**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, October 20, 2021**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

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

***NTT/TT Ratio and Instructional Capacity ad hoc Committee elections***

[NTT/TT Ratios and Instructional Capacity ad hoc committee charge](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/agenda-minutes/faculty-caucus/FINAL%20COPY%20Charge%20for%20Ad%20Hoc%20Committee.pdf)

The chair of the Academic Senate: **Martha Horst, (MUS, WKCFA)**

The chair of the AABC, or designee: **Deb Garrahy, (KNR, CAST)**

The chair of the Planning and Finance Committee, or designee: **David Marx, PHY, CAS, NAT SCI)**

Chair of the Chair's Council, or designee: **Marla Reese-Weber, (PHY, CAST/CAS SOC SCI)**

Ex Officio, non-voting: a College Dean or designee **Diane Zosky,** **(CAS)**

Ex Officio, non-voting: Vice President and Provost or designee **Dan Elkins**

***Tenure-track faculty (3)***

Thomas McClure (POL, CAS, SOC SCI)

Jack Glascock (COM, CAS, HUM)
Craig Cullen (MAT, CAS, NAT SCI)

Sarah Smelser (ART, WKCFA)

Wade Nichols (BSC, CAS, NAT SCI)

Thomas McClure, Sarah Smelser, and Wade Nichols were elected to serve on the ad hoc committee.

***Non-Tenure-Track faculty (1)***

Terry Lowe, (MQM, COB)

Terry Lowe was elected to serve on the ad hoc committee.

***Information Item:***

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

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

Dr. Buckley: Section VII. G. was the first of the AFEGC revisions to clarify the appeals process for AFEGC to make sure that all faculty were aware that that was an option. This does fall under the faculty assignments, faculty evaluation in general, and then there are later AFEGC revisions in the appeals section coming up.

Senator Horst: Are there any questions or comments about this language in VII.G.? (Pause) I have some. You have here that they can file a complaint at any time, and that’s also language that’s used at other points in the document. However, there’s also language on the flow charts, for instance, that say that people can file a complaint any time during the process. So, there has been some confusion about the difference in that language that I want to call your attention to. I believe the intent is that people can file an AFEGC case during the process, but once it goes further past that, they’re not necessarily filing an AFEGC case after the case has gone to the President, for instance.

The other thing I’d like to call your attention to is that the non-reappointments only have five days to file an AFEGC case. I was wondering why there’s such a difference between the timeline for the non-reappointments and the other situations that faculty could be in? My general comment is if you could not say “at any time”, if you mean it’s “within the process”. For instance, there’s a case going on that’s a dismissal case, you mean that they can file an AFEGC case within that?

Dr. Trites: I’m not sure I tracked that. The one you were asking about, the five days with the non-reappointments.

Senator Horst: Section XVII.K. “If a faculty member believes that the basis for non-reappointment was an Academic Freedom or Ethics violation, they faculty member may request a review by the Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee in order to allow a final decision prior to the end of the faculty members appointment. The faculty member must file a complaint as required by the Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance Committee within five business days.”

Dr. Trites: I’m thinking that’s a calendar problem because non-reappointments come a little bit later in the process. But let us jot that down as a question you have for us and make sure that I’m giving you the correct answer.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I think I’ve noted in other past readings of this section that it seems a very short timeframe for such a serious situation.

Dr. Trites: I think it’s because the Provost can hand that result back quite late and May 1 is the deadline that you have to get the AFEGC response. So, I’m pretty sure it’s the tightness of that time frame that’s driving that, but I would much prefer to ensure that I’m right than just guess.

Senator Cline: Just a very minor typo, the last sentence, you’re lacking an oxford comma. “…Faculty Academic Freedom, Ethics, and Grievance…” as it is above in the prior paragraph.

Senator Horst: And then there’s the quote at the end that I don’t think you intended to have.

Senator Nikolaou: In VII. F. The third sentence from the bottom, where it says, “Intended recommendations will become the final recommendation at the end of 10 business days unless additional information is discovered…” I have a question about that part. Is discovered by whom? So, do we mean that unless additional information is provided to the DFSC/SFSC by the faculty or members of the DFSC? Because right now, who discovers it and how is it conveyed to the DFSC/SFSC?

Dr. Trites: I’ve always understood that to be by anyone. I think that’s one of the reasons it’s in the passive voice.

