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***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: I want to start with a couple of Oral Communications. The first one is next time on the 25th of September, we’re going to have a Caucus where we are focusing on the Engineering programs, and I’m going to ask you (I’m going to send you an email) but I just wanted to give you a heads up. I’m going to ask you as faculty Senators to ask your constituents if they have any questions about what we’ve been talking about on campus, I think it’s now been for two years, about potentially having Engineering programs added to our campus academic portfolio. So rather than just having Senators who have questions, we’d like you to go out to your constituents and ask them, do you have questions about the discussion so far, and where we are, and that kind of thing. So I wanted to give you a heads up on that.

The second thing was I wanted to give you an update on the Oral Communication and discussion from last time, about the voting versus non-voting nature of the chairs and directors seat. We did not find any minutes in the archive where the rationale for the voting nature of the seat was being debated or discussed, but what we did find confirmed and also extended my sense of the history. I have Blue Books that go back to 2007, all of which confirm that the chair has always had a voting seat over the past decade, and Cera was able to find Blue Books, believe this or not, Blue Books or other documents in the Senate’s paper archive that extend back into the 1970s.

So it appears that it was definitely intentional to retain the seat as a voting seat when the Faculty Caucus was pulled into the Senate system, around when the Board of Trustees replaced the State Board of Regents. I believe that’s the timing of that. So Senator Horst did raise a very reasonable question to me prior to our meeting last time, as to why the chair would be a non-voting member of the Senate, yet a voting member of the Caucus, and whether or not that was intentional, and my sense of the reasoning is that the chair was deemed to be in their administrative role, and on the President’s side of the Memorandum of Understanding, or the presidential veto power on the Senate side when responding to questions in the Senate, but is essentially expected to advocate for what’s best for the faculty as a whole, and faculty processes when working on the ASPT (Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure) issues in the Caucus, which actually extend beyond ASPT. They’re anything that has to do with tenure, promotion, salary, etc.

So in both bodies, chairs and directors can run and be elected for faculty seats, as we said last time. So actually Senator Seeman is an example of that. He was a Senator, and then became an acting chair but is still in his faculty seat. And thus they can have a vote on the Senate in their faculty role as opposed to their administrative role. So I’m wondering with that information… Again, this was simply an Oral Communication, not an Information Item, or a vote, or anything like that. I’m wondering if we want to discuss the topic further, if anybody wishes to make an argument against that longstanding voting nature of the chair’s seat, or if we want to just leave it the way it has been?

Senator Blum: I don’t have an argument against changing it, or for changing it, but it did occur to me that you wouldn’t want someone to hold another seat… Senator Seeman and the chair’s seat. You wouldn’t want them to have two roles, so to speak, I think would be hypothetically possible.

Senator Kalter: So I’m not sure I’m understanding what you’re saying.

Senator Blum: You could be the elected representative of the chair, and be elected Senator, right?

Senator Kalter: Yes. You would have to vacate one of those seats.

Senator Blum: Yes. Right. Exactly. So you would want language that would stipulate that.

Senator Kalter: Yes. Okay. Any further discussion about that?

Senator Pancrazio: Question: What are the implications for the person who’s actually been voted into that position by that council? The immediate implications? Because if you’re asking us to change one thing, what does that mean for the vote that has already occurred in the Council of Chairs and Directors, or if you’re asking us to leave it the way it is, what are the implications of that? Because I’m not sure where this is going.

Senator Kalter: Well, the legislative intent of the… First of all, I’m not asking for anything. I wanted the Caucus to tell me what they want. In terms of the role of the chair on the Senate and the Caucus, the chairs and directors are eligible for that seat based on legislative intent at the time that the Constitution was put in place. So other members of the Chairs Council are not eligible to be in that role. And several of the people that are in question, who are not department chairs or school directors, are also people who sit on external committees of the Senate and chair those committees, so that also violates that portion. It violates the Memorandum of Understanding, because we could have, for example, an Associate Provost taking that seat. So the legislative intent of the Constitution has always been that it’s a department chair or school director who sits in that seat.

Provost Murphy: Point of clarification, the Associate Provost is not on the Chairs and Directors Council.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Thank you for making that clarification.

