**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, February 9, 2022**

**Approved**

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

***Roll Call***

Academic Senate secretary Dimitrios Nikolaou called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Approval of Faculty Caucus meeting minutes: 01/19/22***

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

***NextLMS Taskforce election (1 Faculty Senator)***

***01.25.22.08 Academic Senate rep for the NextLMS Taskforce***

Meeting Information:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Friday, February 4 | 1-2:30 | Zoom |
| Friday, February 18 | 1-2:30 | In Person- HOV 105 |
| Friday, March 4 | 12:30-2:00 | Zoom |
| Thursday, March 24 | 9-10:30 | Zoom |
| Thursday, April 7 | 1:30-3:00 | Zoom |
| Thursday, April 21 | 9-10:30 | Zoom |
| Tuesday, May 10 | 2-3:30 | STC 401 |

Craig Blum volunteered on the floor and was elected to serve on the task force.

***Information/Action Item:***

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

* ***Section VII***
* ***Section VIII***
* ***Section I***

Senator Horst: I would like to just briefly talk about the process that has been going on since we last looked at this document. I’ve reviewed all of the minutes from our meetings and summarized them in a letter to the URC. The members of the Faculty Caucus Exec reviewed that summation and they agreed, or they instructed me to elaborate on some parts. We sent that in later December to the URC. Then they responded January 24. They have been able to consider some of my revisions, not all of them, and have forward to us their response for items in Articles I thru VIII. That’s how far they’ve gotten.

We have three sections listed where there is new language that the URC is proposing. So, the Faculty Caucus Executive Committee would like us to consider that as an Information Item because it has not been seen by the Faculty Caucus at this point. After we conclude that discussion, we’ll have a motion to start moving these as Action Items.

But let us begin with Article VII. This is document 01.25.22.05. I want to make sure that you have the right document revisions to each version. The new language is in B. We have language that we mentioned in our first discussion about having a specific letter that specifies which proportion of time commitment expectations for scholarly, creative activity, and service. And then we have new language in D.

I want to acknowledge our guests. We again have the chair of the URC Professor Buckley and we have Professor Trites.

Are there any questions or discussion about this language?

Senator Nikolaou: Only one small item. Where it talks about “teaching, scholarly, and creative productivity,” because that’s how we call it throughout the document, instead of “activity.” In the first sentence where it says, “shall specify the proportion of time commitment expectations for teaching, scholarly and creative…” productivity instead of “activity” because that’s what we call it throughout the document.

Dr. Trites: That’s fine.

Senator Cline: It’s lacking the oxford comma. That same line.

Senator Blum: I want to express a concern that was raised in the Department of Special Education. One of the issues is regarding faculty with disability. This actually presents, I think, an opportunity to talk about service especially. I really like the language here. But the concern that was brought up by the constituents in my department was we have certain faculty with disability that are really at, particularly when it comes to service, they are at a huge disadvantage. We have some of these faculty in my department that… because you are consistently trying to make different documents service ready and stuff like that, participation in committees can be more time consuming. So, I’m wondering if the URC could make that part of the consideration, like disabilities and accommodations? Because there is really no way to address it in terms of performance. Things are taking extra time because the way we set things up at the University.

Senator Horst: Would that be accomplished thought an accommodation?

Senator Blum: Well, you couldn’t accommodate because if it takes more time, it just takes more time. Right. So, you really couldn’t accommodate the standard.

Senator Nikolaou: Is it going to be captured from part C where it says, “In the performance evaluation of faculty members, the DFSC/SFSC shall recognize that individual efforts and activities elicit different types of productivity,” etc, etc. that we might have service activities for teaching or scholarly, but they are going to take into consideration individuals. I don’t know if it’s covered there.

Senator Blum: There’s a path to that. I’m not sure that that is clear thought. So, I don’t disagree with what you are saying. I don’t know that I have great language for this. I’m just raising a concern that was raised by the Department of Special Education and thought the URC might have some thoughts on it.

Dr. Trites: At this time, no, I can’t say we have thoughts on this because I don’t believe we have discussed it. We can certainly raise this issue with the URC and in fact I think we should. But I don’t know that just this one place is the one place that if we want to add this kind of language that it belongs. It seems to me it’s a much larger issue than just the assignment letter. So, perhaps the URC can look at an even better fix, a better way to address this issue than simply shunting it off and attaching it to the assignment letter.

Senator Blum: I think that’s agreeable. Thank you.

Senator Wang: I just need a clarification. Coming from a practical point of view, I want to know the intent of the word proportion. Are we referring to percentage or just in general proportioned?

Dr. Trites: Yes, that’s right. It is meant to be the percentage.

