**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2021**

Approved

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate chairperson Martha Horst called the meeting to order.

***Approval of Faculty Caucus meeting minutes:***

[***August 25, 2021***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/agenda-minutes/faculty-caucus/Faculty%20Caucus%20Minutes%202021-08-25.docx)

[***September 8, 2021***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/agenda-minutes/faculty-caucus/Faculty%20Caucus%20Minutes2021-09-08.docx)

[***September 22, 2021***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/agenda-minutes/faculty-caucus/Faculty%20Caucus%20Minutes2021-09-22.docx)

[***October 6, 2021***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/agenda-minutes/faculty-caucus/Faculty%20Caucus%20minutes2021-10-06.docx)

[***October 13, 2021***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/agenda-minutes/faculty-caucus/Faculty%20Caucus%20Minutes2021-10-13%20ASPT%20REVIEW.docx)

The minutes were approved.

***Information Item:***

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

Senator Horst: Before we get to Article XVII, I have a request from Dr. McLauchlan regarding section XVII. The title of policy 1.8 has changed to Integrity in Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities, which I believe is mentioned in Section 12.C.

And then at the beginning of Article XVII, you have a section, “Illinois State University encourages the fair and equitable resolution of appeals” in section A, and then it says, “Appeals policies and procedures in this Article address the regularly scheduled processes for promotion, tenure, and annual performance evaluation, cumulative post-tenure review, non-reappointment recommendations, and disciplinary recommendations.” I’m going to suggest that you refer to see Article XII.C for exceptions there, which is the Integrity policy. That’s one of the exceptions.

* [10.08.21.08 ASPT REVIEW\_ Section XVII](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/09%20-%2010.08.21.08%20ASPT%20REVIEW_%20Section%20XVII.docx)

Dr. Buckley: The change here is regarding formal meetings being requested by faculty. It was felt that the language was not clear enough. This language that we suggested may need some tweaking itself, but the point was that a verbal or informal email was not sufficient to request a formal meeting. It needed to be a formal request for the meeting. And then we needed to clarify that the request for a formal meeting did not constitute the appeal itself; it just began the process.

Senator Stewart: I have a question passed to me by a constituent. Is it the idea that an email request is never good enough or that there is a different between informal and formal email request, and if there is a difference, what is it?

Dr. Buckley: The thought was that a formal email request was different than an informal email request. Email was not ruled out but that might need to be clarified.

Senator Blum: I just want to second that. It’s really confusing about what a formal and informal, and what all this is. I really think that it should be clear enough that a faculty member can easily understand how to request their meeting.

Dr. Trites: I have a member of my former DFSC here when I was serving as an interim chair, it has been known to happen that a faculty member says, “I might think about wanting to appeal this,” and then thinks that’s the request. So, help us with that language please. I agree that what we have here is not ideal, but I have personally experienced that exact problem; we ended up scrambling right at the deadline because the person did not actually make it all that clear to me or the DFSC that he or she wanted an appeal.

Senator Horst: I have another comment on the informal email part. I think people are thinking you want a formal paper letter. So, I think the combination of informal and email is part of the confusion.

Senator Nikolaou: Couldn’t we just say a verbal or informal notification? Why do we need the email in there? Because that’s the same problem. How do I know when my email is regarded as formal and when it is regarded as informal? Then we just need to remove the quotation at the end of the sentence.

Dr. Trites: That might address the issue.

Senator Meyers: I’m just wondering why the original last sentence in this paragraph isn’t sufficient to rule out the scenario that we heard about, somebody asking informally. “I maybe might want to…” it seems like that is not clearly stating in the written request your reasons for the meeting.

Dr. Trites: But we’ve also heard of chairs/directors having this problem with a faculty member orally saying something. I think we just mean this to be a reinforcing statement. I think Senator Nikolaou has really helped us, by taking out that word “email,” I think we reiterate the point and make it even more clear.

Senator Carte: I was just going to suggest maybe rather than getting focused on the nature of the communication, it would be important to indicate the content of the communication. So, it can’t be oral, but a written communication that specifically says I’m formally requesting and appeal. That should, I think, deal with the ambiguity there, probably better than anything else.

