**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, October 14, 2020**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Roll call***

Academic Senate Secretary Martha Horst called the roll and declared a quorum.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. Thank you, everybody. Thank you for taking the time out of your super busy schedules to show up tonight. This is in service, obviously, to our faculty around the University. Given that the DFSCs need us to complete our work, we're going to start right in. We have four items of business. And if we can move efficiently, we will not have to meet on October 21 and can let the internal committees get some work done, and they do have quite a bit of work to do. So, we have first a quick election to the Academic Planning Committee, then we would like to take the motion that was laid on the table last time off the table and move toward a vote on that one. Then we're going to have deliberation and vote regarding whether any student reactions to teaching that we collect this year must be one of the two factors for teaching productivity for 2020. And then we're going to entertain Sense of the Caucus Resolutions that might be needed or desired, including an up/down vote on that concept of relaxing the annual productivity report deadlines for faculty. So, do please hold off on discussion and questions on any of those until we get to that item.

***Action item:***

***Memo to Academic Senate Executive Committee re APC appointments for 2020-2022, COB member***

***Academic Planning Committee election***

Edgar Norton, COB, 2020-2022

Motion by Senator Mainieri, seconded by Senator Lahiri, to elect Edgar Norton to the Academic Planning Committee for a 2020-2022 term. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Continued Discussion: Proposed pandemic-related ASPT exceptions regarding the timing of 2020 annual performance evaluation and/or the format of annual productivity reports***

***Action Item:***

***Individual departments/schools may decide whether to follow the standard format for their department's annual productivity reports for the 2020 calendar year or to follow a different or abbreviated format; they are encouraged to allow abbreviated formats and must accept standard format reports from any faculty who wish to submit them.  Departments/schools that do choose to change the format of their report requirements through an exception for this year must ~~address~~advise faculty regarding how ~~doing so~~ opting for a non-standard format could impact faculty outcomes related to annual performance evaluation (award nominations, salary incrementation, etc.) but should work with CFSCs and the Provost to mitigate against such impacts. ~~visibility for awards, faculty status committees' ability to prepare for possible raise increments, and any other important ramifications of changing the format, and make arrangements to eliminate or mitigate those impacts~~.***

***10.12.20.01 ASPT VII.D.***

Senator Kalter: Terrific. So, now we'll move on to the next item. Exec basically has attempted to incorporate the concerns of Senators Stewart and Peterson as they were expressed on the Caucus floor on the 7th, last week. Let me point out that we are trying to address wording in ASPT Article VII.D. that reads in this way, “Prior to department/school performance evaluations faculty members shall provide to the DFSC/SFSC activities reports specific to their assignments. Department/school ASPT guidelines should provide guidance regarding the format and content of activities reports.” So, that means that departments would have to create an exception to these policy-embedded formats and content guidelines. So, let me read our attempts to incorporate the feedback first

It reads, “Individual departments/schools may decide whether to follow the standard format for their department's annual productivity reports for the 2020 calendar year or to follow a different or abbreviated format;” and so that part is merely stating a fact. “…they are encouraged to allow abbreviated formats and must accept standard format reports from any faculty who wish to submit them.” So that part, that addition, helps to address, hopefully, Senator Stewart’s concerns while also calling DFSC attention to the fact that the formats might need shortening or probably do need shortening. And then it goes on to read, “Departments/schools that do choose to change the format of their report requirements through an exception for this year must advise faculty regarding how opting for a non-standard format could impact faculty outcomes related to annual performance evaluation (award nominations, salary incrementation, etc.) but should work with CFSCs and the Provost to mitigate against such impacts.” So, that was an attempt to address the concerns from Senator Peterson. Senator Blum, you were the one who put this one on the table, would you like to make a motion to take the motion off the table, so that we can discuss whether to incorporate those suggested revisions into it or not?

Motion by Senator Blum, seconded by Senator Cline, to remove the ASPT exception from the table. The motion was approved with abstentions from Meyers, Pancrazio, and Torry.

Senator Kalter: All right. Terrific. So, do we have any debate regarding whether to incorporate those suggested revisions or anything else about the motion?