Senator Holland: Are these percentages supposed to be based on a twelve credit hour base load?

Dr. Trites: University policy stipulates as much right now. I anticipate that in the fullness of time that is going to be addressed through other mechanisms that we will look at that policy. So, I would be reluctant at this time to add to this language anything about fraction or a proportion of a twelve-hour load because that might then mean we’ve got a problem when we look at the policy.

Senator Horst: Yeah. I had that exact same question. There’s this policy 3.2.11 which is where it lists the load as being twelve credit hours but the release... So, Provost Tarhule and I are looking at that policy and we’re going to potentially redraft that part of the policy if this language is passed. I conferred with Janice Bonneville, Roberta Trites, and Lisa Huson today and they didn’t see a problem with the potential tension between policy 3.2.11 and this language.

Senator Holland: I just know that there are a lot of different ways different departments count with a number of credit hours an individual teaches. So, no matter what you do it’s going to be inconsistent across the university.

Dr. Trites: At least in the way that it’s reported out right now. It does continue to be inconsistently reported, Senator Holland.

Senator Horst: Can you elaborate on that?

Senator Holland: In some departments if you go over a certain number of students in a classroom then it will suddenly start counting double even through it might actually be way less work than a class that actually has 10 students in it. If you take a graduate level class then you’re putting in an awful lot of blood, sweat, and tears into that. Whereas I can teach 180 freshmen and everything is graded electronically, and everything is set up on PowerPoint. I just go in and teach it and answer questions outside of class.

Senator Horst: But I don’t think this is going to be tied to credit hours. I think it’s going to be a conversation between the chair and the faculty. Is that correct?

Dr. Trites: That’s the intent of this statement in the ASPT document. Policy 3.2.11 is also not calculated by credit hours generated. So, that is controlled largely at the department and school level how those things are counted. And I don’t think this document needs to address the fact that each department or school might handle these things differently.

Senator Valentin: I know in Music we’re teaching students one-on-one oftentimes.

Senator Horst: Yeah. And we refer to Nazem standards on how we calculate it. But I think the intent of this policy is that there’ll be clear expectations in each area with proportion of how to count that time.

Senator Wang: Let’s assume no complication and a faculty teach three credit hours, that’s nine credit hours. So, basically twelve credit hours. So, what’s the proportion that we should put in there and divide it into teaching, research, and service?

Dr. Trites: That’s a discussion for another day that doesn’t have anything to do with this particular policy. That is governed at the college, department, and school level not, by this University document.

Senator Horst: Provost Tarhule, Senator Wang was not here when you discussed this before. Could you expand on your philosophy behind this language?

Provost Tarhule: Yes. This is not meant to specify what the proportions that departments take. It’s meant to encourage departments to develop those proportions. Currently, there are some departments where service doesn’t appear in the handbook at all. So, a department say your teaching is 75% and research is 25%, service doesn’t appear at all. So, how do you evaluate faculty member for service when you don’t tell them what they’re suppose to do? They don’t know what that expectation is. So, it’s about encouraging departments to develop those expectations. This is the first step. It’s not meant to marginalize what the departments do. So, with this language it places a department… your department could say, how do we want to count research and service and teaching. You could do that in different ways. Some departments might say if you are pre-tenure we expect a reduced service for you. After you get tenure, you have a higher service expectation. You could also accommodate the question that Senator Blum raised at the department level. So, this is really just about saying that faculty should know what they are going to be evaluated on. If you are evaluating faculty on teaching, research, and service let them know. Don’t say you are going to be evaluated on two and then you turn around and evaluate them for three. So, if you don’t tell them now, how do you even assign a weight to their service contributions?

Senator Horst: Thank you. Am I correct in saying that the evaluating metrics won’t necessarily be tied in with the proportions that’s dictated in this letter? Is that correct?

Dr. Trites: That’s correct.

Senator Bonnell: In the middle of that paragraph there’s a sentence that says, “Departments/Schools shall take measures to ensure that there is well-defined and equitable assignment of service…” There’s a question in the library about what a measure might look like. How would that be happening at the department or school level? Did you have any ideas?

Dr. Trites: I think this is a commitment to fairness. I wouldn’t presume to tell you what would be fair in Milner. But I think the idea would be for your service commitment (if you are being judged for librarianship and for scholarship) that you are whatever percentage your service is. Let’s say all four of us are sitting on a similar number of committees as opposed to you having six and me having zero. I think that’s what it’s meant to be is at the local level the unit defines what is a reasonable load.

Senator Bonnell: I guess I’m asking how would that process happen? How would that be defined?

Dr. Trites: That would happen through ASPT revision of the Milner ASPT guidelines. I think the operative part here and the units shall take measures to…, that’s the important part here is that not all units have that written out and that’s the change we’re trying to make here.