Senator Horst: And I believe Section XVII. C is where you specify what you need in that communication. It says, “An appeal is here defined as a written statement by a faculty member that explains why a faculty member believes that there has been a misinterpretation, misjudgment, or procedural error…”

Senator Beucher: I was wondering if adding the word “inquiry” may be helpful, because it sounds like that’s where the nature of the confusion might come up. If somebody is emailing a chair/director asking about the process and then thinking that that might be a formal appeal when it wasn’t. Because I’m wondering if the word “notification” might still be confusing.

Dr. Buckley: It’s my recollection that the problem is that it says in writing, but that saying in writing allows an email that does not rise to the level of formality that it’s clear that’s initiating the process. Right. I think the idea of adding the specific language, so it has these magic words, that it’s an official notification. But I think that would clarify that. Otherwise, my assumption was that people know that a formal request would be a business letter form and not just a couple lines of an email. But maybe we need to draw that line clearly and that would suffice.

Senator Otto: I think it’s important that we don’t shut down the informal dialogue because, in my experience on the DFSC and the CFSC, sometimes the faculty member just has a question and doesn’t mean to appeal but would like more information, and that’s a more informal conversation. So, making a differentiation between informally speaking with or posing questions versus an official notification that this person is starting the process of appeal. I think it would be great to make that distinction.

Dr. Trites: That’s helpful, Senator Otto. Thank you.

Senator Meyers: I would just reiterate that the first two sentences already specify “in writing”. So, I don’t know where there’s room for a verbal request. And if more clarity is wanted, maybe in that second sentence could say, “state clearly in the written request that a formal meeting is being requested, and the reasons for the meeting.”

Senator Horst: As opposed to just the section; be a little bit more explicit.

Senator Meyers: And then I don’t think it needs to say verbal, email, and all that stuff afterwards, personally.

Senator Torry: I’m kind of going to agree with Senator Otto in that anything that I do or say might just be gathering information, and we don’t want to quelch that. But there’s got to be a document that I sign and check that says I’m moving from inquiry to action. And I’m thinking why don’t we just provide that document. Say, okay, if you want to do a formal appeal, you can talk to whoever you want, email whoever you want, but if you want to go further, this is the form and check this box, and once you do that you are making the decision to initiate the appeal process. And we create that form. We have a form to initiate the tenure process, the promotion process that goes with our document. Create the same one for this process so that there is no ambiguity about what I’m asking or what I meant or inferred. This is a document that I sign and check that I am appealing, and that’s where any sort of ambiguity stops.

Dr. Trites: I can see the wisdom of that.

Senator Horst: Any other questions about that? (Pause) Okay. Now we are moving on to the changes in **Section XVII. D.1.** As I read this document, the first sentence in the mark up was a slight wording change, “The faculty member appealing must be afforded a reasonable time to present arguments.” It includes the words “the” and “appealing.” Anything else you want to say about this change?

Dr. Trites: That was just clarification. I think the more significant change to this section is at the end of that paragraph.

Senator Carte: I just have one question and it’s not about the change that you made, and I’m just a bit curious. It says, “Information not originally presented in applications for tenure/promotion or annual evaluation materials may be considered at the discretion of the DFSC/SFSC or CFSC,” which suggests that a faculty member gets to continue to add materials that they left out in their initial request beyond the department level. Is that the intention?

Dr. Trites: I believe it is. If new information comes to light, for example, I get a new publication going from an R and R to being accepted while I’m appealing to the CFSC, and the DFSC has already heard my case, I should have the ability to add that additional information.

Senator Blum: “Additional information shall be provided five days prior to appealing.” What happens if that deadline is not met?

Dr. Trites: I always assume everyone follows the rules. (Laughs) I don’t have a good answer. I would presume at that point it would have to get kicked into some sort of other process, very likely handed to the FRC.

Senator Nikolaou: This is just a clarification. When we say “shall be provided,” but then by whom and to whom? Do we need to say that it shall be provided by the faculty or by the appellant to the chair of the committee?

