**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, January 19, 2022**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

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

Senator Horst: This meeting is being held electronically. President Kinzy has deemed that in person meetings conducted by the Academic Senate are not practical during the time of online teaching and learning. Therefore, from January 10 thru January 21 meetings of the Senate and/or it’s committees that are subject to the Open Meetings Act should be held via electronic means.

***Approval of Faculty Caucus meeting minutes: 12/08/21***

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

**Assistant Vice President for Academic Administration *Search Committee election***

Jack Glascock, COM, CAS

Dimitrios Nikolaou, ECO, CAS

Julie Webber, POL, CAS  
Greg Ferrence, CHE, CAS

Yayuan Ren, FIL, COB

**Nominations from the Floor:**

David Malone, GEO, CAS

Mona Bahl, MQM, COB

Jake Blakeman, MCN

Robyn Seglem, TCH, COE

Kevin Meyer, COM, CAS

Tracy Mainieri, KNR, CAST

The following faculty members were elected via electronic ballot as a pool to be provided to the Provost for the Assistant Vice President for Academic Administration Search Committee. Of these members, the Provost will choose four to serve on the search committee.

Dimitrios Nikolaou, ECO, CAS

Julie Webber, POL, CAS  
Greg Ferrence, CHE, CAS

Yayuan Ren, FIL, COB

David Malone, GEO, CAS

Mona Bahl, MQM, COB

Jake Blakeman, MCN

Robyn Seglem, TCH, COE

Kevin Meyer, COM, CAS

Tracy Mainieri, KNR, CAST

**Assistant Vice President for Student Success Search Committee election**

German Blanco Lobo, ECO, CAS

Saskia Beranek, ART, CFA

Tyler Kybartas, KNR, CAST

Rachel Hockenberry, MUS, CFA

Mallory Jallas, MIL

**Nominated from the floor:**

Tom Lucey, TCH, COE

Julie Campbell, PSY, CAS

Chris Hamaker, CHE, CAS

Eric Peterson, GEO, CAS

Willy Hunter, CHE, CAS

Madeline Trimble, ACC, COB

Tina Fillman, MCN

The following faculty members were elected via electronic ballot as a pool to be provided to the Provost for the Assistant Vice President for Student Success Search Committee. Of these members, the Provost will choose four to serve on the search committee.

German Blanco Lobo, ECO, CAS

Saskia Beranek, ART, CFA

Tyler Kybartas, KNR, CAST

Rachel Hockenberry, MUS, CFA

Mallory Jallas, MIL

Tom Lucey, TCH, COE

Julie Campbell, PSY, CAS

Chris Hamaker, CHE, CAS

Eric Peterson, GEO, CAS

Motion by Senator Nikolaou, seconded by Senator Smudde, to approve the following elections as a slate. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Academic Planning Committee replacement***

Jennine Harey-Northrop, CSD, (Qiliang He, HIS, 2020-2022)

**University Library Committee election**Guang Jin (Michael Barrowclough, CAST, 2019-2022)

***Council on General Education***

* Taeok Park, CSD, (replacement for Georgia Tsouvala, CAS, Social Sciences, 2019-2022)
* Bill McBride, ENG, (spring 2022 sabbatical replacement for Amy Wood, CAS, Humanities, 2020-2023)

***Information Item:***

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

***12.09.21.04 ASPT REVIEW Appendix I***Senator Horst: At the very end of our last meeting, we discussed revisions to the calendar in Appendix I. The information came from the documentation from the University Review Committee, however it was not presented with all of the text of Appendix I. So, Cera created a mark up of Appendix I which includes the calendar for performance evaluation review of tenured faculty only. The Faculty Caucus Executive Committee thought it important to have a conversation on this even through we touched on it before, just to make sure now that we see it in context there are no further questions. We do have members of the University Review Committee here. Thank you very much for joining us. Are there any questions about the material presented in front of you?