Senator Bonnell: I guess I’m just saying that maybe that should be clarified. That it would be in the document at the department level.

Dr. Trites: It would be really easy to add in the units (or whatever the right language is) in the ASPT document. It would be very easy to add, sure.

Senator Horst: I do think that Mennonite does it in their college bylaws—I recall that from my Rules Committee days. So, it might be good to specify where it should show up.

Senator Meyers: Two questions. One is just to refresh my memory. This date of March 15 is unfamiliar to me, for the date that the assignment letter comes. Would that be the assignment letter for the following year?

Dr. Trites: I’m perplexed myself, Senator Meyers, because that’s very new and very different. It has typically been August 15. So, can you let us look into that? And we would also want to consult with the chairs and directors on this. I suspect that’s just a good catch on your part of a typo. Because I think a lot of departments don’t have a clue, for example, what committee assignments are going to look like by March 15. So, that’s a very good save. Thank you.

Senator Meyers: For the second questions, I feel like this is rehashing some of the discussions that happened last time that this item came up. And following on one of Senator Bonnell’s questions, there is assignment of service responsibility that happens in the assignment letter, and then there are evaluation of the service that the person did which is usually, in my department, mostly based on a whole bunch of other stuff that’s not what was assigned. And I’m having trouble understanding which of those or both is what’s being addressed here.

Dr. Trites: Assignment. I think the idea is for you to know upfront what you’re assigned to do because we have a lot of units right now that never specify what your classes are, when they are to be taught, how much you’re getting reassigned to service commitments out of that teaching load. So, I think this is an effort to get consistency on the assignment end to then affect later in a different section of the ASPT policies consistency of evaluation.

Senator Otto: This is just a little language thing. In the next to the last sentence, “Departments/Schools shall take measures to ensure,” is there some reason that we need “take measures to” rather than just say “shall ensure,” which I know is hard to say. But is “take measures to” referring to something?

Dr. Trites: No. I think that’s just wordy verbiage. Thank you, Senator Otto. Well received. Dually noted, we’ll change it.

Senator Nikolaou: Going back to March 15, I found my notes. The concern last time that we met was that the students should know who the instructors are going to be for the fall semester and we also need to have the textbook selection. And for example, for the fall semester in 2021 it was March 19. So, it would make sense that if you were faculty you would know what courses you are going to teach, because you need to submit your textbooks that you are going to have for the students. I think the other part that we mentioned, even if it’s not March 15 it should be before the end of the spring semester because the faculty need to prepare for the courses, and we cannot request for them to work on the courses during a period when they are not under contract.

Dr. Trites: I think right now a lot of departments handle those differently. So, the August 15 letter I was talking about was the more formal letter than the typical email that people get that say here is your class assignments that you receive usually well before the 15. But I don’t think most department chairs or directors are in a place to start thinking about service assignments then. I think what we are talking about here is kind of an apples and oranges about the informal communication that goes out to you to tell you what your courses will be, that goes into course finder, so the students know, versus what I just mention, that formal assignment letter that’s finalized by August 15. So, let us take a look at making sure we are consistent about that.

Senator Horst: And this is for proportion, not necessarily to specify specific things.

Senator Meyers: For clarification, is the expectation that the chairperson or director will be assigning service only within the unit? Or would that assignment letter become service outside?

Dr. Trites: That’s again why it would be difficult to assign a date of March 15. There is a provision later on that says it will acknowledge, you’ll get a revision, say for example, in September you get elected to a university wide committee. So, the chair or director is assigning only in the unit but then us acknowledging if you’re serving on a university level committee or a college level committee.

Senator Meyers: And would that acknowledgment be included in the assignment letter or not?

Dr. Trites: Typically, it would not be in March because we don’t know. But that’s why there’s a provision in there for revising it.

Senator Meyers: So, ultimately the letter would reflect that once it gets revised and it would reflect service outside of the unit as well as inside the unit.

Dr. Trites: That’s the intention. Yes.

Senator Horst: This is covered in the next part in part D. So, I think we can move on to that proposed language. There’s a new sentence, “Faculty members shall include in their annual performance reports all service activities that they were assigned, as well as any informal or unassigned service activities that are pertinent to the faculty member’s professional duties.” Are there any comments or questions regarding this new language?

Senator Stewart: Could you just say a little bit about why the sentence ends the way it does with “pertinent to the faculty member’s professional duties.” What is that meant to add here or convey?

Dr. Trites: I believe that’s talking about both internal and external service. So, for example, I don’t get assigned by my department chair, nor should my chair assign to me the service I have as an Editorial Board Review member.