Dr. Trites: We’ll do that, but we’ll take it into the active voice rather than the passive voice.

Senator Beucher: I’m wondering about clarification for first sentence: “Faculty member appealing must be afforded a reasonable time to present arguments.” Is that the actual time when they’re in the room making their appeal? Okay. And then there’s a separate timeline for the amount of time that they have from when they got the decision that they’re appealing, and then that’s somewhere else in this document? Okay.

Senator Otto: I think that this notion of “at the discretion of the DFSC/SFSC” is a little bit worrisome for folks because what is that discretion? Are there criteria that’s associated with it that makes something admissible versus something that is not permissible to add to your dossier? So, I would encourage that to be clarified.

Senator Bonnell: In other places we say five business days, is this meant to be five business days?

Dr. Trites: Yes. Thank you.

Senator Carte: Just to follow up on Senator Otto’s comments on this notion of discretion. When you gave your example, you talked about evidence that was not available previously. That might be better language rather than a faculty member just digging back into what they’ve done but they just forgot or left out originally. It would take the discretion piece away too. Say if new information is available, that should and will be evaluated. Just a suggestion.

Dr. Trites: I like your point very much, Senator Carte. I’m concerned by that word discretion myself, even though that’s not what we were charged with doing in this section. I would not want to be the faculty member whose department chair said I have the discretion to say no. I think we do need to clarify all of that language. So, let us tinker with this a little bit, because I do think there are some great wisdoms in what you’ve said.

Senator Carte: And let me just say I wouldn’t want to be the department chair that says I have the discretion to say no either.

Senator Blum: I just wanted to say quickly that AAUP best practices on tenure and promotion recommend that those deadlines be specifically set. So, specifically this issue, that there’s new information that’s added, right, so the deadline should be very clear from the beginning when new information can be given. Now, I’m not sure that that can be decided at this level, but it can be asked to be clear at the FSC levels what those dates are so you would know, in terms of tenure and promotion, these are the dates.

Dr. Trites: It’s in the Appendices that have the timelines. So, if, for example, the CFSC is accepting something that came out during the two weeks between your appeal and when it goes to the CFSC, those dates are listed; so that would make it very clear what your absolute drop-dead date is for that one last acceptance you really need. But it’s a very well taken point.

Senator Beucher: Do you know about this addition of five days prior, because prior to this is was just at the meeting, and you bring forth your evidence. I’m curious as to why the five days prior was added in? And also, to express a concern that, I believe it’s already a tight turn around time; this is putting additional pressure on a faculty who’s also carrying out all their other job responsibilities at the same time to putting their appeal together with five less days.

Dr. Edwards: I don’t recall the specific discussion, but it seems to me that if material doesn’t come in soon, it’s sort of like when you get the master thesis the day before the defense; it’s hard to give a fair reading. So, you want to be confident that the FSC has had time to read what they’ve got from you. While the timeline is tight, I think you do need to leave that time to really consider it.

Dr. Buckley: I don’t recall where the five days came from, but I think the intent was to provide time for that information to be considered fully.

Dr. Trites: Because you are right about it. Effectively, at least at the DFSC/SFSC level, it’s effectively 10 working days right now. Please let us go back and review that. You are right. That appeal level cuts the time in half.

Senator Horst: But you wouldn’t want somebody to come to the meeting and drop something on the table.

Dr. Trites: Here’s a 40-page article, read it now. Correct.

Senator Beucher: Just to follow-up on that. The deliberation happens after that, not at that meeting, so they could still look at the materials after.

Dr. Trites: Not in my experience. The deliberation happens after the person leaves the room.

Senator Beucher: Okay.

Dr. Trites: But the timeline is such that you don’t get another week to make your decision. For example, if it’s scheduled on February 15, then you don’t have time to deliberate. But we do need to look at that though because your point is absolutely right.

Senator Horst: Any other comments? Alright. We will move to Section XVII.D.4. Seems like a straightforward reference.

Senator Cline: Can we step back. It’s not really relevant to D.1 but D.2, I’m not sure but the typo of “eaching” rather than “teaching.”