Senator Lucey: Susan, one of my constituents asked me to add a couple words in there. For the sentence that says, “Departments/schools that do choose to change the format of the report requirements through an exception for this year advise faculty…,” we would ask that you include the words “in writing.”

Senator Kalter: I think… Do we have any objection to adding those? Let's do it that way. Do we have any objection to adding “in writing?” (Pause) I’m not seeing any here. So, sounds good.. Do we have further debate?

Senator Meyers: I'm opposed to the wording “they are encouraged.” I don't think that we should be encouraging departments to do one thing or another. I think we can be allowing this. I'm not sure that we should, but encouraged seems too strong to me.

Senator Kalter: And, Cera, would you put the motion on the screen so that we can all see it at the same time. So, you're in the second part of the first sentence, Senator Meyers.

Senator Meyers: It's where it says, “…they are encouraged to allow abbreviated formats.”

Senator Kalter: And so, you'd like to change that “are encourage to,” to the word “may” m-a-y?

Senator Meyers: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: May allow. Okay, let's see if we have objections to that change.

Senator Horst: Could we also include the other edit, please?

Senator Kalter: So, I'm not seeing objections to that change. It looks like that… wait, I'm sorry, I missed Senator Cline. Go ahead.

Senator Cline: This is not an objection by further comment.

Senator Kalter: Great. Let me just make sure there are no objections, it looks like not. (Pause) Yes, go ahead.

Senator Cline: So, I might not make any friends with this, but reading this back over, I'm just struck by the length and complexity of what we have prepared. And so, I agree with the taking out of suggestions, but I would be in favor of ending, you can see where the first red letters come in, just ending at “…abbreviated format.” That allows schools to decide whether they want to defer this year without encumbering this process too much, but that's me. But I sort of, when I was struck by this, I thought, that's a lot of words and it's a lot of places for interpretation and misinterpretation. And so, I’m always a fan of brevity. So, that's a suggestion from me.

Senator Kalter: All right, thank you.

Senator Mainieri: Alright, so I was the original author of the very original motion. And so, what I'm about to say is going to be a little bit different. But when I originally drafted this motion, I did it because we were asked if someone could write down some language. So, I did. And that information was based on the fact that we, as a group, I feel like were under the impression that there was something in the university ASPT guidelines that indicated the format for these reports. And since then it's become clear that there is no such language in the university ASPT guidelines. Departments and schools already have purview over the format of these reports and so I don't feel the need to have a motion. So, I will actually be voting against this motion. I think that if we have recommendations, they could come more in a Sense of the Caucus as opposed to a motion like this.

Senator Horvath: I apologize, because I wasn't here last time, if you already had this conversation, but I'm not sure I understand what you're looking for with respect to the sentence “advise faculty regarding how opting for a non-standard format could affect performance evaluations.” I mean, it shouldn't have any effect at all, right. I mean, I'm not sure what kind of effects you envision that faculty need to be advised about.

Senator Kalter: Yes, thank you, Senator Horvath. We had some discussion about that last time and sort of were trending in the direction of that conclusion, but because there was no conclusive debate on the floor about that, we were simply trying to incorporate the changes that were sort of suggested by two of our members, rather than, you know, making any motions to alter and basically cut off that last part. Those are obviously possible tonight. So, we've had a couple of suggestions, one by Senator Cline that we indeed do that, and one by Senator Mainieri that we vote against this essentially. So, is there any further debate on that?

Senator Horst: I agree with Senator Cline. So, I'd like to make a motion that we split this item into two parts. The first part, going through, “…submit them.” And I'd like us make a motion that we vote on that and then we can vote on the second part.

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Cline, to spit the motion. The motion was approved, with abstentions from Meyers, Pancrazio, Peterson, Torry, and Kalter.

Senator Kalter: All right. Terrific. So, we're going to keep debating the first part of this motion. Do we have further debate on the first part of this motion?

Senator Horvath: Can we see it again? Sorry.

Senator Peterson: Thank you, Senator Kalter. I guess when, as I've sat and read these and thought about where we're at, and I realized this is just on the top one right now, but I'm going back to what one of the Senators said earlier, I'm not sure, given what we've already passed at a previous Caucus meeting, that we actually need this Action Item because we've already allowed the DFSCs and SFSCs to make changes retroactive to January 1. So, they have the ability to do this now. And the second part, and I'll stop there because the other one will go to the second half. So, I'll just stop there.