Senator Horst: Since that’s not a change they’re proposing, maybe you could take it back to your committee and see if you think it needs clarification? Would that be acceptable?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. The discovered seems too general, and general is fine. But then how does the committee that actually reviews the case get this information? Because I may discover it, but I may not share it with the DFSC/SFSC. So, am I required to report it to them just because I discovered it? That’s what I had in mind.

Dr. Trites: Thank you.

Senator Horst: Further questions? We’re doing F. and G. (Pause) Alright.

* [10.22.21.03 ASPT REVIEW\_Section VIII.A\_addition](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/10.22.21.03%20ASPT%20REVIEW_Section%20VIII.A_addition.docx)

Dr. Buckley: So, what was sent out to Faculty Caucus was missing a sentence that URC had approved that I just sent to Martha today. The addition that you have says, “Each School/Department should establish clear, specific, and well-communicated criteria for promotions based on quality standards in their discipline.” This was to clarify the issue for standards, for promotions, and putting that at the Department/School level. And then the additional sentence deals with the quantity versus quality issue. The additional would read, “While the candidate’s productivity items may be enumerated, such counting metrics shall not substitute for a holistic and qualitative review of the candidate’s impact on the University, the community, and the field of endeavor.”

Senator Horst: So, in other words, if I have four articles, it’s not necessarily the only thing I have to do.

Dr. Buckley: It’s not just about numbers.

Senator Horst: Right. It’s not just about numbers.

Senator Blum: Would the URC expect a Department/School to elaborate on criteria that would fit that sentence? On one level, the first sentence is asking for specificity. Then, the following sentence is saying there’s a more holistic view to tenure and promotion. Is the URC hoping there would also be more than general statements in a tenure and promotion document to meet that second sentence?

Dr. Trites: These are decisions that are done best within the discipline. So, I don’t think we want to elaborate that here; but it would be incumbent on Department/School documents to have measures of quantity and quality review. It would be incumbent upon Departments/Schools to have measures of quantity and quality so that it can be judged within the discipline.

Senator Blum: The reason I’m discussing this is because I come from a department that has for many years has had a very vague document. So, we’re currently working to rectify that. And I totally agree that the place for this is at the Department/School level for that specificity, but at the same time words like holistic and specificity are a little bit different in their description. I have come to believe—I came up under a very vague system—in the importance of specificity and the importance of transparency. So, I just want to make sure that as this language comes forward, we don’t muddy the waters any more than what’s intended here.

Dr. Buckley: I think the committee’s goal was to establish some sort of common standards for promotion at the Department/School level, but then also remind that the overall process should still be holistic and look at quantity and quality.

Senator Nikolaou: One small thing from the previous sentence first. That we want to say each Department/School because that’s how it’s mentioned everywhere else in the document.

Then, I’m not sure about, where it says, “…the candidate’s impact on the University, the community, and the field of endeavor.” Is it about my contributions, not necessarily about the impact? Also, why is it first on the contributions to the University? Shouldn’t it be first on my discipline and on my field of interest, then the University, and then the community?

Also, I was thinking is it a bit repetitive? Because the previous sentence says we are going to develop “…criteria for promotions based on quality standards in their discipline.” So, we talk over there about the quality. But then the next sentence says, while we are going to look at the quantity, we are going to look at the quality. But we did mention it in the previous sentence. So, I get that we want to emphasis that we want to look at the numbers and the quality, but it seems like we address it kind of in two parts over there.

Senator Meyers: I would just like to echo what Senator Blum said that specificity and holistic seem like they’re directly in contrast, and clearly communicated and holistic are kind of in contrast. I understand the desire to make room for both, and I also think it will be hard for departments to really live up to all that.

Dr. Trites: How about if we try to tweak that one?

Senator Otto: I wanted to echo Senator Blum’s comment. I have a comment to read from one of my constituents, who says, “Standards criteria should be clear, specific, and well communicated, and should be up to date and publicly available. They are not now, as some Department/School ASPT documents on ISU website are out of date, which continues to be frustrating and dangerous to pre-tenure faculty trying to plan for tenure bids.”

