**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, November 3, 2021**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

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

***Information Item:***

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

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

Senator Horst: We are now at Section IX.D.4, referred to as pages 30-31 external peer review requirement. It was 3 and now it’s turned to 4.

Dr. Buckley: We were looking at external peer review and it seemed like it was a common requirement at other institutions and in some departments and schools at ISU as well. So, we proposed making that a requirement rather than having it be an option for faculty to request peer evaluators. This is in the tenure section. There are a number of department and schools that do require that here at ISU. Also, for promotion it’s an option as well, or a requirement in some departments or schools. We have it in the tenure section here, and I believe it was an oversight to put it in the tenure but not the promotion sections. So, that’s something that could be discussed as well.

Senator Harpel: I have some concerns from constituents. In CAST, we don’t actually require them. They are an option. So, we can have them, we’re encouraged to have them, but we’re not required. So, I had three different constituents basically wanting to know what problem or issue this is trying to solve? Or in other words, what is the purpose or motivation behind it? And who is championing this change?

Dr. Trites: As I understand it, this came out of Faculty Caucus and some other recommendations, and discussions over several years. I think the biggest champion should be us. This is the standard in the field, and it is the mark of a university that values scholarship, research, and creative productivity. This is also something that helps us get our name out there and letting people know the excellent work we do.

In Arts and Sciences, for example, we ask each candidate to submit a certain number of names, I believe it’s about 10, of potential reviewers, and then the chair or director contracts with those people. Now, if I’m going up for tenure or promotion, I’m not likely to put up the six people in the field who hate me the most, I’m going to put up the people who know my work and who support my work. Some of them are even people who I’ve never socialized with, I’ve never met, but maybe I know they cite my work. One of the exciting things that can happen then, is they read my scholarship and it gets my name out there, it gets ISU’s name out there. When we set the process up right, which we should do, we get feedback that’s beneficial to us and adds emphasis to what the DFSC has been sent; it helps us get scholarly opinion and feedback into our letters, instead of that naval contemplations of, yep, the DFSC thinks I’m good, I must be good. I think it’s the basic principle as why we do peer review when we’re publishing. I believe it’s a standard in the field because peer review is the local currency. It’s the currency that we employ in higher ed. So, if there’s one particular driver or champion of this issue, I’m not aware. I know that we’ve been talking about it on this campus for 20 years, but I’m not aware this go-around of one particular driving force; but that could be because I’ve only been here since 1991, but not in this job quite as long.

Senator Harpel: So, this one person tried to briefly say, I think some of the concern looking across the comments, came out of how much guidelines would be given to departments that don’t currently require this in terms of what feedback would they give to these reviewers? How would they guide them? What if someone is asking someone from a land grant to review on a different basis? I know in our department the ASPT guidelines are actually sent to the reviewers that we choose.

Dr. Trites: That would be required. All chairs and directors would receive at least one standard form. Now, I do believe this is going to be up to colleges what the uniform, like, how do I as a faculty member say, “Here’s what I want on my list.” We aren’t trying to dictate that. But all chairs and directors will be given a template of a letter that says we don’t want you to evaluate this person’s teaching, you can’t do that. You’re not part of our culture. We only want you to evaluate their scholarship within the field within the guideline within our units’ criteria. It would not be fair for someone on a 3:3 load to have someone from a land grant… I’ve graduated from one. So, no one at Texas A&M should be telling people in our Agriculture department or school, well, I got $97 billion worth of grants like they’d have to to get tenure here at Texas A&M. But no one from a land grant should be saying someone doesn’t deserve tenure here because they wouldn’t get it there. So, I’ve written dozens of these kinds of letters in my own career, and I always get the guidelines for that department. That has to be uniform across the board.

Senator Harpel: I understood that coming from my department, but I think the individuals that have the concerns didn’t understand that that’s how it would be done. Perhaps you need to have a discussion with the department that they’re in.

Dr. Trites: Yeah. Those are great questions, by the way, and your constituents are not the only ones to have articulated them to me. So, I’m glad to hear them because I know others have them as well.