Senator Kalter: Okay, great. Do we have further debate on the first motion?

Senator Blum: Yes. Well, I would argue this is slightly different. While the previous motion, which was passed related to retroactivity. All right. And in criteria built into the departmental ASPT. And so, what this is here is not about the criteria or retroactivity. All right. It's about the, however, whatever, productivity report and the process of information gathering that the department uses to get to that criteria. So, I actually see these as fundamentally different. So, to me, what this does, and, you know, I sort of realized on one hand it's not completely explicitly laid out in our current ASPT, but what it does do I think is clarify for DFSC or SFSCs as they may be, that they actually can do this in the year. And I think given the considerations that people have already talked about, the unique considerations, the unique strains on faculty, how useful standard to standard format may be, while I do agree that that is a decision for an independent D or SFSC, that allowing them to know that, I think that they can make that change in the context, in particular, of the context of what's going on, I think, has some importance to come from the Senate.

Senator Meyers: Thank you. So, my son was born on January 5, 1999 during my first year as a faculty member at ISU. So that means I was in labor when I was working on my first annual productivity report. And when I hear that people spent a month on it, you know, in these conversations, I think that is just outrageous and out of proportion, and it's a cultural thing at ISU. I've never done it… you know, having had that experience put it into perspective for me and I've pretty much limited myself to one day on my annual productivity report. And I think that passing something like this when it's not strictly necessary given that we already passed something that allows the DFSCs flexibility sort of ratifies the importance of this document in a way that I don't think is necessary and don't think is productive.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you, Senator Meyers. Just to clarify for the record, I believe the highest amount of time that anybody mentioned so far on the floor was one week, rather than one month. So, that you weren't wondering if it was really a whole month. Do we have any further debate on the motion?

Senator Cline: I’d like to make a friendly amendment to the text and to suggest to end the sentence with the word “format.”

Senator Kalter: Can we put the text up again.

Senator Cline: Exactly. So, taking all of our additions off. So, the item would be, “Individual departments/schools may decide whether to follow the standard format for the department's annual productivity reports for the 2020 calendar year or to find a different or abbreviated format.”

Senator Kalter: Okay, so do we have objection to not including that part, or taking that out, or leaving it out as the case may be? Is that a friendly amendment?

Senator Pancrazio: I had a question. Does different mean longer? Because I think we've… I mean, what's different? I mean, if it's not abbreviated, are we selling, yeah, you can have even have a longer one? Because I think the sentiment is already been that we're getting plenty of information already, and we don't need more. But the issue that I think keeps coming back, is that people want a shorter one, which is a, I think, a question that DFSCs would probably… should entertain because they get to, it's the departmental culture, if they have created a document that it's really cumbersome, they probably should think towards streamlining it. But at the same time, if we leave the word different in there, doesn't it mean that we opening up to longer?

Senator Kalter: Okay, so, let me separate those two questions. I don't want to have two questions about friendly amendments on the floor at the same time. Let me just confirm that nobody has an objection to removing that red part.

Senator Stewart: I mean I don't strongly object, but the spirit of my comment was that the DFSC, as this is currently written, could move to requiring everyone to do an abbreviated format. Now, in light of what Senator Horvath said, that may not actually matter, but at least the spirit of my proposal was in allowing those faculty who might be going up for promotion or who might be applying for a service award or etc, you submit the fuller report in case they were worried about the abbreviated report that that might address their anxiety.

Senator Kalter: So, with regard to that, then it looks to me like, so remembering that the red part is suggested friendly amendments from last time. Since there is dispute about this one, it looks like we're going to have to have a motion to amend and, you know, if there is any further debate about it, debate, and then basically move about whether or not that will be included. So, Senator Stewart, do you want to put a motion to include that on the floor?

Motion by Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Horst, to include the additional language in red on the first motion.

Senator Seeman: Um, yeah. So, I just had a question. I know earlier one of the people suggested we got rid of the “they are encouraged.” So, I was thinking maybe we want to put “may” in is all.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Yes. I think the strike through that Cera just did accidentally erased that “may.” So, you're right, it would have said, “…they may allow abbreviated formats,” and that was already accepted as a friendly. Thank you so much, Senator Seeman. Do we have any further debate before we vote on whether to include this language or not?