Senator Holland: I’m assuming that that also includes… there’s a lot of service that people might do in the community, organizations that aren’t involved or related to their teaching.

Dr. Trites: I think the idea is that if I play second violin in the Peoria Symphony (in my dreams), it doesn’t have anything to do with me as an English professor. But if Senator Horst does then that is within the scope of her professional duties.

Senator Horst: But if I volunteer for the Habitat for Humanity, would that be included?

Dr. Trites: It would depend on your unit’s definition of how they want faculty being publicly engaged. I personally wouldn’t report it myself, but I can really imagine units where that would be highly pertinent.

Senator: Construction management.

Senator Cline: I would just add my voice to the concern about the way it’s stated. “Professional duties” seems sort of as an exclusionary marker. I understand nobody in this university is going to get tenure based on community engagement, but I think it’s an important growing aspect of our university, civic engagement, and so the notification in our documents about what kind of civic engagement people are doing I think would be important. Again, it’s not going to be agar to get somebody tenure, so there’s something about the professional engagement that seems intentionally exclusionary.

Dr. Trites: Can you suggest some language, Senator Cline?

Senator Cline: I’m not sure… I would just leave it off. I would say, “…any informal or unassigned service activities” period.

Dr. Trites: Period.

Senator Otto: I’m just a little bit worried about peoples understanding of assigned versus elected. Because I can’t really think of a service activity that’s interior to the institution, all the way down to the department, that I’m not elected to. I’m just worried that people may have some confusion around that. I’m not sure I have any assigned service.

Dr. Trites: I would say, for example, a department chair who assigns someone to work on a program review as part of their service. They’re not elected to that position, as an example.

Senator Otto: Okay. That makes sense to me, but it sounds like we’re talking about all service in this document.

Dr. Trites: That we can fix. Yeah.

Senator Pancrazio: Just a clarification, in our department, that would be an elected position, somebody doing program review.

Dr. Trites: Not in every unit.

Senator Horst: Or if I helped students start an RSO and then I was their advisor.

Senator Smudde: I was thinking the point of the phrase that we’ve been talking about is really to suggest that whatever someone does ought to pertain to their field, and that the work that they do… say I work in public relations, and then I do some volunteer work for Habitat for Humanity and I’m doing some public relations or other kinds of communications stuff, that would qualify and it’s also in my field. I think that’s kind of what this phrase is getting at. I agree that it ought to be clarified in some way, but tied directly to what it is that somebody does in their field of specialty.

Senator Horst: Is that something that’s clarified in an appendix?

Dr. Trites: I would like to defer to what Senator Cline was referencing earlier. When you were talking about the encouragement, we’re all encouraged to be more publicly engaged. I’m perceiving Senator Cline and Senator Smudde to be coming from different positions. And I think it’s an important one for us to clarify.

Senator Holland: I tend to agree with Senator Smudde that anytime we’re evaluating somebody based on their professional activities should definitely be in their field. I highly encourage people to get involved in anything in the community, but I don’t think it’s appropriate to rank somebody for that.

Senator Stewart: I just wanted to comment that many faculty engage in lots of student mentoring, and I’m not sure how that relates to my field exactly. I might mentor students that are not philosophy majors even though I’m a philosophy professor in various ways, but that seems like relevant service.

Dr. Trites: I again, think this might be a more local matter. I can imagine some departments or school really wanting all faculty to be involved in community outreach of some sort. And I can imagine others that would say, no, Roberta, we don’t care about your violin playing because you’re an English professor. I wonder if this is not something that is going to be resolved at the local level, and perhaps we don’t need to make that distinction as we move forward.

Senator Avogo: I think she has made my point for me. It’s more of being resolved at the department level, because if you limit any service that would be of contribution to the community, in my opinion we’re going down a slippery slop. Because if I serve in my church, which I do, and the College Council, and I do a lot at my church, would I be at liberty to report that to my service? I have not done that because I think it’s not something that I’m looking for credit for in my profession. Things that I would do in my profession tend to be a little more different and well defined than what I would do in my church or in my community. So, I think we should leave it to the departments.

Senator Blum: One of the things in listening to this discussion and questions, it seems like leaving it in departments is a good idea, but it will also, I think somehow, we need to prompt the departments to actually define these. So, if you’re going to leave it, I think it’s an idea with lots of reasons why different disciplines/areas might view this really differently. So, that should be left to a department or school. But at the same time, departments, I really do believe, should lay this out for what’s going to count and what’s not going to count. That should be clear in the department document.

Senator Horst: Is that typical in the department governing documents?