Senator Pancrazio: So is that a… When you talk about legislative intent, is that a legal opinion, or is that just your reading?

Senator Kalter: It’s the history of the Senate.

Senator Pancrazio: But when we say the legislative intent, we’re kind of blending a legal language in that. Have we had counsel involved in that, or that’s just your reading?

Senator Kalter: No, I have not consulted legal counsel.

Senator Pancrazio: Okay, so it’s just your reading of that. All right. Now would there be any instances in which the so called, what we would call a legislative intent is not the way something is being done? Because in policy review, we always find that there are instances where the policy is not really what people are actually doing. It happens all the time.

Senator Kalter: It is certainly interesting when the Chairs Council changes its structure but does not tell the Senate for several years. I do agree with you that that’s an interesting kind of scenario.

Senator Pancrazio: Yeah, I’m not sure. But at the same time it’s kind of frequent that for example, in the Transfer policy that we just finalized and I just sent to Cera, there was an instance when they were talking about veterans. And I said to the Registrar, which policy? Because there were two different references in all of our policies about veterans credit, and I said which one of these is accurate, and he said neither. What happens, a university changes its practices, and policy sometimes catches up, we do that. So my question, if they didn’t tell you, I mean is it written, are they being consistent with their policy?

Senator Kalter: So I can certainly…I have already gone back to the previous two chairs of the Senate, which represents pretty much 20 years of history, and they were in agreement that the legislative intent is for a chair or director to sit. I can reread what I said last time about what the reasons for that, particularly in the Caucus, are.

Senator Pancrazio: But who legislates that? I mean, is it? I think we’re talking about. I’m sorry?

Senator Ferrence: We’re the legislature.

Senator Pancrazio: Are we talking about the Illinois State legislature that creates this committee’s rules?

Senator Kalter: No, we’re talking about the Senate as a legislative body, primary governing body of the University.

Senator Pancrazio: But did the Senate create that committee because I don’t think that committee…

Senator Kalter: No, the Senate did not create the Chairs Council, and we’re not changing their bylaws. We are stipulating that for the person that we need to serve on the Senate has to be a chair or school director. Not that they need to have a different chair of the Chairs Council. I would recommend that they change their name, by the way. But regardless of that, that we are saying that for our purposes, we need to have the three traditional layers of academic administration. We have the Provost, and all the Vice Presidents, and the President who sit on the Senate. We have the dean who sits on the Senate, and we have the chair or school director who sits on the Senate, and particularly in the Caucus where we’re dealing with ASPT issues. It’s not going to help us if we have the Lauby Center director, or the Stevenson Center director, or the Honors Program director, or the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education. And it also begins to get into pretty big problems with where the line between the Memorandum of Understanding draws the difference between administration and faculty.

Senator Pancrazio: Well, I mean, when you’re saying it’s not going to help us, I mean, who’s to say that that person is not going to present a perspective, even if it would be the person from the Lauby Center. Who’s going to say that that person is not going to be able to represent their constituents in a very accurate way? So when you say us, it sounds like you’re including all of us in that, and I’m not sure I’ve made a decision on that.

Senator Kalter: Well, terrific.

Senator Pancrazio: I mean, so that is…

Senator Kalter: We can certainly have that debate.

Senator Pancrazio: I think you’re speaking for yourself, is that correct?

Senator Kalter: We are talking about the legislative intent of the Academic Senate going back many, many decades.

Senator Pancrazio: If I understand correctly, that’s not a Senate committee, is that correct?

Senator Kalter: The Senate is not a Senate committee?

Senator Pancrazio: The Senate does not, like an internal or external, create, and view the bylaws of that committee, is that correct? That committee has some autonomy from the Senate, but works with the Senate.

Senator Kalter: We are not looking at their bylaws.

Senator Pancrazio: Well…

Senator Kalter: So, I’m going to shut down this conversation so that we can get to our business tonight.

Senator Pancrazio: Sure.

Senator Kalter: We can certainly debate whether or not we want to have more administrators sitting on the Senate from the Provost’s office, or not.

Senator Pancrazio: Um-hum.

Senator Kalter: And I’d be happy to do that. But the question that I raised was about voting or non-voting. And it sounds from the silence as though we’re good with having that position, the chairs position, stay voting. I’m thrilled with that as an outcome, because I think it would be very bad to take the vote away from the department chair or school director on this body.