The motion was defeated 9-9, with abstentions from Braswell, Mainieri, Pancrazio, Peterson, Torry and Horvath.

Senator Kalter: Great. Alright, so let's go back to the motion at hand. Do we have any further debate on that first paragraph? (Pause) Alright. I see none. Let's move to a vote on the motion itself for that first paragraph.

The motion was approved 16-5, with abstentions from Pancrazio, Torry, and Tranel.

Senator Kalter: Okay. The motion passes. So, we move into the second part of that, the other part of the split motion. Let's see, let’s screenshare that again and remind ourselves, refresh our memories about it. So, it reads, “Departments/schools that do choose to change the format of their report requirements through an exception for this year must advise faculty regarding how opting for a non-standard format could impact faculty outcomes related to annual performance evaluation (award nominations, salary incrementation, etc.) but should work with CFSCs and the Provost to mitigate against such impacts.”

Senator Lucey: Yeah, I would just ask that the amendment that I suggested before be included into the screenshare, please.

Senator Kalter: And could you say that one again, Senator Lucey?

Senator Lucey: In writing.

Ms. Hazelrigg: Where was that again, I'm sorry.

Senator Lucey: Between “faculty” and “regarding.” So, second line, “faculty in writing regarding.” Thank you.

Senator Meyers: We just struck that second sentence of the first part. So, there's no option for faculty if the DFSC changes. So, I don't know that they need to be informed of anything.

Senator Kalter: Can you say that again, Senator Meyers, so I can follow. I'm not sure I understood what you mean.

Senator Meyers: I mean, it seems like a lot of the second paragraph is about warning people that if they go with the shorter version that it might affect their outcomes, but we just took away the option for the longer version by taking out the second part of the first.

Senator Kalter: We did not, because we say they can decide whether to follow the standard format or to follow a different or abbreviated format, right?

Senator Meyers: Where does it say that? I mean, so the DFSC can decide, but can an individual faculty member decide? Like if my department says we're going with an abbreviated format, it seems like we've taken away my option to give a full format.

Senator Kalter: I see what you're saying. Okay, thank you. I was just trying to clarify where you were going with that. Wonderful. And then it looks like somebody else has their hand up. Senator Cline.

Senator Cline: Right, just to address that last comment. I think this is still valuable because it's saying that, you know, should the department make the choice, they then need to advise faculty how that might affect things like award nominations, salary increments, and things like that. So, this is, should your department choose, then they must advise.

Senator Horvath: Within the ASPT guidelines, there are requirements for the things you must include in the report, but there's no rule against including more than is required. So, to address Senator Meyers’ point, if a faculty member wanted to generate a 20-page productivity report that includes all of the information, they would have included in a standard format, there's nothing that precludes them from doing that, right? So, if they were concerned about that information going forward, right, in their report for some other reason, they could just include it, right? So yeah. Again, the format dictates what must be in there, it doesn't preclude you from adding additional information if you would like.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Senator Horvath. Do we have further debate on this motion?

The motion was defeated 6-12, with abstentions from Marx, Meyers, Midha, Murphy, Pancrazio, Torry, and Tranel.

***Discussion:   
Third in a series of pandemic-related ASPT discussions and/or information items (see tentative schedule on the next page):***

***Action Item:***

***ASPT policy currently states in Appendix 2 under Teaching Productivity that “Departments/schools must use two or more types of factors to evaluate teaching performance, one of which shall be student reactions to teaching performance.” For the 2020 performance evaluation year only, the requirement that student reactions to teaching performance must be one of the two factors evaluated is removed.***

Senator Kalter: Let's move on to the next one. Do I have a motion from the floor to adopt the Action Item language regarding Appendix 2 Teaching Productivity? And let me read that out loud, and if we could put it up on the screen as well. So the motion would be, “ASPT policy currently states in Appendix 2 under Teaching Productivity that ‘Departments/schools must use two or more types of factors to evaluate teaching performance, one of which shall be student reactions to teaching performance.’ For the 2020 performance evaluation year only, the requirement that student reactions to teaching performance must be one of the two factors evaluated is removed.”