Provost Tarhule: I want to share a few comments for your consideration. In my time evaluating faculty for tenure and promotion, one of the most vexing situations we face is if a faculty member receives five years of excellent reviews and then somehow is denied tenure or promotion; it’s very hard for administrators to defend. It’s almost like we were misleading the candidate, or the candidate has been misled. So, if you are getting progressively good statements, you should have a good sense that you are going to get tenure. We have a sentence here that says, “Hence, promotions are neither automatic nor the product of any set formula based on yearly performance-evaluation ratings.” I think that almost adds to the kind of confusion. I know it’s not automatic, but I’m not sure what that sentence accomplishes if you look at the practicals.

Couple of other things very quickly. Building on that first comment, especially for tenure-track faculty, the annual evaluation should be a good indicator of how they are doing. So, if we have a requirement here by the tenure, that better be included as an expectation. If we are talking about holistic assessment for tenure, then somehow, we should have that holistic language in the annual evaluations as well. Otherwise, they’re being evaluated on what kind of criteria and they come up for tenure and here is this other criteria that wasn’t included in the evaluation all along.

And by the way, I do support Senator Blum and the other comments, that having that holistic and specificity language is confusing. I think faculty should be evaluated on teaching, research, and service. Anything else you want to add should be imbedded amongst those. So, I don’t know that you need additional criteria.

The last comment I’ll make is, again, maybe not related to what you are working on, but unfortunately, we do have instances where the decisions for tenure and promotions differ between the CFSCs and the DFSCs. I don’t know whether this committee, your group considered that, or if this is something you can consider about trying to alleviate in some ways. In my mind, when that happens that speaks to the lack of clarity about what the expectations are, because there shouldn’t be such a big difference between the decisions of the CFSCs and the DFSCs.

Senator Blum: I just want to speak in support of what Provost Tarhule is saying about the differences between the CFSCs and DFSCs. There is actually in current University ASPT document that actually requires a CFSC member to look at departmental ASPT in the evaluation process, which I think this is the practice of the University; it’s best practice, but I don’t think there’s anything that requires it. So, there’s not even a dean that’s chair of the CFSC that could actually guide the CFSC members to look at departmental criteria. So, I think this is a hole in the process, and it produces that. This is really good about the specificity of the criteria, but also the process has to be built around that specificity.

Senator Horst: Further comments? (Pause) Okay.

* [10.08.21.07 ASPT REVIEW\_Section IX](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/08%20-%2010.08.21.07%20ASPT%20REVIEW_Section%20IX.docx)

Dr. Buckley: The language in Section IX.C. was added to mirror what we added at the beginning of the document to clarify that in some cases hiring with tenure does occur, and then this person would be exempt from going through the probationary period, obviously.

Senator Nikolaou: When it states in the addition, where it says, “…comparable probationary period…” is that in terms of time length only? What if I served in a different department and let’s say I was in a different school and I did my six years and I was not going to get tenure and that’s why I looked for a different job. So, does it matter that I was there for six years? Are we going to count this? So, is that the comparable part? Or is it about the length of the time that it’s comparable? Or is it about the quality?

Dr. Trites: I would think that if the person did not gain tenure at the first institution, they would not be granted tenure here. I might not be tracking what you’re saying.

Senator Horst: So, for instance, sometimes people go up for tenure on a short clock.

Dr. Trites: Right.

Senator Horst: So, they’re at some other place and they go up for tenure in three years.

Dr. Trites: And that’s fine.

Senator Horst: And so that’s not a comparable time period, is that what you’re asking?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Dr. Trites: But we do that all the time.

Senator Nikolaou: But is that captured by the “comparable probationary period?” So, I’m not clear what the “comparable probationary period” (these three words) is. It says, “It is expected that such individuals will have completed a comparable probationary period at their previous institution, and/or have tenure there.”

Dr. Trites: If we’re not clear, we can make it clear. This sentence only refers to when we plan to appoint someone with tenure because they have earned it somewhere else. So, if someone comes to us for a tenure denial, they’ve got six years in the field, we’ll only give them three, and they still have to earn tenure here. But if someone was successfully tenured elsewhere, in a process that was similar to ours, that’s our intention. So, clearly, we’re not making that clear. It’s almost like if we had those two added sentences separated with a semicolon instead of a period. The “such individuals” refers to exceptional cases an individual may be initially appointed with tenure.

Senator Horst: I think Senator Nikolaou is wondering if the comparable part a length of time? The six years.

Dr. Trites: Yes.

Senator Horst: So, if I’m at some institution and I somehow got tenure in three years, would that not be a comparable probationary period?