Senator Mainieri: Part of the reason why… I feel like the two items, the item that Senate Pancrazio is bringing up and the voting seem to be interlinked together, because of the unique situation or the new situation with the current Chair of Chairs. And so for me, that’s why I’m having trouble commenting on the voting situation, because I feel like it’s also motivated by the current situation in the Chair of Chairs, who’s sitting right across the table. And so that’s why I’m having a hard time giving input on that item, because I think they go together right now, and we can’t talk about one without thinking about the other, and addressing the other, that Senator Pancrazio is bringing up.

Senator Kalter: Thank you.

Provost Murphy: Just for clarification, there is nobody from the Provost office who sits on the Chairs and Directors Council. I just want to make sure you’re clear on that. There’s no associate vice presidents or assistant vice presidents on the Chairs Council.

Senator Kalter: In the one-on-one meeting that I had with you back in April that was not what I understood you to be saying, so we’ll have to clarify that sometime in one of our one-on-ones.

Provost Murphy: That’s pretty easy to clarify, there are no members of my staff on the Chair’s and Director’s Council. I’m sure I wouldn’t have said that.

***Action Item:***

***Formation of University Professor policy working group volunteers***

3-5 Faculty Caucus representatives

Senator Kalter: All right. We are going to move on to our Action Items, Formation of the University Professor policy working group volunteers. So you might remember, last year we had the Distinguished Professor policy debates, we moved those through, and then we got real tired. We decided that the University Professor policy should wait until this year. The Executive Committee for the Faculty Caucus decided that we should form a working group, and so we’re asking for three to five Faculty Caucus volunteers to serve on that working group.

The following Senators were elected to serve:

Martha Horst, CFA

Craig Blum, COE

Adena Meyers, CAS

***Honorary Degree Committee***

David Marx, CAS, was elected to serve a one-year term on the Honorary Degree Committee.

***Campus Communication Committee***

Senator Kalter: The Campus Communication Committee, we are going to ask for staggered terms here because over the years… the terms are supposed to be staggered, but they’ve gotten off, and so we’re going to have someone sit in the one year term, and somebody sit in a two year term.

And did we give you enough information to understand what the Campus Communication Committee is about? Would people like me to repeat that? Okay. So the Campus Communication Committee is a constitutionally specified committee. It is not an external committee of the Senate. It was created in order to have a flow of information to the Board of Trustees. Part of the lore about this is that at the time of the creation of the Board of Trustees, apparently, there was an attempt to put a faculty member on the Boards of Trustees around the state, but the state rejected that. And so this committee, I think this committee actually preceded that, but has been a conduit of information. So they do two things, they decide on presentations that the Board of Trustees is going to see in the hour prior to their meeting each quarter (in October, February, May, and July). And then they also participate in the creation and reading of a letter to the Board from the faculty, the two staff councils, and there’s also the Student Body President who sits on that, but it is primarily—because there is a Student Trustee—it’s primarily for the employees of the University to communicate their thoughts to the Board of Trustees. And so they meet first to do the brainstorming meeting in the week before the Board meeting, and then they meet with the President to have him know what the letter’s about, and give us any advice about that, and then go to the Board meeting. And the chairpersonship of the CCC rotates among the faculty, the AP Council, and the Civil Service Council. So this particular year, it’s in the Civil Service Council, it will then go to the AP Council, and then come back to the faculty in the third year. Anything else that anybody would like to add or question about that, that you have questions about?

The following Senators were elected to serve:

Greg Ferrence, CAS, 2019-2020

Tracy Mainieri, CAST, 2019-2021

The below were elected unanimously by slate:

 ***Academic Planning Committee Member Confirmations***

Mary Henninger, KNR, 2019-2021

Rose Marshack, MUS, 2019-2021

Do-Yong Park, TCH, 2019-2021

Orin Reitz, MCN, 2019-2020

***Classified Research Review Committee (1 faculty member)***

Pranshoo Solanki, CAST

***University Service Award Committee- CAST representative***

Julie Schumacher, FCS(Replacement for Sally Xie)