Senator Bonnell: Milner constituents had some questions and concerns about this. I’ll start off with the people who supported this. They appreciated the extra time to review and provide input for the tenured faculty. Typically, when there are interviews for some of the tenure track positions that we have, those usually fall in January, so they appreciate it because the extra time helps out in that case. And it also happens that the American Library Association, we have our conference in January. So, this would also help out with that.

There are people who had some concerns about the calendar. They cited things like, they feel like this is a split evaluation period, and it creates another logistical detail for the DFSC chairs to figure out. They feel like it creates some inequity for reviewing or could play out in the salary incrementation process. They feel like the processes shouldn’t be different for the different faculty lines. There is a concern that some tenure track appeals would be conducted when the tenure faculty are being reviewed. They are concerned that there would be a longer review period of tenured faculty. And this extends the process which then creates a trickledown effect for others who aren’t on the DFSC/CFSC, and those things would include like collaborative work. So, when other people are on DFSC other people have to kind of fill in for what they are doing.

And then the questions. People are interested in knowing, what’s the rationale for this? And they’re wondering if you considered extending the deadline for all people to February 15. And then there was one question about whether URC considered creating an earlier submission deadline in December? Thank you.

Dr. Buckley: The rationale was to allow more time to focus on pre-tenure evaluations so those aren’t so rushed. We did talk about the extra time, and I will let Professor Trites jump in as well, but the impetus was to allow more time to focus on pre-tenured faculty.

Dr. Trites: And I don’t think the suggestion to extend everyone to February 15 is a bad one. That might very well help alleviate some excellent points that Senator Bonnell raised about pre-tenured people going through appeals, while their colleagues on the DFSC are still getting their letters written. Those are things that we had not discussed. I think those are excellent points. So, there might be some wisdom if our concern is rushing. There might be some very real advantages for us to consider moving everybody back to February 15. We did not consider, nor should we, I think, a December deadline because teaching evaluation summaries don’t get to faculty in time, what with university closures sometimes coming right on the heels of when grades are due in December. So, I personally would prefer to see us go to an academic year evaluation and have materials due in September/October but that was not supported by the Senate last year. I think in this instance you have identified that the real problem is rushing. Maybe the best solution would be for us to consider that February 15 for everyone.

There was one more question, I think, Chad, that you were asking. Oh, the raise process happens much much later, all evaluations would be done by that time, so there shouldn’t be any discrepancy on how raises are calculated. Was there another question that I missed?

Senator Bonnell: Thank you for your response to that. I think I’m going to do a batch… maybe describe how Milner does it. We do our review, “meets, exceeds, does not meet,” and that’s how our salary incrementation process occurs as well. So, it’s simultaneous. If there is a review period for pre-tenure, and they’re a cohort unto themselves, they are then “meets, exceeds, does not meet” done separately. And then follow that process for tenured, they’re a separate cohort. There still is a split for us for the salary implementation process because we align our salary incrementation process with those ranks, if that makes sense. Chad, if you can make that more clear than I can?

Dr. Trites: Okay. I’ll just throw out my question because I’m not tracking whether you answer it or whether Professor Buckley does. Are you operating from a quota system where only x number of people per rank kind of exceeds? Okay. Then I definitely don’t understand… I really think a solution would be to put everybody on February 15, so I don’t want to spend a lot of time splitting hairs on this one. But I’m definitely not understanding if the standards are the same, the standards are the same for each group. So, that’s the piece I’m not understand, but that’s okay that I don’t understand.

Dr. Buckley: We did talk in URC that practically most salary incrementation tend to fall within the January start date. So, that does leave plenty of time throughout the whole calendar year once the evaluations are completed and January/February for that information before forwarding it on for salary incrementation.

Senator Horst: I’m just wondering, if we moved everybody to February 15, how would that impact the non-reappointment calendar?

Dr. Trites: We would have to look at that, Martha. We have not looked at that because we hadn’t thought about it until this last 10 minutes. We have not done that homework.