Senator Harpel: The last one is more of a concern, so it came from someone who had at one point been a department chair and has returned to faculty, just saying that they didn’t really perceive them as being that advantageous once they became a chair, and that they felt that peers were better evaluators of their peers than external reviewers. So, they just wanted that concern shared as well.

Dr. Trites: I guess I’m stuck a little bit on the word peers because I consider the scholars in my field to be my peers too. So, I guess I’m absolutely missing that point.

Senator Harpel: They meant peers as being their fellow faculty in their areas. That they know more about their contributions and their teaching and so forth, than external peers.

Dr. Trites: Oh, gotcha. There are other English professors in the room, so I hope I will get forbearance from them. I’m a children’s literature scholar, and I would much rather have children’s literature scholars evaluate the depth of my scholarship than my good colleagues who are in cultural studies, linguistics, or rhetoric. That said, I’d rather have what you’re calling my peers, my colleagues in my department, evaluate my teaching and my service because they’ve seen me every day. They know when I’m working and how hard I’m working. So, if everyone in the department is kind of a generalist, that peer-to-peer scholarly thing makes sense; but since most of us do have a sub-specialization, if you would please convey to your constituent that I agree completely about the importance of peer evaluation, especially in teaching and service.

Senator Torry: I also went to my constituents, and I’ll be honest, of the 15 responses I got not one was in favor of this on any level, and for a number of reasons. I would like to forward them so you can review them.

Dr. Trites: What college are you in? And it would be very help, yes.

Senator Torry: CAST.

Senator Horst: Senator Harpel is in CAST as well.

Senator Torry: I’m also going to speak from my own experience, I’ve been in an institution where I have had to get this for myself. It was an institution that was department chair heavy, and I can tell you that those negotiations of selecting those three external reviewers with my department chair were not fun. I have no control, and I felt at the mercy of an external reviewer that I could not choose. So, I’m going to get in the weeds that I’m not totally against this process, but the management of it better be really clear.

Dr. Trites: That has to happen upfront.

Senator Torry: But at other institutions, many people do this, it’s not upfront. It’s not done.

Dr. Trites: It is in Arts and Sciences here.

Senator Torry: Okay. But I’m talking about outside these walls that you said, you know, let’s get our name out and other institutions do that. They’re not like that. They are department chair heavy in selection, and I’m against that 100%.

Dr. Trites: And I am too, frankly.

Senator Torry: My other issue is what are we trying to accomplish with this? I understand you are separating teaching from research, and we can get our name out there with our peers; but my peers know my name, my research, and publications anyway. So, I don’t buy that as a credible reason for doing this. My peers are at bigger universities. That’s who I’m trying to impress. I wouldn’t want them to review me because I don’t get the same start up. I don’t have the same teaching loads. I don’t have TAs/RAs. There are so many things that will go into selecting who is going to be those external reviewers. I quite frankly don’t know how in a large department a chair’s going to do this, relative to Illinois State and the culture from teaching and research, to select three peer reviewers from my research that could honestly understand my output in this university versus their own university.

Dr. Trites: You don’t think that if you provided the list of initial possible people, and there’s a template that explains what your start up was, you don’t think…

Senator Torry: I’ll even narrow it down to, in the State of Illinois, I’m not sure I could select reviewers from my state schools that could do that for me.

Dr. Trites: I’d be hard pressed if I had to do it in the State of Illinois myself.

Senator Torry: So, in the State of Illinois, our funding for things like start up is ridiculously low in state schools compared to outside of Illinois.

Dr. Trites: Right. I know.

Senator Torry: So, right there, I have an issue from accepting a peer review from Indian State reviewing my peer review research at Illinois State given I get below $20,000 start up and they get over $100,000. Right, there is the difference.

Dr. Trites: I’m going to turn this to a member of the URC who is from one of the bench sciences where we’ve been doing this process for, in my memory, 20 years. Kevin, can you talk about the process as it unfolds in your experience when you know that people in other bench sciences are better funded? Can you talk about that please?