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Nikolaou, to approve the ASPT language regarding Appendix 2 Teaching Productivity.

Senator Kalter: All right, let me just give a little bit of background to this one. I received a couple of queries about this. There are two types of faculty who this would affect. So, you may remember that in the spring, we had debates about this and we sort of didn't take any action because we did not need to take any action. There was no policy issue at hand. There is a policy issue here because for the whole 2020 calendar year, or for any calendar year of annual productivity, the ASPT specifically states that one of the minimum two factors to be used to assess teaching productivity has to be student reactions to teaching.

So, the two types of people who this affects are people who were on sabbatical in the spring and so for whom the advisories that came out of the Provost Office, you know, basically did not apply because they weren't converting to online for the first time in an emergency in the spring. But some of them, or many of them, maybe most of them, did in fact sort of get thrown into online teaching unexpectedly as they went into fall semester. The second type of person that this impacts are the people who after August 3, who had planned to either have, mostly those that had planned to have face to face classes, but it also could impact some that had hybrid classes, who were basically pulled online without much preparation. And I will say that although we were instructed over the summer, essentially, or at least advised over the summer, encouraged I guess you could say, to make sure that we could pivot really quickly, there was not much else in terms of guidance about how to pivot quickly and so you would maybe have found that if you went to CTLT, but not necessarily, and there weren't necessarily avenues for knowing which courses at CTLT would have advised about that. So, do we have a debate on this motion with that background of why this is on for tonight?

Senator Horst: Yeah, I'd like to just support your words and say I'm one of those people that I had a hybrid class and it went to all online. And so, all of my testing arrangements that I made won't work. And one of the reasons I'm also concerned about the evaluations, is I'm concerned about the number and the type of evaluations we’ll receive. It's one thing when you're in a classroom and you can pass them out. But I'm not even quite sure at this moment how my department is going to hand out the evaluations. I'm very concerned that we're going to get either, you know, the people who love the course or hate the course and I'm not even sure how the distribution will work. So, the number of evaluations will be potentially quite low. And I think that could really impact the type of evaluations you're going to get.

Senator Meyers: So, I have a few comments. The first is, and I think that Sam Catanzaro made a comment along these lines in an earlier Caucus meeting, I think that this is an opportunity to deemphasize student evaluations in annual productivity reports in general, and I would be in favor of that. However, I'm opposed to making a change that's just specific to the COVID situation. I think that if… unless we're prepared to really have the conversation about whether teaching evaluations are a valid way of evaluating teaching in general, I think that in this year of so much change and chaos that we need to stick as much as we reasonably can to our institution’s traditions and policies, and to change things midstream is disruptive and counterproductive. And I don't think that it would play well outside if students learned that their opinions suddenly don't count this year, when they probably have strong opinions that they want to express. I don't think that DFSCs should put a lot of weight on them, but I don't think that they should be allowed to eliminate them all together, either.

Senator Stewart: Yes, thank you. I just mostly wanted to second what Senator Horst said. I mean, speaking of my home department, our tools for gathering student feedback in the spring, especially, we're just inadequate and there's no way to require students to complete the feedback. I had a total of 95 students in the spring. I got I think five feedback responses total. So, I would just second that unless, especially this semester, we have much better tools for gathering student feedback, I think there's probably just going to be too little of it to be worth much.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Thank you, Senator Stewart. I'm going to let everybody know that if you have your physical hand raised rather than your virtual hand, I do see you, but you'll be behind the people with the virtual hands, but no worries, I do see that you're on the screen. I'm actually going to skip over you, Sam, for a minute so that we can go to all of the Senators first and then come back for your comments.

Senator Mainieri: I will be voting against this motion. I think that in recognizing that yes, there have been challenges and we know that there are shortcomings with student evaluations, the student voice is still essential, and I trust the DFSCs and SFSCs to take them within the context that each unit is experiencing. I just think that it's important for us to hear the student voices particularly right now. And I think there's valuable things that can be learned from them.

Senator Blum: Yes, I was going to suggest some additional language. I was gonna add the sentence at the end, “When they are used, the negative impact of COVID-19 on instruction must be considered.”