Dr. Buckley: I think it was just lost in the transferring of documents.

Senator Cline: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Nikolaou: I had a question in that same section in D.2. Currently, the last sentence states that, “The DFSC/SFSC has the discretion to limit the number of witnesses…” suggesting that there is the possibility for the DFSC/SFSC to limit the number of witnesses to zero. Therefore, should we specify what the lower limit is? For example, to limit the number of witnesses but to no less than one witness?

Dr. Trites: I think that’s a really good point. I mean, again, this not something that this URC was charged with addressing; so I think the way to handle that would be for us to add something like “to have the discretion to limit the number of witnesses,” but something like, “to no fewer than 1 no greater than whatever,” or just “no fewer than one.”

Senator Horst: Now we will go to **Section XVII.D.4.** This is just adding a reference.

Senator Nikolaou: I think instead of saying “refer to” we might want to say “see” because that’s what we say in the previous sections of the document.

Senator Horst: Yes. Consistency that is important. Now, moving to **Section XVII.E.3**, you’re proposing to strike this language. Could you talk us through that?

Dr. Buckley: As the note on the right says, there was a feeling that this was redundant. I will let Dr. Trites address the DFSC/SFSC/CFSC discretion issue on that.

Dr. Trites: I do believe that the note provided there does exactly explain why it’s being stricken. It’s not that we’re trying to eliminate informal discussion, it’s just that that’s covered in a different place.

Senator Horst: I’m not sure we all have the footnotes. Can you walk us through the logic of striking, “Information not originally presented in applications for tenure/promotion may be submitted, and will be considered at the discretion of the Chair/Director or Dean”? I think what you’re saying is it’s not at the discretion of the dean or chair, it’s at the discretion of the committee?

Dr. Trites: The note that’s on the side reads, “This paragraph seems redundant with Section XVII.A’s text on informal meetings and gets in the way of DFSC/SFSC and CFSC discretion.” That we just discussed.

Senator Nikolaou: But on the other hand, if we remove the whole paragraph, does it mean now that additional information can be provided and not be accepted? Because the paragraph said that instead of meeting with the whole DFSC, I can ask to meet with the chair or the dean. During that meeting I could provide additional information, and then it is at the discretion of the chair or dean to accept it or not. Now that we delete the whole paragraph, does it mean that I still meet with the chair, I provide additional information, and now they have to accept this additional information? Because before we were saying it is at their discretion to accept the additional information. But now if we don’t have documentation, and the chair accepts this additional information going back to the previous part in D.1…. if the chair has this information, shouldn’t they share it with the DFSC? That means it’s not up to their discretion anymore.

Dr. Trites: I believe that informal means that I talk one-on-one with my department chair who then takes it to the DFSC. So, I think that’s the nature of what a “informal meeting” or “informal resolution” means. Maybe underline why these two things seem to be different?

Senator Nikolaou: Where is the informal part? Because I don’t see the word informal here. In Section XVII E.3, the one that we’re proposing to delete, it says, “As an alternative to a Formal Meeting with the entire DFSC/SFSC or CFSC, an opportunity to meet with the Chair/Director or Dean shall be provided.…” Then it says that during this meeting, if I believe there was material that was ignored or misinterpreted, I could present it; and then also the last sentence says, “Information not originally presented in applications…may be submitted and will be considered at the discretion of the Chair/Director or Dean.” Now if we delete that whole paragraph, I can still meet with the chair and I present the material; but if I present the material, doesn’t the chair now have to accept this new material because we just removed the sentence that says that it is up to the discretion of the chair or the dean? And then, if they have to accept it, if we go back to what we were discussing earlier in D.1., where we said it was at the discretion of the DFSC, well if the chair has this additional information and has accepted it, they have to present it to the DFSC.

Dr. Trites: I would like to put that in the category of, we need to redefine what we mean by “at the discretion of.” So, would you please allow us to take both of these questions back to the URC? Because we can’t resolve the question you’re raising now until we resolve the previous problem with the word discretion.