Dr. Trites: I would think if you were good enough to get tenure in three years somewhere else, we would gladly grant you tenure here. I don’t think it’s about amount of time.

Senator Horst: Process maybe? Comparable process?

Dr. Trites: Process, standards, things of that nature.

Provost Tarhule: I wonder if the emphasis should be on the type of school, rather than the probationary period. Because if somebody got tenure at south/southeast community college after six years, I don’t know that that qualifies. So, what some schools typically do is to say that if you get tenure at a school of comparable rank or higher then you may be eligible for tenure at our institution. If somebody got tenure at R1 institution, let’s say, Johns Hopkins and they come here, and we say no go through tenure again. It’s the prestige of the institution in comparison to us that I think is more important than the length of the probationary period.

Dr. Trites: I think that solves the problem and we can address that.

Senator Horst: Further comments on this language? (Pause) Okay.

Dr. Buckley: **Section IX D.3** is suggesting that all candidates for tenure will undergo a mid-probationary review by the DFSC/SFSC in the third or fourth year to give them formative feedback on how they’re doing.

Senator Nahm: Is there a reason why you’re giving the committees the option of either the third or the fourth year? I’m particularly concerned about, depending on when the candidate review results, if it’s late in the fourth year and their portfolio is due soon, right, the following year, will they have enough time to address concerns?

Dr. Trites: And the converse, your third year, we only have two and a half years of data. If we perform your evaluation in the middle of the year, we really only have two calendar years’ worth of data. So, that is why we said third or fourth because we could see in some departments that doing it in January of what is your third year, but you’ve only had two calendar years’ worth of teaching evaluations, wouldn’t be enough in others. It could come too late. We grappled with that. I think it’s a very valid point.

Senator Peters: If I could add to that too, from the Department of Chemistry for example, it takes us a couple years for us to get a lab set up and going. And so, to be evaluated at three year could be difficult. So, it makes sense.

Dr. Trites: It’s very disciplinary specific.

Senator Beucher: I’m wondering if you discussed, or you’d be open to discussing, whether the annual review should continue to be required in Department/Schools that require it in the same year that the third- or fourth-year review is being conducted?

Dr. Trites: If that’s not clear, we’ll make it clear. It’s already required. The annual review must happen as an annual review because that’s just in here; this does not take that out. So, that would be a supplemental review, the formative review. So, yes, we’ll make sure that’s clear. Thank you for raising that good point.

 Senator Horst: Professor Trites, could you give us information as to how many colleges currently do this type of third year review? Is this only being done in CAS right now?

Dr. Trites: It’s not widespread.

Senator Horst: So, this is a big change?

Dr. Trites: I don’t know that a third-year review is even happening all over Arts and Sciences.

Senator Horst: I see.

Dr. Trites: So, it’s not happening in the COB. It’s not happening throughout all of Arts and Sciences, to my knowledge. So, I think it would be a substantive change.

Senator Nikolaou: So, for example, in my department we do have the mid-probationary tenure. So, my question comes from that. So, does the process stop there? Do they submit it to the DFSC/SFSC, and it’s done? Or is it something that’s going to go to the candidate’s folder for when they actually apply for tenure? Is it going to go as a required document in addition to the annual productivity, the mid-probationary, to go to the CFSC as well? Is it going to be more of a required document or is it just an optional document that stays within the department?

Dr. Trites: Excellent question. We’ll clarify.

Senator Nikolaou: And then the other part was for the second half of the addition, where it says for faculty who have had to stop-the-clock request, that year will not be considered in the timeline. So, even though it might not count in terms of time, if I have a publication that came during this time period it should count towards my productivity.

Dr. Trites: That’s right.

Senator Nikolaou: So, we might want to clarify something along those lines. That any productivity that is happening during the stop-the-clock period, it’s going to count towards.

Dr. Trites: We’ll try to align that with other places in this document that say the same thing. If we add that language here, we’ll try to make sure it’s consistent.

Senator Stewart: I’m wondering what the mechanism for deciding whether it will be a third- or fourth-year review? Is it the choice of the candidate? Is it the DFSC that decides? Is it something that should be specified in department documents? I do worry that if we left it to DFSCs and one of them behaved in a sleazy manner, it might do it in the third year for one person and a fourth year for a different, and now we’ve got complaints.