***Council for Teacher Education***

Tom Crumpler, TCH (fall replacement for Sandra Osorio)

***Team Excellence Award Committee***

Michaelene Cox, POL

***Advisory Item:***

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

Senator Kalter: All right. We move on to the Academic Impact Fund ad hoc report. Let me go over this report in some detail for you. And I first want to add also, we did not add to the report who was on this committee over the year or two that it was in formation. So it was myself, David Marx, Tracy Mainieri, Stacy Jones-Bock from Special Ed when she was the Chair’s representative, and Steve Hunt during the following year, Mark Hoelscher before he stepped off of the Senate, Marie Dawson took his place, Kathleen Lonbom from the Library, and then Julie Murphy for the Library, Ann Haugo from Theatre, Dimitrios Nikolaou from Econ, and then Alan Lacy was the administrative representative.

So as you can see from the report, the final charge of the committee was to look at the historical trends and reallocations that have happened over the last 20 years in the Academic Impact Fund, or through the Academic Impact Fund is probably the better way of putting it, and then the balances in tenure line or non-tenure line, or instructional capacity spending, in other words where those balances should ideally be. This is, as I said, the 20 year mark, and one of the recommendations at the end is that a study like this be done every 10 years. About 10 years ago there was a study, but it was not a Senate committee that studied it, it was sort of a cumulative one from the Provost office. You’ll notice then we moved into, sort of, what has happened in terms of historical trends and reallocations. And you’ll see that Milner College and College of Arts and Sciences have lost some faculty lines, so to speak, and that College of Education, College of Business, College of Applied Science and Technology, College of Fine Arts have gained. And depending on the way that you want to look at it, Mennonite College of Nursing has also gained, but there are some different ways of thinking about that, because they were a new college (entered in FY2000) which was a couple of years after the implementation of the fund. There were overall 46 lines that were reallocated out of those two colleges, and of course, that has changed and fluctuated back and forth over years. So this is just a snapshot of that, one has been created, theoretically. Another way, again, to look at that if you think about the way that Mennonite came in, their lines where added not from the AIF. In other words, not from taking them from the AIF, and putting them to Nursing, but bringing them in in a centrally funded way. So another way of thinking about it is that we have reallocated 29 lines, and that 17 of the ones that we had back in the past are not currently being funded. And that again is a snapshot from about 2 fiscal years ago, because the work of the committee took a while to complete, so that may not be the same during this fiscal year.

In fall of 2013, just to put that into real numbers, there were about 737 tenure line faculty. In fall of 2017 there were 718, so that shows that loss. There were 32 more non-tenure line faculty FTE, which is an important thing to add to that number, since the inception of the fund, but since just the year or two before, in other words since 1995, 143.5 more NTT FTE at 292.5 total. You’ll notice then there’s some discussion about the various dynamics involved, and what is happening. In terms of the College of Arts and Sciences, for example, enrollment drops and that kind of thing, and enrollment gains in other colleges, so you can kind of read through that paragraph and look at that.

The committee was concerned about the apparent fact that Milner is bearing the burden of a lot of the reallocations, and what that might be doing to its ability to provide for the academic mission. So then the committee went on to do some further analysis, and because of this historical concern not just at ISU. As you see in the folder, there are a number of documents and one of them, I believe, it’s a 2002 report on the use and allocation of non-tenure line faculty in the university. And so they were concerned (as apparently at that time the whole state was concerned) about the increase in non-tenure line faculty, and if you read the Chronicle of Higher Education, you know that this is a concern all over the country. So we decided to look at that ratio, looking at departments where it would be above the 30% that the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee has in the past recommended for this University. Also anything that was above the 15% that the American Association of University Professor recommends. And then also not just at those departments where those ratios are at that or above, but where they had lost in that department tenure lines.

So we were looking for whether there had been any detrimental effects on department health or on the university’s health. We did not look at places, for example, that are important to look at in other aspects of the AIF where, for example, there are enrollments that are outpacing the allocations of tenure line faculty that are needed to accommodate that capacity, or where there are majors in demand as Senator Mainieri’s committee is looking at. So, that doesn’t mean that the committee thought that those were unimportant, but that we chose to look at this particular question.