Dr. Edwards: It’s my understanding, (and maybe some of my colleagues will know, the current practice)…It’s my understanding that a lot of that information that you’re talking about is given to those reviewers, so the reviewers are made fully aware of the resources that we have here and are asked to take that into consideration. That’s my understanding, but I’ll defer to my chair.

Senator Cline: So, I represent the College of Fine Arts and, like Senator Torry, I understand and in very general terms am in favor of movement in this direction; but I think doing it in this way is catastrophic. It’s a terrible idea. We don’t do outside review in the college. We do not have any support. Zero dollars do faculty get for travel and research on an annual basis. I cannot travel to a research conference. Zero dollars. And until those kinds of inequities are handled at the University, I think applying this kind of uniformity in the tenure review process is inappropriate and discriminatory to the areas who do have less funding and resources even than some of their colleagues. I think unfortunately you’re asking us to trust that the process will happen, but all the PNT guidelines in the entire College of Fine Arts would have to be completely revamped to even allow for the possibility of this. And you’re asking for us to approve this first, and then go back and approve the tenure and review processes throughout a college. It seems backwards and I think not having an escape route here is really problematic, where there is no culture of doing this. I’m a scholar, I could do this easily. I promote the long-term improvement of our place in the landscape of Illinois universities and all those things; but there are far too many problems in terms of unequal support across the University, especially my college, that make this kind of change seem punitive, given our historical practices in the college.

Dr. Trites: If I may ask, I didn’t understand what you meant when you said, “without an escape route.”

Senator Cline: It has been an option and now you’re mandating it.

Dr. Trites: That doesn’t sound to me like an escape route. But I get it. Totally get it.

Senator Cline: That you’re allowing the college to choose, and maybe this is a stepped process. But this would be a radical change for the College of Fine Arts and would have, I think, very little support.

Senator Horst: Senator Cline, didn’t we make this change two years ago? Am I mistaken about that?

Senator Cline: I was on the CFSC last year. This is not required.

Senator Horst: Oh. Okay. I thought the School of Music went in this direction, but maybe not external reviewers that are chosen by the DFSC.

Senator Cline: There are no external reviewers at all in the Wonsook Kim School of Art and there is no requirement at this point in the college.

Senator Horst: And this just leads me to a larger question, what is the background? What sort of research did you do about the different colleges and the patterns that are used? Are we correct, is there no process in the CFA?

Dr. Trites: To be fair, as I understand it, those processes are driven more at the unit level in the colleges other than Arts and Sciences. I could be wrong about that. I know the College of Business, for example, has not implemented this. I do want to point out that when we change our ASPT policies in a very major revision, like a brand new policy (what you call the coral book now) in 2000 this was the process. We all agreed what the University should be working towards. And then the departments (we didn’t have schools then) but the departments and colleges did do the work to meet the University’s shared vision. So, Senator Cline, on that one point, I wanted to just respond that I know it feels backwards to you, is what I think I heard you articulate, but we institutionally have done that before. You didn’t have the DFSC guidelines that you have now in 1995, they just didn’t exist. They did exist in a very different form. So, just a process question that I wanted to throw back to you.

Provost Tarhule: I try not to interject myself very much because I enjoy listening to the exchange, but I just want to share a couple of personal experiences, if they will help. I was chair for many years where we practiced this. I want to say that we should separate between the concept and the process of the application. So, the way that we did it when I was chair was that when somebody came up for tenure, that person would submit ten names of people that they thought would be suitable reviewers of their dossier. There were guidelines of where the names came from. The guidelines were that you should select individuals who came from schools like yours or departments like yours. So, try to find peer departments where you can find scholars that were as comparable as possible from institutions that were as comparable as possible to your department. So, the idea that you would get a reviewer from Stanford or Harvard when you know that’s not your category, you know, that’s not a good thing. Even then, some people would say, yeah, my research is as good as anybody anywhere and I would put names from places like that. But the person coming up for tenure would put up five or six names, the chair will come up with five or six names. One of the things we really tried to guide against was this; in the eventual letters that we’re reading, we want to make sure we have as many that came from the candidate as those that came from the chair. So, we didn’t want to have four letters that we’re reading by people who were nominated by the chair and three that were nominated by the candidate. We tried to have as equal as possible. That’s one.