Senator Horst: Would they have permission to submit it to the chair or director if the language wasn’t here? Because you can have the meeting, but would you necessarily have permission to submit something to the chair or director if there is no language there?

Dr. Trites: That’s covered in XVII.A. up at the very beginning about encouraging the informal resolution. So, I think that’s part of the problem, we have not defined what informal resolution looks like as opposed to informal meeting, informal resolution, formal meeting, formal written notification… Do you see what I’m saying? We’re using a lot of formal and informal in different contexts.

Senator Nikolaou: But section E doesn’t talk about informal, it’s just formal.

Dr. Trites: Right. I was just giving a whole list of ways that I see a lack of clarity around similar and overlapping issues.

Senator Aldeman: Just a couple of quick comments. I think to me in section A, there’s nothing in there about a meeting with a department chair or a dean. So, to me, I don’t think that’s redundant with the part that’s being proposed to be stricken. Then, in E.5., I’m wondering if that would also need to be stricken if E.3. is stricken also? Because that also refers to the meeting with the chair/director or dean.

Dr. Trites: Were you referring to the old 5 or the new 5?

Senator Aldeman: The new 5 where is says, “The timeline for meeting with the Chair/Director or Dean…”

Dr. Trites: Thank you.

Senator Horst: Alright. We are now on **Section XVII.G.2**. **AFEGC complaints to**. This is just a reference to the policy, correct?

Dr. Buckley: Correct. I believe these next series of changes all refer to clarifying AFEGC grievances and appeals.

Senator Horst: I do note that there is a gender he/she in this part that you might consider to changing gender neutral. Are there any other comments?

Senator Otto: I’m thinking that in 3.3.8, there are actually letters like a-something that should be considered.

Senator Horst: I think there’s a 3.3.8 and then it goes into the letters.

Senator Otto: I’m wondering if it includes all of those or if it’s just the one?

Senator Horst: Is this the first reference to the AFEGC?

Dr. Buckley: I don’t believe so. I think it comes up somewhere earlier in the policies.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, you might want to put it at the first time.

Senator Nikolaou: Right now, it talks about academic freedom or ethics. Do we need to add “or grievances?” I was just wondering because we are eliminating the G part of the committee.

Senator Horst: But actually, later on we’re not.

Senator Nikolaou: But also, in 3, for example, it also says “if the FRC believes that the basis for the appeal is an academic freedom or ethics violation.” So, again, is it that we don’t care about the grievances? I’m wondering should it state “academic freedom or ethic violations,” or do we need to say “academic freedom, ethics, or grievance violations”?

Dr. Trites: I suspect that the implication is that all grievances are either going to fall under academic freedom or ethics. I only suspect that. I wasn’t around when this was added. But it would be easy enough to ask. It’s hard for me to imagine a tenure and promotion appeal that isn’t based on a grievance of academic freedom or a grievance of ethics.

Senator Horst: I actually looked into the policy to make sure that I understood the grievance part, and the AFEGC policy defines a grievance as “any dispute with respect to the meaning, interpretation, or application of University policy, or any dispute arising from the deviation from longstanding past practice.”

Dr. Trites: That makes it definite that we should add it. Thank you.

Senator Horst: I had a question going past that, but let’s state that that’s what the grievance part means.

Dr. Trites: Thank you. That was very helpful.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, this was just the reference to just AFEGC, yes?

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. And if we add it, then we need to add it under 3 in the first sentence as well, because it talks about only academic freedom and ethics. It’s the sentence immediately following the one that was added.

Dr. Trites: We might need to go back and look at the FRCs charge. We’ll include it if we can, but the original language might have left grievance, as Martha just read, the definition for a reason. So, we need to make sure if the FRC is charged only with academic freedom and ethics violation but not grievance, because grievance goes to AFEGC. Let’s check that out since we’re not clear on it, okay.

Senator Horst: I’m not sure if you have a policy interpretation in the appeals situation. That’s my next question. But let’s get to there. We have a simple proposed reference to the AFEGC policy in Section XVII.G.2. If there’s no objection we’re going to move to **XVII.I.1**. “If the CFSC believes that the basis of the appeal includes matters under the jurisdiction of the AFEGC and the appellant faculty member has not already done so, then the CFSC may refer the matter to the AFEGC and suspend its proceedings until it receives a report from the AFEGC.” Are there any comments about this change?