Senator Kalter: Okay, hold on just a minute. Let me write down the people who have their hands currently raised, because I’d like those of you who have your hands raised to put them down so that I can find out whether or not there is any objection to Senator Blum’s, would that be a friendly amendment to people, or do we need to debate it?

Senator Mainieri: Susan, can you clarify the question? Like, when should we be raising our hand?

Senator Kalter: I was just going to say that. So, if you find this, what Senator Blum just said, adding that one sentence at the end to be friendly, keep your hand down. If you want us to debate whether to add that sentence or not, put your hand up.

Senator Lucey: Can the sentence be repeated please?

Senator Blum: Yes. “When they are used,” meaning the student reactions so that, “When they are used, the negative impact of COVID-19 on instruction must be considered.”

Senator Kalter: And it looks like Senator Cline put her hand up. Is that an objection? You want us to not consider that a friendly amendment, was that correct?

Senator Cline: Correct.

Senator Kalter: All right. Okay. Thank you. Senator Cline. So, we'll come back to that, Senator Blum, in a moment. I just want to get through the people who had already raised their hand, and then we'll come back and allow you to put that amendment on the floor. Senator Nikolaou was next.

Senator Nikolaou: One, I guess question/concern is if we have the student evaluations, how is it going to conflict with the extension we gave to the withdrawal date? Because now we extended the withdrawal to the Friday before the Thanksgiving. And in the past, I think we could give the evaluations the week before Thanksgiving and the week after Thanksgiving. So, if now we have students who let's say withdraw at the last possible date, how long is it going to take the Registrar to actually reflect that on our rosters so that when we are sending out the evaluation request, it is only for students who are actually going to complete the course and they are not just dropping the course, they’re not just withdrawing. So, that's one concern, but even if we do not use the student evaluations as one of the required items, it doesn't mean that we don't gather the information. We can still gather the information about our own information. We still get the feedback for things that work, things that didn't work, what we can improve, but we are going to rely more heavily on all the other 12 items that are on the ASPT document instead of the actual student evaluation.

Senator Torry: Yes, I'm going to make a comment directly to Senator Mainieri. There are classes that cannot be moved online. And I'm in a class right now, it’s a 300 level. It is a graduate class and undergraduates can take it, so mostly seniors who need it to graduate, as well as graduates who needed for the graduate credit. It is a laboratory class that requires practical skill demonstration in the laboratory with equipment, I cannot do that online and I'm going to ask students to evaluate my teaching ability to teach it online. In all honesty, we can turn this in, but I, as faculty should be able to say this class cannot be offered reasonably well online, but it was, because I had no choice not to, therefore you need to take those comments from any student from that class with this in mind. And I as faculty need to be able to tell my school, my DFSC that. Because no one's hearing this from my perspective, and to say that the students’ evaluations of my ability to teach an online class that cannot reasonably be offered online, it's just, it's not fair to me in any shape, way, or form. I can't rely on members of my SFSC to know my ability to teach a course online that well and to use that judgment call. Only I know my ability to offer that class reasonably well to give students the skills they need to be getting or not in that class. And that has to be stated somewhere. And if I don't have a document like this, allowing me to do that, I don't want to rely on SFSC to use their best judgment when they don't know themselves.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Senator Torry.

Senator Nahm: I am in support of this motion. I do understand some of the comments that other Senators have brought up about, like, honoring the students’ voices and making sure that they're heard. I do want to echo what Senator Nikolaou has said about how this data will be there, right? It's not that we're not gathering this information, these evaluations from students, we're just not applying them to the ASPT process. I think there is still a way to use that information to assess, you know, the state of online teaching and learning at ISU, and if there are other measures that the university needs to take in the future. And I think that is also in the spirit of, you know, like honoring what the students have to say and responding to their feedback. But I do think that for any faculty members who, you know, who knew going into the semester that they were going to teach online, it is still a compromise that they made as opposed to a voluntary choice to offer their course online. So, I think for those reasons, I think some accommodations need to be made.

Senator Cline: All right. And I just, I suppose I have a question to pose. If we say that if this requirement is removed, a department can still opt to include the student evaluations, is that correct?