The other is that the external reviewers are not being asked to decide whether you should get tenure. They’re being asked to comment on the quality of your scholarship. And as a rebuttal rightfully said, you actually have more people when we have areas—I’m a Hydrologist. Maybe in my entire department, I’m the only Hydrologist. This department is Geography. I’m a Hydrologist. My colleagues are Human Geographers. Who is better qualified to review me than other Hydrologists or my peers who work elsewhere as opposed to Human Geographers who are my colleagues? So, in that sense, you are actually reaching people who know your work, as opposed to people who don’t understand what you do. I don’t know what the situation in Arts is, but in my field, the distance between a Hydrologist and someone who studies Human Geography is night and day. So, it’s much better for me to have reviewers that are other Hydrologists as opposed to other Human Geographers.

The other point I will make is the difference between goals and specifics. As I understand it, this is almost like a goal or an aspiration. The actual specifics of how the process would work, departments will have to develop that themselves. Right. This is a goal. Basically, the only thing that it says is it’s encouraging an external review. The department will then work out the specifics of how they want to do that. If I’m speaking out of turn, please correct me. It’s very similar if you read the institutional language on tenure and promotion. It’s only one sentence, the person should maintain high quality research. That’s all it says. But then the departments work out what that means for them. So, I think here, also, the goal is to encourage external reviews. Then your department will work out those details.

Then with respect to where is this going. I think Roberta gave a good example when she talked about journals. Imagine a journal you set up in your departments. All the editors and reviewers are in your department. Sure, they know your work. How would you consider the work of your colleagues if they’re only published in journals that are all reviewed by people in your department? How would other people outside of our University consider the quality of the journal versus a journal that is reviewed nation-wide? I think we have excellent scholars here. I think our scholars can match up with any anywhere in the country. And we should be proud of that. We should be showcasing that work, not hiding it. We’re almost hiding it. I think in some ways, we are underselling ourselves. We should expose our work. They’re not deciding if you get tenure, they’re just commenting on it.

Finally, I would say from my perspective, I get to read all of this stuff in the end—it’s very, very helpful -- especially in those cases where we have some disagreement in the department between different reviewers -- to then refer to some of the external letters where they don’t have any of that baggage. They have that neutrality. They have no skin in the game. They’re just commenting on the scholarship. Again, they’re not saying give this person tenure; no, it’s just an internal neutral input into what that scholarship is compared to other people of peers, your groups, of your status. The only thing when we did this was to say that you don’t want to find reviewers at universities or departments lower ranked than you are. That was the only stipulation. So, just as we don’t want to find people too high up reviewing our work, we also don’t want to find people too far below your status reviewing your work because it doesn’t add much value.

Senator Bonnell: A lot of the comments mirror what we’ve heard before from others, Harpel, Torry, Cline, especially on the idea of what problem is this solving. So, that is something; if we require this, people will want to know that. One of the issues that haven’t been raised, from Milner’s side, is this idea of specialization. I think all of those that have commented feel that they would be at a disadvantage; because when you think about librarianship and you think about that pool of those librarians that have faculty status, that’s not something that happens at all in Universities and Colleges.

And then when you think about that, you break it down even further, there’s some librarians and archivists, special librarians who, Provost Tarhule, you talked about seeking out 10 people, that might not even be an option. There might not even be 10 people in the field who are talking about that same unit who have not a higher rank. Some people feel that would be really disadvantageous to them, and what would happen to them in that instance? And the other issue that people talk about was, again, the logistics which other people have commented here. It’s adding a layer. It’s making the process more work, and it’s uncompensated work for those people, our peers and colleagues at other universities.

And the last category of things that people commented about, again, it’s been raised here before, the idea that in Milner Library, we ought to be able to determine the level of scholarship and creative expression from our colleagues, from our peers. We know that work.

And the last thing I want to mention, again, I’m just reporting back what people said to me, they felt like this is a stick to them. Like this wasn’t something that was going to help them out. And it goes back to the issue of what problem is this solving. So, thank you.