Senator Nikolaou: Then it says that if the faculty member has not already done so, then the CFSC may send it to the AFEGC and then they are going to suspend the proceedings. Do we need to clarify that if I am the faculty and I have submitted to the AFEGC the proceedings will also stop for the CFSC, right?

Dr. Trites: I believe that’s covered in a different section.

Senator Horst: My question was, you have a CFSC appeal, and the CFSC is supposed to be doing interpretations of faculty performance and adherence to the ASPT policies. So, they’re the ones that are supposed to be interpreting the adherence to the ASPT policies. But then you’re sending it to another body that’s—the grievance part—is the interpretation application of University policy. So, I’m a bit confused about the role of the AFEGC if you’re including the grievance part with the policy interpretation and then the role of the CFSC.

Dr. Trites: I would imagine that the AFEGC would be better poised than the CFSC if it’s a matter of an ethics violation, for example. So, if, for example, the CFSC believes that the DFSC has done something unethical, specifically to the candidate, and they want a more neutral body to determine that, they should have the right to say, “AFEGC, we need your help determining if this is an ethics violation.” I think that’s what that’s about.

Senator Horst: That’s the E and then the F, but the G is about application of University policy and interpretation of University policy, so that’s why I’m a little bit confused. The CFSC is supposed to hear an appeal regarding adherence to ASPT policies. The A, F, and E are clear. But if we’re including the G part, which gets into policy interpretation, then where is the line between the CFSC and the AFEGC?

Dr. Buckley: The AFEGC does not handle anything with ASPT. So, the AFEGC would reject anything that was ASPT, so that conflict shouldn’t occur.

Senator Horst: Okay. Are there any further questions about Section XVII.I.1? Okay. Then we will go to **XVII.J.1** and it’s similar language here. Are there any questions about this? No questions? Okay. Then we will go to **Section XVII.L.7** adding the language, “and the appellant faculty member has not already done so.” Any questions about that? Alright. That concludes the discussions of the Articles.

If people don’t mind, I have a note to bring up Professor Kalter’s language regarding the timeline we talked about with the CFSC and the DFSC working on their procedures, but I don’t have that language in front of me. But I just have one question about the definition of faculty in the beginning, and I think I sent you guys a note. As we were working on the deletion of this policy and we were discussing the dismissal of non-tenure track faculty, it was discovered that in the Constitution there is language that points for dismissal for processes for non-tenure track faculty it points to the ASPT process, which was surprising. But that’s what it says in the Constitution. So, one possible way to deal with that would be to just say for the dismissal process the term faculty would apply to non-tenure track as well as tenure track; but there’s that very specific language in the beginning that says faculty is tenure track. So, I just wanted to present that idea to you.

Dr. Trites: It’s only in the dismissal process that we need to add that?

Senator Horst: I will leave that to the URC to consider.

Senator Nikolaou: Just a small typo, to fix “under” in the “includes matters der the jurisdiction.”

Dr. Trites: I pointed that out to Chad.

Senator Beucher: Since we raised gender neutral language previously, this wasn’t an item we discussed but K.5 uses a he/she.

Senator Horst: Thank you Senator Beucher. I’m sure you could do a search and replace. So, we have completed our review of the articles.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Beucher, seconded by Senator Blum, 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 - EXCUSED | 0 |
| 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 - EXCUSED | 0 |
| Schmeiser, Benjamin | 1 |
| Seeman, Scott | 1 |
| Smudde, Pete | 1 |
| Stewart, Todd | 1 |
| Torry, Mike | 1 |
| Valentin, Rick | 1 |
| Vogel, Laura | 1 |
| Carte, Traci (chair rep)  | 1 |
| Vacant - 1 CAS SS Faculty | 0 |
| Vacant - 1 Faculty Associate | 0 |
| **QUORUM IS 17** | 27 |
| (Provost Tarhule - NV) |  |