Dr. Trites: In some it is and in some it’s not. English, for example, does ask that we report whether we spend an hour a day, a week, a month, a year on each of our service activities. But I think English might be in the minority of asking that in our annual productivity report.

Senator Horst: But the types of service that they would accept, is that something that’s in some department documents?

Dr. Trites: If it’s in English I’m unaware of that.

Senator Nikolaou: But part of that might be resolved when we start looking at the appendices because the service appendix talks about how civic engagement should be one of the types of service activities that’s going to be reported. But if someone is doing community service and it’s related to civic engagement then hours, assuming we’re going to adopt that language in the appendix, they can claim it even if here it is not as clear.

Under F, do we need the “no” part? “Unless no new information” or “unless new information is discovered?” I think the addition is “no new” but my question is do we need the “no” part. Because we say that if there is new information or the department changes their recommendation then it’s going to count. But now we say, “unless no new information.”

Senator Horst: So, you would say it was clear if it says unless new information is discovered?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes. So, my question is do we need the “no” over there or not?

Dr. Buckley: I believe that can be removed. I believe this was a suggestion from Faculty Caucus to change the additional to “no new,” so we can consider that.

Senator Horst: Are there any other comments from Article VII? Seeing none. We will now go to Article VIII. We have new language in part A. There was no additional information in Article VIII, no response for URC regarding anything else in Article VII. We are just going to focus our discussion on part A. We commented that it was vague last time. So, they tried to add more clarity.

Senator Nikolaou: My only question was if we should remove the “/or.” Because if it is and/or then it means that I can just look at your contribution to the community and totally ignore your contribution to the university and the discipline. Because it says that it could be the discipline, it could be the university, or it could be the community. But I wouldn’t think that for promotion you would just look if someone contributes to the community regardless of the discipline at the university.

Dr. Trites: Are you recommend that we take out the “and” or “or?”

Senator Nikolaou: The “/or” because “and the community” it also means your professional organizations where you participate.

Dr. Trites: I’m not sure that’s how I would read community. I would read it as something here in McLean County. So, what I was curious is are you now saying that everyone must be doing community service in order to achieve promotion. I don’t think that’s what you are saying.

Senator Nikolaou: No. If we leave the “or” someone could say I can only do the community part and claim that I’m going to get promotion.

Dr. Trites: Right. And we do have service to the discipline in field of interest, which includes external service. I think there’s not a real easy way to put in community if in some fields it’s very pertinent to be working in the community and in other fields it’s not. So, I think that’ s what we didn’t have, simply the “and.”

Senator Seeman: I have a question along the same lines as that. Going from assistant to associate level in terms of saying contributions to the university. I know in our department typically you’re not doing much service centered things in terms of contributing to the university, outside of what you would do service wise for the department. So, that was always the case.

Dr. Trites: I think the idea that we’re trying to get away from counting metrics says that, like, we’re not going to say did you check your department box, the college box, the field at large box, and the university box. We’re saying just the opposite which is we don’t want you counting those wells.

Senator Horst: Any further comments or questions? We’re in the question phase.

Senator Blum: It says, “clear, specific, and well-communicated criteria…” and then in the second sentence it talks about holistic and qualitative review. In our department, we just updated this, there is both quantitative and qualitative criteria. So, it’s not just counting materials. And those exist in the different areas. So, I would say the metrics that we have set forth in our new and revised standards have qualitative metrics that I would expect that assistant professors would want to know.

Dr. Trites: There’s nothing to preclude quantitative and qualitative evaluation. It is saying that you may not only use counting metrics.

Senator Horst: You do not satisfy the criteria simply by having four articles.

Senator Wang: Just a suggestion. Maybe I think the confusion comes because it’s a negative sentence. Is it possible that we can rephrase it in a more positive way? There would probably be less confusion.

Senator Horst: This is their second attempt.

Dr. Trites: To be fair, I think we are trying to prohibit something, which is why it’s in the negative. Because we really are trying to prohibit: you must have 10 points, which you achieve by publishing one point for this type of journal and two points for that type of journal, and all you’ve got to do is get to 10 points. So, we really are trying to prohibit something, hence the statement in the negative.

Senator Wang: I’m not an English major, I’m just thinking out loud. If we indicate that this shall take a holistic and quantitative review.

Dr. Trites: But that’s not prohibiting counting metrics, which is explicitly what we are trying to do. And we did revise this based on a previous conversation where we had some contradictories be quantitative and qualitative at the same time. We realized as a committee that what we were really trying to get at when we initially phrased it that way was that we were trying to preclude solely counting. This is the revision that addresses what the Caucus asked us to address.

Senator Horst: I have three fantastic articles, but I don’t have four. Or I have four mediocre articles. So, it should be holistic review, not necessarily counting metrics.