Senator Blum: I just wanted to speak in support of a universal timeline. I think the non-reappointment calendar is an important issue. I also think that having flexibility within DFSCs to manage it is important. For our department right now, we have so many assistant professors that there really is no benefit to a split. Almost all of them are assistant professors. So, there are different stories all around campus from DFSCs/SFSCs, but I think the extra time—we have a reasonably large department, and I know there are departments that are even much larger than ours—basically this is some kind of insane spread in the beginning of January. I can’t think of any reason why that’s fundamentally necessary.

Senator Horst: Thank you, Senator Blum. And I know you’ve been serving on a lot of SFSCs throughout your career, so you have a lot of valuable perspective. You don’t think the extra time would benefit you?

Senator Blum: Let me clarify what I’m saying. Yes, I do think extra time would be beneficial, but I think it would be extra time for everyone. Yes. Sorry if I didn’t state that clearly.

Senator Horst: I see. Thank you.

Senator Blum: So, yeah. I actually do think it would be beneficial, in particular to large departments that have a lot of faculty to evaluate. But it shouldn’t be a split between tenured and non-tenure. Let the DFSC manage those kinds of issues. And by adding the flexibility, say to the 15th for example, if that’s a suitable date, then I think the DFSC could figure out how to manage their pre-tenured faculty versus their tenured faculty and work out their own system.

Dr. Trites: Senator Horst, you hit the nail on the head. I’m on page 89 Appendix I, A.1.a the notification in cases of non-reappointment shall be received “not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service.” So, to give the proper appeal time for pre-tenured people the deadline does need to be Feb 1. So, if we want everybody to have the same amount of time, then we keep the marathon sprint that we’ve got, keep making mistakes, and using the two-week period to correct it (which seems inefficient) not every department that’s heavy on assistant professors is going to be that way 10 years, 5 years from now. And if we really feel like a two-week difference isn’t something that we can trust DFSCs to have fairness on, the most compelling argument that I’ve heard is definitely appeal processes happening when the DFSCs are still being written. That might be a justification for having… we just have to have the three-and-a-half-week sprint.

Senator Horst: Thank you.

Senator Cline: On a slightly different topic. I know, Dr. Trites, that Chairperson Horst addressed part of this question, but I just wanted to bring it up in front of the body. Given that there is a lot of discussion about external review processes. I think we can expect that over time external review processes will become more standardized across our campus, but at this point they are not standardized and so there is inconsistent use. I would ask the URC to consider the possibility that under item B. November 1, that there be some sort of statement that all external review processes shall have concluded by that time. Right. I’m not asking to change the date in any way, shape, or form, but in an acknowledgement that that review process begins earlier that November 1, and that’s sort of an external to the candidate process. But it might be nice to simply have a cavate that says, external review processes shall have concluded, or what have you, just so that benchmark is there.

Dr. Trites: That’s an unspoken assumption in Arts and Sciences right now, and I definitely think that needs to be put in writing. Absolutely. Thank you, Senator Cline.

Senator Horst: Further comments?

Senator Blum: I just have a question. Could non-reappointment calendar be adjusted slightly by like a week or something? I mean, if it’s March 1, March 8 instead? And everything is just a week later, rather than two weeks later, is that a possibility?

Dr. Trites: It could be. It’s something we haven’t looked into closely enough. I know that when we initially established these calendars that we were trying to follow AAUP guidelines for non-reappointments in particular because that’s a very sensitive issue. So, we’re trying to offer as close as we can to 90 days’ notice, which is not quite that. It’s 75 days’ notice right now. So, I think that’s a much larger issue and not something we’re going to be able to determine tonight without a great deal more in-depth study on that. But, Craig, thank you, I appreciate the spirit that you’re coming from.

Senator Horst: Right. And that timeline is so compressed now. I think they have five days to decide if they have an AFEGC case because the timeline is already very compressed. I wouldn’t be in favor of compressing that even further.

Dr. Trites: I wouldn’t either.

Senator Horst: Are there any further comments or questions on Appendix I? Seeing none.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Lucey, seconded by Senator Grieshaber, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.

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