Dr. Trites: Thank you. And I do think Provost Tarhule really hit on one of the problems it’s solving, which is when we get a split decision from a DFSC/SFSC. When we have objective people talking about the quality of the scholarship. Not should you get tenure, not how was your teaching, but simply, yes, this person’s reputation proceeds them. That does help us understand that there are some personality issues at stake. It actually does help us make the process more objective. So, just to go back to what problem are we trying to solve, that’s one. Another problem that we’re trying to solve is insularity, recognizing that there are other schools like us who make this work. We are a very, very excellent school. Why are we afraid of participating in a standard in our industry? There was one other question I don’t remember.

Senator Horst: Specialization. That she may not be able to find people.

Dr. Trites: Oh, yes. That’s one that I’m not quite ready to solve tonight. There was one that I was going to come back to, one that I had an answer to if you could...

Senator Bonnell: I have a whole page here. I tried to distill them.

Dr. Trites: I would encourage all of you who have heard from your constituents, please send use those lists. But I did have a response to you, I’m sorry it’s late and I’ve forgotten.

Senator Bonnell: Can I just say, the one that I found really sad, I’ll just say, is the person who replied that it was a stick.

Dr. Trites: That makes me sad too.

Senator Bonnell: So, I don’t know what to say to that, but that’s the impression that that person has.

Dr. Trites: One of the most joyous things I got to do in my career was, after the whole process was over, I was able to read those letters; and I was like, “Oh, wow, I didn’t know anyone thought that highly of me!” So, it didn’t feel like a stick to me at all. Again, I do agree with Senator Tarhule. You can’t confuse process with the goal and the vision; but the fact that I could control who was asked and my chair couldn’t go out and find people who hate me the most…Senator Torry, I do know that happens other places…

Oh, it was the uncompensated labor piece. When it’s done right, and I believe in Arts and Sciences, and I’m going to defer here to Senator Bowden, I believe we compensate our letter writers, admittedly a nominal amount.

Senator Bowden: That varies by department. So, we do not. But I’m asked to do this somewhat regularly and I do not find this as uncompensated labor. I actually regard this as one of the highest honors I can do for my profession, because I’m weighing in on the quality of someone else’s scholarship in a fair and impartial manner. I try to do this with the goal of providing a very fair and impartial assessment of this person’s work. I do not feel like it is my responsibility to decide whether or not they get tenure. I am simply evaluating the quality of the work and providing that information.

Senator Pancrazio: The question I have is, we’ve had these in CAS since around 2000 right?

Dr. Trites: Yeah. It was a little bit after 2000 when it was implemented.

Senator Pancrazio: And the way that we have been doing it, from all the descriptions I’ve heard, the way we do it in foreign languages is quite different in part we really need to rely on these; because, for example, one of my colleagues that is in Asian languages, I have no ability to evaluate some of those documents. The question I have is for colleges who have not been doing this, is there an avenue for the departments to create their own way of doing this? or is this coming down saying, because I think at one point—I’m hoping I heard it wrong—was like we’re going to give you this model rather than just saying you give us the model that you want to use?

Dr. Trites: No. My suggestion, Senator Pancrazio, involved hoping that we could give some templates that would help people.

Senator Pancrazio: Oh, thank you.

Dr. Trites: But as Senator Tarhule said, it’s a principle that we agree to, and then the units must determine how they’re going to meet this requirement. Now, the department of Oceanography doesn’t get to come back and say, “We hate the next five people that are going up, so we’re going to say they all have to be from R1s.” They don’t get to do that because it has to come back through their CFSC, and it has to come back to the Faculty Caucus. So, there is oversight in these policies. It’s not like one bad department. We all have shared governance to ensure that all schools and departments, all of the units, have fairs processes.

Senator Horst: And just to clarify, the part that’s going back to the Faculty Caucus would be the ASPT language? Yes. Okay. Very good.

Senator Blum: It’s really hard for me to say this is the way to get our—I just dissent on this point—that this is our way to get our University noticed.

Dr. Trites: It’s not the only way.