Senator Avogo: Just a small clarification. Who constitutes holistic and quantitative? I’m not talking all the criteria; I’m talking the metrics. You wanted four articles, five articles within a certain period. Who made that?

Dr. Trites: Again, this is about… that sentence is that simply counting is not enough. We want the whole record to count. We want the quantity as well as the quality of your publications to count. We want to know that you’ve done a fair amount of service but we’re not going to count, did you do department, college, university level committees. Nope, you didn’t, no tenure for you. So, really, I think the holistic part is we want everybody to have their whole portfolio looked at not simply the boxes checked.

Senator Horst: Could this land us some flexibility with some candidates that went through the COVID years, for instance, and their research was impeded because they couldn’t travel because of COVID.

Dr. Trites: That would be an example of a holistic review, yeah.

Senator Novotny: I’m not sure this captures what you are saying. I feel like I’m hearing two messages. Would adding the word only at the start of the sentence, would that account for all of…

Dr. Trites: I would prefer something like simply or nearly. But, yes, I do think that might add some clarification.

Senator Novotny: Okay.

Senator Horst: Great. I’m going to propose now that we go to the main event, which is the language in Article I. We requested a definition of conflict of interest when we last discussed this part of the ASPT document. I noted that there was some language that came from Legal. We passed some language that defined conflict of interest in policy 1.8. We are now going through the language that is coming back from the URC which is new. Everything else, they accepted our changes, or they did something else. But this is actually new language. So, we’re basically having an Information Item on this. This is Article I document number 01.25.22.02. Committees: Policy, Selection, Organization, and Responsibilities, and part B has a definition of conflict of interest.

Senator Otto: I think this really well covers the personal consideration side of things. But I wonder if we need to include something about institutional considerations, such as in the case of legal litigation, someone on… you know, there being that kind of conflict of interest.

Dr. Trites: I think we thought that was covered by personal considerations, Senator Otto.

Senator Otto: I’m just going to put that out there and let you all think about that. Because I think that maybe personal considerations aren’t really going far enough on that side of things.

Dr. Trites: Thank you.

Senator Blum: Are there professional conflicts of interest? There seems like there must be, right, like some kind of professional bias.

Dr. Trites: Yes. My co-author, the person who published the idea a week before I did so I hate him now.

Senator Blum: Right. So, that kind of thing.

Senator Horst: So, are you proposing adding the word professional?

Senator Blum: I don’t know if that was what Senator Otto was getting at, but to me professional is not listed here and it seems like it’s a common conflict of interest in academia.

Dr. Trites: Yes, I agree with that.

Senator Otto: I agree.

Senator Avogo: Why do we say faculty members may not state their reasons for revocation?

Senator Horst: That was a suggestion from Senator Reese-Weber that we discussed at one of our first meetings. So, that’s coming from a suggestion by the Faculty Caucus.

Senator Avogo: So, if I wanted to state my reasons, I can’t now.

Senator Horst: She commented that she thought a case actually was tainted because somebody said, “oh I just think this is a bad case and I’m going to recuse myself,” if I recall her comments.

Senator Pancrazio: Also, if a person decides to recuse themselves and then provides a rationale for it, it would run the risk of swaying the committee or advising the committee. So, the idea is to allow the committee to just speak directly to the evidence they have.

Senator Horst: We also discussed personal relationships that may not want to divulge, if I recall Senator Nikolaou’s point.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah, that’s when we had the more detailed language.

Senator Horst: Do you have a question?

Senator Nikolaou: The only point I had, in that sentence where it says, “No person at any level may participate in situations where there is a conflict,” of interest. Other than that, I think it works, especially with the addition of the professional part.

Senator Samhan: I don’t know if this is something we can change to the document here or to be added. But at the CFSC level, it’s consistent with members of each members of a department from the college. When they review the tenure package for faculty, the person from that person same department is excluded because of conflict of interest. So, just because you are of the same department it’s considered a conflict of interest automatically. I personally find that not true because the person then would be the best who can speak on your case on your behalf because they know the field very well. They can argue for the packet that you’re putting up for tenure. So, I’m not so sure if that’s something we need to edit to say that if you are a member of the department you are not automatically excluded or recused because of a conflict of interest.

Senator Horst: Senator Samhan, that’s covered in a different part of the ASPT that’s not currently under review. And that was hashed out, I believe, by Senator Holland many years ago. Lots of debate about that one.

Senator Holland: It depends on the college you are in and each college voted to whether or not they wanted to have their faculty recuse themselves from the CFSC.

Dr. Trites: But that is specific to CFSC. And this is a more general, any type of conflict of interest.