We talked about potentials for vicious spirals, in other words, where you lose tenure line faculty, and then because of that, you lose further enrollments, and then it could create a vicious spiral. An example of that could occur, for example, in the Fine Arts where tenure line faculty tend to be a very major part of the recruitment process, and so they need those tenure lines to do that. And also for the reputation, the networked placements of graduates, and that kind of thing.

We were also concerned about the morality of the issue that’s there on the national level and to the extent that we have those morality issues here. Minimizing the use and maximizing the working conditions of non-tenure line faculty. There were mixed results when we tested that hypothesis, and that’s important to emphasis. So we went in wondering if we would see vicious spirals or other detrimental effects, and we may have in some department, but in others it was fairly clear that they were fairly stable.

So the recommendations: the first one is that the AIF currently, and over the past say decade or so, has been a little bit too strongly weighted toward allocation of IC money over authorization of tenure line. This was not a major correction that the committee recommended, but a minor correction of about 2.5%, room for about 19 more tenure lines, and that refers back up to the fact that 17 that we used to have were currently not funded in fall of 2017. Again, I want to call out some of the department where there is unmet enrollment demand like Psychology, Criminal Justice, and KNR. So, we don’t want to have this report be taken that just because we studied a particular department, the nine departments that we studied, that we’re saying that those 19… that room for more lines should definitely go to those departments, but that in general there might be some room to grow the number of tenure lines, and might go to other departments. The SBC stuff that we have discussed over the last couple of years also shows that room, that perhaps a little bit too much has been remaining in the fund to carry over.

And so, then getting onto the exact recommendations, we had sort of three layers of them. One was the group that constituted Math, Milner, and Languages. So we have in Math, we are recommending that the University prioritize hires in that area, particularly if there is a move into Engineering programs. With Milner, the need to work out metrics about what is appropriate and a good level of funding for tenure line and non-tenure line faculty, and then also to increase the tenure line there, at least by some. And then in Languages, several things came out of this study. One was a tentative recommendation of three faculty per major in that department, and the need to work out a good number of faculty if there’s a minor in that department. The recommendations about the non-tenure track contract, and how that might disadvantage the Languages department in various ways. And then, discussion that is needed on campus about language requirements, the Bachelor of Arts option, and the overall credit hour in general education contribution that Languages makes to the University.

Then the second tier were two departments or schools, Theatre and Dance, and Accounting. What we recommended about Theatre and Dance is more internal to the College of Fine Arts than a recommendation at the University level. For Accounting, examining the cost per credit hour there. Just because there’s always a kind of discussion about, well, how expensive are business faculty? Because they tend to get paid higher salaries. But we want to make sure that that’s also being realistic in terms of the number of credit hours they generate, and if the cost per credit hour, for example, is less than in another college where there’s maybe fewer students per faculty member, that makes a difference in term of how we’re allocating faculty.

And then finally there’s kind of the “remain vigilant” category, which includes Communication, Art, Philosophy, and English, rebound efforts needed in some of those for enrollment rebound, thinking about their needs in graduate programs, in general education, and in IDS. And then we had some recommendations regarding making sure that there is tighter alignment between the program review process and the AIF process. The augmenting of hiring support about non-tenure line faculty, piloting a particular kind of enrollment rebound program, a very small one, not the one that you might know as ERIP, and then to project and plan for retirements as much as possible, and then again to study every 10 years. So that took a little while to go over, but I wanted to make sure that we understood the full scope, and of course, this is still in draft form so it’s here for discussion, and for input, and the committee will take any questions or comments.

Senator Meyers: I appreciated your comments about certain departments that may also have needs not being named in here. I worry unless that is said very explicitly in the report that it will go unnoticed, and that the focus will be on the departments that happened to be picked, and coming from one that has had a more than 100% increase in freshman enrollment at the same time as a decrease (I don’t know what the percentage is) but down from 37 to 31 faculty over the past handful of years. I think these are good examples, but not the only ones in need.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. We do say it explicitly in the report, but we can expand on it with the comments that I have just made and maybe create a separate paragraph about that.

Senator Meyers: Yeah. I think especially in light of increasing enrollments across the University maybe that could be included as a specific consideration.

Senator Kalter: Terrific.

