph could work too.

Senator Horst: Senator Bonnell, do you accept that?

Senator Bonnell: Yeah. And if we had time, it would be really nice to just take this whole thing, because I agree with everyone, there are some redundancies here. Just to me, I’m wishing there was just a big hammer that we could pull out and say local control is what we are after here, and that’s something that will remain.

Dr. Trites: Yeah. I agree.

Senator Horst: Senator Nahm, do you agree with the new paragraph?

Senator Nahm: With the comments that have been made about the controlled redundancy, I think that it covers a different area of the policy. So, yes.

Senator Horst: Okay. Is there any discussion/debate on Senator Bonnell’s proposed addition?

Senator Nikolaou: Instead of saying “will be encouraged,” should we use something different? In the new language. So, “Scholarly and creative productivity varies considerably from discipline to discipline. Each DFSC/SFSC and CFSC,” and now it is my question, instead of saying, “will be encouraged,” is it just an encouragement or is it that they should?

Dr. Trites: My preferred language to make perfectly clear what Senator Bonnell just said is that this is about local control, would be to take out the softening language and say “DFSC/SFSC and CFSC shall develop governing documents consistent with their with their specific discipline.” That would absolutely make it clear that local control will be respected and must happen. I can’t make a friendly amendment, but that would be my personal recommendation.

Senator Horst: A friendly amendment that was then passed to Dr. Trites. Senator Bonnell and Senator Nahm, do you agree with that wording change?

Senator Nahm: Yes.

Senator Bonnell: So, this is what I have, which is probably not right, so tell me what I don’t have right. So, it will be each DFSC/SFSC/and CFSC shall develop governing documents…” is that what you are saying? So, get rid of encourage and given the latitude? I know what you are saying. And I guess maybe I’m a librarian so I’m always trying to encourage, like, “hey we can do this.” So, that’s me. But I will also say that given the latitude is… I don’t know.

Dr. Trites: I think my one concern with the existing wording is, this is English professor to respected Librarian, it’s the passive voice. Who’s doing the encouraging and who’s giving the latitude? I understand it’s this document itself that’s giving the latitude, but who’s doing the encouraging? We could say, “shall have latitude to…” which is not passive voice. And now that I think about it on my sheet, schools or departments that simply wanted to adhere to college standards, if we said, “shall have the latitude to develop…” If they wanted to say, yeah, we’re doing what the college does. So, my real bigger concern is with, “will be encouraged,” rather than, “shall have the latitude to…” So, I’m backing of a little bit, half of what I said. If that makes sense.

Senator Horst: “Scholarly and creative productivity varies considerably from discipline to discipline. Each DFSC/SFSC and CFSC shall have the latitude to develop governing documents consistent with their specific disciplines establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers.”

Senator Nahm: May I offer another alternative? “DFSC/SFSC and CFSC have the latitude and shall…” and then the rest.

Senator Horst: “…have the latitude to develop governing documents consistent with their specific disciplines establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers.”

Senator Nahm: “have the latitude to and shall…” Thinking about, like, having the ability to set your own criteria, and also, I think there is something important in saying that these committees will, they are charged with developing the documents.

Senator Horst: So, you’re saying, “DFSC/SFSC and CFSC have the latitude to develop governing documents consistent with their specific disciplines establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers.” And dump the shall.

Dr Trites: No. I think he’s saying FSCs “have the latitude to and shall develop governing documents…”

Senator Horst: “Each DFSC/SFSC and CFSC have the latitude to and shall develop governing documents consistent with their specific disciplines establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers.” Do you agree to that Senator Bonnell?

Senator Bonnell: Yes. I think that’s great. Thank you.

Dr. Trites: Did “and selection of” fall out of the language?

Senator Horst: Yes, it did.

Dr. Trites: Okay. I’m trying to keep careful notes.

Senator Horst: So, we’re in debate. We have a motion on the floor to add this proposed language, “Scholarly and creative productivity varies considerably from discipline to discipline. Each DFSC/SFSC and CFSC have the latitude to and shall develop governing documents consistent with their specific disciplines establishing the qualifications for all external reviewers.”

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Cline: Senator Horst, I’d like to make a motion to table this discussion to a date certain, which is April 6, our next meeting.

Motion by Senator Cline, seconded by Senator Nikolaou, to Table article IX, as amended. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Horst: I conveyed to the URC that we had feedback on article X, but I don’t think you guys have processed that feedback at all. Is that correct?

Dr. Buckley: I do not believe so.

***Adjournment***

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