Senator Horst: And just in general, so everyone understands, we have sort of a formal agreement with the URC that they are the primary body to propose things and then we review it, debate it, and then approve it. We can amend it at that point, but we are not reviewing the entire ASPT document at this point.

Senator Otto: I just wanted to suggest in the last sentence of that first paragraph, “Faculty members should not state their reasons for recusal.,” that that should be may not.

Dr. Trites: I believe that we were actually responding to the Senate because if one person states their reasons and possibly sways the opinion of the DFSC and another person doesn’t because they fear revealing something about a personal relationship in the past, we’ve got two different types of problems. And so, that is intentionally shall not, or should not, or whatever it is, to protect everyone. If we say may not, then that means that I can go in and say I’m recusing myself because Senator Pancrazio is an idiot—he knows I’ve always thought that.

(Laughter)

Senator Pancrazio: Nothing better to do on a Wednesday night.

(Laughter)

Dr. Trites: So, I think if we say “may not” we’re going to create some problems down the road that are alleviated if we say you cannot.

Senator Horst: Senator Otto, I’m just going to point out that that’s the kind of edit that we can do when we’re in the action phase. So, we can have the debate and vote to have the wording change. Did you have any further questions, Senator Otto?

Senator Otto: No, but it seems to me that the word may actually means that you cannot, that you should not. Not that you should which leaves that open.

Dr. Trites: How about shall?

Senator Otto: I think that would be better.

Dr. Trites: now I understand.

Senator Horst: Any further questions? There is interesting language regarding the, “Failure to recuse in response to conflict of interest would provide grounds for an appeal of an ASPT decision.” Can you go through your logic regarding that sentence?

Dr. Trites: So, if Senator Pancrazio is mad at me for not recusing myself, he does have grounds, if he can prove that I had a legitimate conflict of interest, which my personal opinion of his intelligence (which is actually quite high) has nothing to do with an actual conflict of interest. But if for example, we shared a yard line, and I lost and he got 10 feet of my yard and I didn’t recuse myself, that would give him grounds to appeal.

Senator Horst: And then, “The ASPT document for each unit will specify the details of the recusal process,…” Can you just reflect on if we did pass this language, for instance, and there was this other discussion about the definition of service, what would be the timeline for the DFSCs to develop this sort of language?

Dr. Trites: I think we have some language in here somewhere else about when we will be asking revisions of documents. Not unlike what happened when we put in the disciplinary articles. We told every unit we need your revisions by X date. So, I think that’s in there somewhere else, but if it’s not we’ll make sure it is.

Senator Blum: One of the things that it talks about is being replaced. Is that even permissible? Is it permissible to replace a DFSC or SFSC member? I know if they are on sabbatical or leave or something like that it is. So, are you saying they would have to build a policy for this particular situation, like during a tenure or promotion case?

Dr. Trites: I’m thinking of an example of a married couple, because that’s a pretty clean and obvious one. I personally would argue that, no, that spouse should not be replaced if they had been elected to the DFSC, but I could imagine in another department that would say for the entire tenure and promotion process for everybody going up we want that person replaced just for this one function. So, I would rather leave that to the unit.

Senator Horst: So, they could appoint an alternate, for instance.

Senator Wang: Just a clarification. In this case, a recused member must be replaced?

Dr. Trites: No, in fact I said just the opposite. That it would be up to the unit to define if they wanted if, for example, someone only recuses themselves every year when it’s their husband’s annual evaluation letter, they might not want to be, but if it’s a matter of promotion and tenure the department might want a whole new member there. So, we are not saying top down. We are saying the unit must define that.

Senator Horst: Including for instance, the number of committee members. So, if it’s below a certain threshold you might need to replace.

Dr. Trites: Yeah. If we had three first cousins on the same DFSC and they all had to recuse themselves, we would need to replace them. Yeah.

Senator Wang: May I suggest that when the time comes that you provide language for the units to have. I think that will be very helpful.

Dr. Trites: Yes.

Senator Horst: And that would be done in a different context, when the time comes?

Dr. Trites: Yes.

Senator Horst: Any other questions about this?

Senator Cline: I would say that I don’t disagree with all the comments and statements, but the way that the last sentence of that first revised paragraph, “Faculty members should not,” or may not, or however that’s going to be resolved, state their reasons for recusal. It seems very abrupt in the paragraph and I wonder if it might be smart to preface that to say, in order to avoid bias or cannot state it publicly, couch it in some way because out of context it seems kind of strange.

Dr. Trites: And you’re also asking us to explain the benefit of everyone having the same rule, and that’s a great idea.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, to summarize, we have the proposal of the word professional. We have the proposal to say whether to call it a conflict of interest. We had a nice conversation about may or shall or should, and I’ll true to the English professor for that. And then the comment that there could be a sentence before the last sentence in the first paragraph that stated the logic behind why members shouldn’t state why they’re recusing themselves.