Senator Blum: It’s just that the body of work, the scholarship that people do here is what gets the University noticed. I realize this is a normative practice, but I’m going to tell you that universally, my department opposes this. I think at its core one of the things that is in the proposed language so far is specificity. Specificity about requirements in all the areas, but specifically in terms of scholarship. So, the problem now is, you have a call for specificity, and we’re working on my departmental ASPT right now trying to make it much more specific, particular in the area of scholarship. Now you have that specificity, and now you’ve introduced something that is loose, at best. Right. So, the whole point of having the specificity is so the DFSC could make those types of decisions. I think from the faculty point of view, and this is something we’ve never done in our college, although people have done it informally, I guess. So, if you were going up for full professor, people would solicit letters, but there was no requirement to do it. They just did it. So, you have this very specific requirements, and department X says that ordinarily for five peer reviewed articles and that is a successful portfolio towards tenure in the area of scholarship, then what do these people add? I think the anxiety is that you’ve specified that very specific criteria, and then now there’s this other commentary, and they were sort of evaluating themselves, on whatever it is, and there may be quality indicators beyond that. I used peer review as an example, there are many other types. But I think that right there is the tension, because you are introducing other voices that don’t seem to be sensitive. I know you are saying, well, we’ll give that to them, and stuff like that, but I think that’s what it is. I think the Provost said it well, we do quality work here. I’ll just let you respond.

Dr. Trites: Thank you very much. I appreciate you identifying the tension. Right. I’ve never written one of these letters where I didn’t get the specific guidelines. The hardest ones to write are the ones that don’t have any indicators of what they count as quality or quantity. Right. But if they say to me that it has to be five peer reviewed double blind, I can judge that. I can judge that easier within my field than I can within my department, because I don’t know other journals in linguistics, but I certainly do in my field. So, I do think this all has to hang on respecting the guidelines that are already in place, and then, as you said, this is then a second indicator of quality. So, it helps us cut deep and cut wide, instead of just going deep within the departmental view. So, that’s trying to add depth.

Senator Otto: Thank you. There’s a couple of things. I’m going to speak for myself first, and that is I want to echo what some of my colleagues have said. I am often asked to do the work of external review; I think of it as a great honor and I always learn a great deal from it. I actually requested external reviews when I went up for full, but as there’s no process or procedure or policy in the College of Ed, I wasn’t allowed to do that. That said, I think this mandate is causing a great deal of anxiety and frustration and, you know, the word hazing has been thrown around. For people who have come in who are not yet tenured, they came in under a certain understanding of no external reviews, and so now they feel like the goal post is being moved. So, what do we tell them? What do we tell them about how we’ll instruct external reviewers in pandemic times? And then finally, these are constituent comments, at the university level and at all the other levels, the school and department level, it will be very important if this implementation comes, even if it’s optional, to come up with very specific criteria on how these external letters should be considered in the overall dossier, and at what weight are they going to be given, as well as pointed conflict of interest guidance on both sides, both on the faculty members side and all of the FSFC sides.

Dr. Trites: I really appreciate you mentioning the thought of the goal post being moved. When Arts and Sciences implementing this, I don’t remember that being part of the conversation, although it had to have been in some departments. I also know that there’s ways if this is truly a deeply held fear, we can have individual units write into their policy for all faculty members hired after X, or Y, or Z date. We can’t grandfather people in by having some of the people using one policy book and others using another. But we can alleviate, especially if we’re talking about tenure as opposed to promotion to full. We have some flexibility there. I appreciate many of the things you said, but I do want you to know, I do take exception to the word mandate. This has not been mandated. This is a conversation that came to the URC from faculty on the Senate, and it hasn’t even passed the University Review Committee. So, I just want to make sure you understand, this isn’t a mandate. If it doesn’t pass through Senate it doesn’t happen.

Senator Otto: I understand completely, and I appreciate you saying that. I’m really just speaking the words of my constituents and how they see this potential large change. So, thank you.

Dr. Trites: Sure. And, Senator Otto, if you could help us spread the word that this is about shared governance, this is not about mandates at all. So, if you could help us spread that good word it would really help, and I’d be grateful. Thank you.