Senator Horst: Susan, could you let us know, I appreciated these detailed analysis of each department, and when there is a program review, is such an analysis completed on how the tenured and non-tenure faculty balance is working?

Senator Kalter: There is a question that is asked in the program review process about the ratios of tenure line and non-tenure line faculty, and the credentials that are necessary to be in the tenure line role, the non-tenure line role, and things like that. The first question I think was added a couple of years ago, it has not always been in the program review process, but it’s beginning to be asked. And the second one, I believe, has been in that process for quite a while. Is that the kind of question…

Senator Horst: Okay. I mean I’m just wondering (I’ve never seen a program review) if they complete an analysis like you did for these departments?

Senator Kalter: They would not complete the same kind of analysis, because what we did was to interview… We sent out a list of questions (I think it was four questions), and then as the chairperson, I was the one tasked with calling them up, and talking through their answers on the phone. So the Academic Planning Committee doesn’t do that type of analysis, but they’re definitely looking at… For example, for some departments, there’s an accreditation issue in terms of the balance between tenure line and non-tenure line, and that kind of thing, and also how well things are functioning. And so the committee does look at those kinds of questions. It’s not the only thing that the program review process looks at, but it’s one thing that can be looked at, and discussed, and then discussed with the department.

Senator Horst: I guess I’m just thinking about Senator Meyers’ question and how we can take the things that are uncovered in this report and spread it across the University, and that was my one thought, is that it could somehow be folded into the program review process, but it sounds like part of it is already happening.

Senator Ferrence: One of the attached documents which you referred to, which was distributed to Senate in 2002 refers to itself as proposed policy and philosophy. So 2002 was a while ago, has this document become policy, or is it still in the proposed stage, because there’s certain things in it that say things like, “the common practice of limiting the use of NTTF with terminal degrees to less than six years,” and I’m not sure, is that still is common practice. So what does the word policy mean on this document, anything?

Senator Kalter: It seems…You’ll notice also that there was a pitch for multi-year contracts, which is also something that we don’t do, or don’t usually do. I think that part of what was going on there is that as that report was being discussed and debated in Senate, the non-tenure line union was coming into play, and so a lot of those debates got deferred into the negotiation process. Perhaps Senator Murphy has more of a history on that, or knows something about that.

Senator Ferrence: So basically it died.

Senator Kalter: I believe that it, I’m not sure I would say that it died, but it certainly has been forgotten that that particular examination was done. It’s not a, I wouldn’t call it a living document, which is one of the reasons I wanted you to see it, to see where we had been, and how some of that got stopped, or you know, got diverted into other types of discussions, and whether or not there’s anything in there that might need to be revived, or should be revived, because it’s a good idea to keep pressing on certain issues about non-tenure line work.

Senator Ferrence: Thanks.

Senator Evans-Winters: I’m not sure if it’s relevant or not, and I know that we’re all tired at this point, so I just want to bring it up as a point of discussion for future conversations. But I think that we always want more faculty, right, and tenure lines in every department, but I think something as a faculty, as a University, we need to consider too is the diversity of our faculty. I believe we said earlier in the meeting that we did really well with the DFI students’ applications, as well as people who were accepted, right? We have now someone appointed at a different level, to represent us at the state level. It would be really nice, especially for a graduate student, and especially for undergraduates, I should say too, as well, to see their faces represented in the faculty. And I thought about that when Senator Johnson was speaking as well and the SGA representative when she said okay, he said we’ll have people who are making phone calls to 6,000 students, they talked about the social, emotional, and mental health of our undergraduates, and sometimes that role modeling, it matters. And that pipeline definitely starts at the undergrad level, but when we talk about matching our DFI fellows, we really do need the representation especially of racial and ethnic minority faculty.