Dr. Trites: We understood it to be that it would be spelled out in the DFSC/SFSC documents, but we will make sure that language gets added. That’s very helpful. Thank you.

Senator Otto: I think it might also be helpful to make clear that this is purely formative, rather than a summative, evaluation. At a lot of institutions where people might be coming from, you can be non-reappointed in your third-year review.

Dr. Trites: If we non-reappointed someone in their third-year or their fourth year, we would have to follow a different process, which is our non-reappointment policy, Dr. Otto. So, I think it’s well advised for us to put in that this is intended to be formative because we do have a different mechanism if we decide to non-reappoint in the third or fourth year. Thank you.

Dr. Edwards: In our discussions of this, it was purely for the benefit of the faculty member. As I recall, it was not going to be leaving the department. So, if it’s the sense of the Senate at all that this should be used up above then we can put that in. But that was not the intension as I understood it. It was purely to help the faculty member for the reasons the Provost spelled out there. That you might have good mid and annual reviews and then end up short, and this would be the warning step for that. And so, for the same reason I would also hesitate to have anyone spell out third versus fourth because it would be the chair and the FSC working with that faculty member as to when that works best for them, so that they get the information that they need in a timely way to make those adjustments. And you may not know if the third or fourth year is better until that time is approached. So, unless there is a strong sense to not, I think it would be best left open because it would benefit the faculty member more to have it done at an appropriate time for them. That’s just my sense.

Senator Horst: Maybe just some language to clarify that.

Dr. Trites: That keeps it in spirit with Senator Otto’s idea about it being a formative summation, but I could imagine since everything is discoverable, I’m a little concerned about how we would prevent a negative fourth year review from being included. So, we’ll need to think that one through. You are right, in the committee that was the sense that it would be more informal, but that’s something I hadn’t thought of all the way through.

Senator Nikolaou: Under B.5., where it says, “Department/School and University criteria for tenure shall be provided to faculty members.” Do we need to specify over here by whom? So, who’s responsibility is it? Is it the DFSCs, the CFSCs, the deans, the department chair, the school director? Also, do we need a time period? When am I going to be given these criteria for tenure? Am I going to be given these criteria the year when I’m applying, which is not going to be helpful, is it going to be provided when I first come with a meet tenure review?

Dr. Trites: I would like to hope that all our Departments/Schools have this information available, not only before faculty are hired but even during the interview process. So, this is meant to be the existing policy now, is that you’ll get this book, and you’ll get your departments documents August 16 of the year you are hired. There is no point this should be considered a secret document that the chair or DFSC gives you separately. If that’s not clear, “…shall be provided…” again that passive voice is killing us. So, let us clarify that because all faculty should have access to this information at all time.

Senator Nikolaou: Do we also need to add Department/School, college, and University criteria? Because it goes through the DFSC, CFSC, and then it goes to the Provost.

Dr. Trites: Yes. Good point.

***Adjournment***

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Attendance |
| Aldeman, Matt (rep Qaddour, Jihad) | 1 |
| Avogo, Winfred | 1 |
| Beucher, Becky | 1 |
| Blum, Craig | 1 |
| Bonnell, Angela | 1 |
| Cline, Lea | 1 |
| Garrahy, Deb | 1 |
| Harpel, Tammy | 1 |
| Hollywood, Mary | 1 |
| Horst, Martha | 1 |
| Lahiri, Somnath | 1 |
| Marx, David | 1 |
| Meyers, Adena | 1 |
| Midha, Vishal | 1 |
| Nahm, Kee-Yoon | 1 |
| Nichols, Wade | 1 |
| Nikolaou, Dimitrios | 1 |
| Novotny, Nancy | 1 |
| Otto, Stacy - VIRTUAL | 1 |
| Pancrazio, Jim | 1 |
| Peters, Steve | 1 |
| Samhan, Bahae | 1 |
| Schmeiser, Benjamin | 1 |
| Seeman, Scott - EXCUSED | 0 |
| Smudde, Pete | 1 |
| Stewart, Todd | 1 |
| Torry, Mike - EXCUSED | 0 |
| Valentin, Rick | 1 |
| Vogel, Laura | 1 |
| Branoff, Ted (chair rep)  | 1 |
| Vacant - 1 CAS SS Faculty | 0 |
| Vacant - 1 Faculty Associate | 0 |
| **QUORUM IS 17** | 28 |
| (Provost Tarhule - NV) | 1 |