Dr. Trites: Or even an introductory transitional clause.

Senator Horst: There you go, very good. Are there any further comments about this language? Okay. I’m going to propose that we take a short recess and then have a motion to go to Action Item.

Okay. So, now we have done an initial review of the articles that the URC sent us and also their replies. We are still waiting to see what they do with some of the other articles language revisions they are consideration, for instance, I suggested language changes in the overview section. So, because things are at different phases, I’m going to propose that we go article by article and set them to be separate Action Items. We will have a motion and a section for each separate article and we’re not at all going to consider the total document. Is there any objection to that approach?

Motion by Senator Lahiri, seconded by Senator Smudde, to move document 01.25.22.03 Article IV College Faculty Status Committee for Information to Action Item. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Horst: I’m going to note some editorial changes. We had an editorial proposal when it said performance evaluation the URC is comfortable taking out the dash. That’s an acceptable friendly amendment. However, when it has performance evaluated, they’d like to keep that dash in. I’d like to suggest a friendly amendment in part A where there is a paragraph above the membership of the CFSC, at the end it says, “or if they have other conflicts of interest.” I would like to make a friendly amendment that it says “(see I.B.).”

Senator Blum: There’s another part of the document that says if something is voted on by the DFSC that (I’m not sure if it’s been changed or not) currently the way it is, so if it’s been voted on in the DFSC current or previous year then it’s approved by the CFSC and then it can go on next year. I’m not sure that’s been eliminated.

Senator Horst: Are you thinking about the language in Article V.B.1.a?

Senator Blum: Yeah. Right.

Senator Horst: So, this language is, “Revised ASPT policies received by May 1 from a DFSC/SFSC shall be considered and either approved or returned to DFSC/SFSC with comments by November 1.” Then the suggestion was to keep it flexible, “Revised ASPT policies received after May 1 from a DFSC/SFSC will be considered as time and conditions allow.” So, there’s not a firm deadline. The comment was, for instance, if COVID happened you would want some flexibility.

Senator Blum: Right. Right.

Senator Horst: “Revisions approved by November 1 will take effect the following January 1.”

Senator Blum: I get what it’s saying here. I’m just saying in the other section where it talks about the DFSC it doesn’t state this.

Senator Horst: Are you talking about Article V? B. DFSC/SFSC Development of Departmental/School Policies and Procedures?

Senator Blum: Right.

Senator Horst: Yeah. That’s the next document.

Dr. Trites: And we’ve had suggested that that language be parallel there as well, Senator Blum.

Document 01.25.22.03 Article IV College Faculty Status Committee was unanimously approved, with friendly amendments.

Senator Horst: Okay. Now we are going to move to Article V, document 01.25.22.04.

Motion by Senator Cline, seconded by Senator Nikolaou, to move document 01.25.22.04 Article V Department/School Faculty Status Committee (DFSC/SFSC) from information to action item. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Horst: the proposed language as Senator Blum indicated for the DFSC/SFSC Development of Departmental/School Policies and Procedures in B.1.a is, “Revised ASPT policies should be sent to the CFSC by May 1.” So, this is the reversed side. “CFSC shall consider DFSC/SFSC revisions and either approve or return to DFSC/SFSC with comments by November 1. Revised ASPT policies received by a CFSC after May 1 will be considered as time and conditions allow.” Again, allowing flexibility if there is a grave need for some reason. “Revisions approved by November 1 will take effect the following January 1.” There are no other revisions to Article V. Any debate?

Senator Nikolaou: I have two smaller items. Under C.4 where it says, “In cases of tenure…” are we using neutral language? So, instead of saying his or her materials, say their materials. The eighth sentence.

Dr. Trites: It would be my great good hope that we would be doing a global change on all such language because we also have some places where we sometimes say department schools spelled out and sometimes, we don’t. So, it would be my great good hope that all of those stylistic issues would be addressed globally.

Senator Horst: Senator Cline would you consider that a friendly amendment?

Senator Cline: Yes.

Senator Nikolaou: Yes- I seconded. The second one, under D.1. the fourth sentence, the same thing his or her rank with their rank.

Document 01.25.22.04 Article V Department/School Faculty Status Committee (DFSC/SFSC) was unanimously approved, with friendly amendments.

Senator Horst: Okay. I think we have addressed all of the items the URC has concluded their work on. They still have some work to do on the Overview and the additional sections. Because we just discussed the conflict of interest and those other parts, I’m going to take that back to the URC with our suggestions.

***Adjournment***

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