Senator Kalter: A long while back, when I was looking at some piece of the Academic Impact Fund, one of the things that I noticed was that we tend to be more successful in hiring for diversity in various areas in our tenure line hiring, rather than in our non-tenure line hiring. But in many departments, the non-tenure line or the graduate student cohort is the first face of the University for our students because they are teaching the lower level classes, the entry classes and that kind of thing. And so that’s one of the things… I agree with you. That’s why we need to think about and monitor both ASPT appointment processes, and think about, in our own departments, non-tenure line hiring, and whether that is nationwide searches, whether it’s publicized in various locations, whether you have committees or just a single person doing the hiring, whether or not you have, say… In English departments, for example, it may not happen in other departments, but when I first got out of graduate school, I went around and gave my CV to a number of the area colleges from… you know, where I was still coming out of graduate school in San Diego…and they kept files of people who were interested in jobs, and then would call them up. But if you don’t keep those files, you end up doing the kind of last minute hiring, and it’s often your local community. It often becomes, at least in our area, a white female faculty member, rather than a diverse search throughout the country that might get a larger pool of applicants.

Senator Evans-Winters: And I’ll be more specific too, because when we’re looking at that data on undergraduate students who are coming into our institutions of higher ed here in Illinois, the majority of them who are from a racial ethnic background are going to be African American or Latino. And so our faculty, the recruitment process, but also the faculty that are being hired, are they representative of that demographic group that’s coming in at the undergrad level. And when we’re looking at our grad students, as we know across the country, the majority of them are going to be African American as well, but our faculty certainly aren’t reflective of those demographic groups; And that’s a trend. That trend is not going to end at least for the next 15 to 20 years.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. And you probably know in your own department that that’s also a pipeline issue, right? So that we need to, as disciplines, start talking about how to create pipelines into graduate work, and then into the professoriate for a diverse group of students, because as you move from undergrad to grad, and then grad to the professoriate, you often find that those percentages diminish in terms of the percentage of African American students at the undergraduate level, the percentage of African American students at the graduate level, for example, and then the percentage at the professorial level. So we’re losing certain demographics of students who are going out of academia. And how do we create pipelines that professionally develop those students towards the professoriate. Yeah. All right. Do we have other comments?

Senator Campbell: So with this being a report with recommendations, what is the next step or where do we go from here on it?

Senator Kalter: Good question. So all of the reports for the Caucus essentially land on the Provost’s desk. And so we’re making those recommendations to the Provost’s office to look at these issues, look at these departments, look at the departments that Senator Meyers was representing, and to respond as best they can to our recommendations. All right. Are there no further questions? Terrific. Yes. Do we wish tonight to move to endorse this or should we wait for it to be an Action Item next time? It is currently on the agenda as an Advisory Item. I’m not sure that we looked very closely at that in Exec, it probably should have been an Information Item.

Senator Ferrence: Personally I would be happy (depending on what the room feels) to move. I don’t know if we dispense with rules or whatever, and vote, but I haven’t heard a lot of discussion that suggests that it would be likely to change a lot with further, and to be able to save the time of review, I would be happy to move to the floor that we proceed with the vote tonight. I don’t see anybody yelling at me yet, so I make that motion.

Motion by Senator Ferrence, seconded by Senator Marx, to endorse the Academic Impact Fund ad hoc committee’s report.

Senator Kalter: I want to ask Senator Meyers, because I had said in response to your question that we could make that one paragraph more explicit, are you comfortable with moving this forward without doing that or would you prefer for us to defer?

Senator Meyers: If we move if forward, will you still make the revisions?

Senator Kalter: I would feel a little bit uncomfortable without the Caucus having their eye on that.

Senator Meyers: I’d rather have the revisions included. I don’t care when we vote on it.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Do we have further debate on that? Does anybody want to say anything opposed to what Senator Meyers just said? Or should we just…

Senator Horst: I agree with Senator Meyers and so then therefore, I guess I’m making a motion to table until those revisions are made.

Senator Ferrence: I don’t know that we’d need a motion to table. I mean technically we had a motion and a second, but we could happily vote down voting tonight. If we motion to table, then it would take an action later to bring it off of the table. So vote against me! I’m going to vote against me.

(Laughter)

Senator Ferrence: With further consideration, I plan to vote against my motion, if that helps.

Senator Kalter: You can withdraw your motion. That’s probably the easiest way to do it.

Senator Ferrence: Oh, can I do that too? Oh, okay, then I’ll withdraw it. The other would have been more fun.

(Laughter)

Senator Kalter: Haha! That is more fun. Excellent. Alright. Thank you very much, Senator Ferrence, Senator Marx, for withdrawing the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

***Adjournment***

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