Senator Horst: We have five minutes. I’m just going to interject that I don’t recall this conversation happening in the Faculty Caucus. Maybe I’m mistaken about that. I’m just surprised at the lack of reach out to the different colleges that don’t have this current process. But that’s just my comment.

Senator Cline: I just wanted to make a follow up because I evidently didn’t communicate myself well. I’m a Classical Art Historian in the Visual Arts Department. You do not need to tell me how important it is that my work is not understood by the people who teach along side of me in the building, right. I understand that. What I’m trying to say is that I’m not certain that most parts of the campus are structurally ready for this change. New faculty in my department receive little if any start up, and we do not receive annual stipends to travel to conferences and the like. The rationale for this has always been that we don’t have external review. So, we don’t have the money to send you, but that’s okay that you’re not making those relationships in the same way that other departments are making them, because we don’t have external review. Now, is that fair? I don’t think so. Is that right? I don’t think so. But what I’m trying to say to you is that there are areas of the campus that are not, I think, structurally fiscally ready for this kind of process now. I agree, external review is a standard. I was very surprised when I was hired here and I was told that I didn’t have to do that. I think we should take it as a goal, but I think if we are as a group here trying to decide, there are so many negative responses, I hope you take that on board; this is what this sort of process is about. I haven’t heard any of us commenting positively. Right. That maybe we need to have, in the short term, that the University prefers that external review happen; and then maybe in ten years we’re ready to go to the actual requirement. But I just think that there are parts of this campus that are built around, that this doesn’t exist, and support their faculty likewise. And I think it’s important to not suggest such a radical shift when most of the campus, it seems to me, at least my school, is not set up to support faculty in a way that can support them in creating the relationships that external review would then become a meaningful part of the review of their career.

Dr. Trites: I’m shocked that you were ever told that the reason that you don’t get travel funding is because you don’t… that’s just… I can’t even express the words that are going through my head. I cannot agree with you more that if we are going to move this direction, we need to put our money where our mouth is. So, I do agree with you that we’ve got more than one problem to solve here. But Senator Horst, I’d like to come back to you, would the URC typically go college to college to college without first having talked to the Faculty Caucus? That seems a violation of shared governance.

Senator Horst: I wasn’t even sure if the URC was aware of which colleges did external reviews and which didn’t.

Dr. Trites: We’re aware. We’ve got a representative from every college.

Senator Horst: When I talked with Professor Buckley, he wasn’t sure. I’m not pointing fingers, I’m just saying I’m not quite sure there’s been conversations with different colleges that don’t have this, because it seems like a big shift. And that’s what we’re hearing tonight, is that it will be a big shift.

Dr. Trites: Yes. And I’m not surprised.

Senator Horst: All right. We have one minute so we’ll pick this topic up next time.

***Adjournment***
Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Meyers, 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 - EXCUSED | 0 |
| Harpel, Tammy | 1 |
| Hollywood, Mary | 1 |
| Horst, Martha | 1 |
| Lahiri, Somnath | 1 |
| Marx, David - EXCUSED | 0 |
| Meyers, Adena | 1 |
| Midha, Vishal | 1 |
| Nahm, Kee-Yoon | 1 |
| Nichols, Wade | 1 |
| Nikolaou, Dimitrios | 1 |
| Novotny, Nancy - EXCUSED | 0 |
| Otto, Stacy - VIRTUAL | 1 |
| Pancrazio, Jim | 1 |
| Peters, Steve | 1 |
| Samhan, Bahae | 1 |
| Schmeiser, Benjamin | 1 |
| Seeman, Scott | 1 |
| Smudde, Pete | 1 |
| Stewart, Todd | 1 |
| Torry, Mike | 1 |
| Valentin, Rick | 1 |
| Vogel, Laura | 1 |
| Bowden, Rachel (chair rep)  | 1 |
| Vacant - 1 CAS SS Faculty | 0 |
| Vacant - 1 Faculty Associate | 0 |
| **QUORUM IS 17** | 26 |
| (Provost Tarhule - NV) |  |