Senator Kalter: So, yes, a faculty member could say, you know, please do look at my student reactions to teaching and consider them as a factor. They could say, please consider them as a third factor. All that we would be doing is removing the requirement to consider them as at least one of two factors. So, the DFSC would be able to make its own choices, essentially.

Senator Cline: But it's the DFSC/SFSC that would make the choice and not the individual faculty member?

Senator Kalter: We may want to discuss that.

Senator Cline: Yeah, my concern is about differential. So, I mean, if we drop the requirement, and I agree with Senator Mainieri that you really, I feel very uncomfortable with the elimination of the student input here. I mean, I'm somebody who I'm sure will get slammed in all sorts of ways, so I understand that, but I think that… I'm concerned about that, how that looks, and the precedent it sets. But I'm also concerned about setting up a situation where one department might choose to do that, and another department may not. So, if that's going to create differential results for people in the long run.

Senator Pancrazio: Yes, I think I share the same sentiments as Senator Mainieri and Senator Cline that I think we should hear the students’ voices, even when it is positive or when it's less than positive, but I also trust my DFSC to be able to sift through that. I've been a member of the DFSC on multiple occasions, and there are things that I am really well aware that we don't need to pay attention to and there are things that do come out of those. But I think it would be a bad message to send to students that we just don't want to hear it. And so, while I understand the situation that Senator Torry has brought up, it's been very difficult and very challenging. At the same time, I think that my DFSC knows that. And this is an opportunity for me to remind them how difficult it is, so that they at least give that credit where credit's due. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. And I am going to speak for myself first and then go to Dr. Catanzaro. But I do see that Senator Torry also wants to go. And then after, if this general debate sort of wraps up, after that, we will then go to Senator Blum’s concern and then to Senator Cline’s point about who chooses. So first, I was one of those who was not teaching in the spring. So, I am speaking in support of this motion. It's the very first time that I ever have taught online. And so, I actually believe that my students are going to be very favorable to me and I do intend to include those evaluations, but I think that people who were in the position that I was in, with not having any experience whatsoever prior to this, no training, not necessarily having, you know, the ability in some cases to devote their summers to train, to CTLT classes, should have the option. And so, you know, to sort of speak to what Senator Cline said, I do think that it should be the faculty member who gets to choose to say to their DFSC, I would like you to look at my student reactions to teaching and use them as a factor in my evaluation, or I would prefer not to do that, but I'm going to look at them myself, or what have you. So, I also, I strongly, strongly believe that we should collect student reactions to teaching for all courses, regardless of what we do with it in the ASPT process. It's just simply been too long for students if they did not get asked in the spring for them not to have a voice. And I think that sends a terrible message. I think the question that we're looking at here is whether or not they should be included this year in the evaluation of teaching productivity for faculty.

So, looks like I've got a number of people. Let’s go first to Senator Torry, then to Senator Horvath, then to Senator Mainieri, and hopefully we’ll get to Dr. Catanzaro right after that.

Senator Torry: So, I will just say that I'm not asking that we don't collect the student evaluations. I am asking that I as a faculty should be able to tell my DFSC/SFSC that I don't think they should be considered in my class and list my reasons. In my letter I intend to do that, because there are circumstances in these classes that go beyond just the student evaluation of the class content. And so, to give you an idea, my class was a lab class. I had 23 students. We started off face to face. After three weeks, 13 out of 23 had COVID. I then had COVID. The class had to go completely online, and it's been really difficult. My students have a preconceived notion of that class and their illness associated with my ability to teach online, and all of that is mixed up in those evaluations. It might be an extenuating circumstance, but classes that were face to face where students got sick, there is a bias in those evaluations based on they got sick in the class and that has to be considered. They're not just evaluating your teacher evaluation online. There's many more things that go into that, students’ perception of their experience in that class. And I'm just sort of giving you my… I'm going to allow them to evaluate me, but I'm going to very clearly in my letter submit this is why I don't think these should be taken with any type of evaluation towards my ability to teach. There's too much bias in that beyond my teaching.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Senator Torry, and I'm very, very sorry to hear that you contracted COVID because of that. I think Senator Horvath is next.

Senator Horvath: Many of you know I have strong views about the value of student data for course evaluations, because I’ve talked about it a lot, but I just would like to remind you that one of the big problems with it is racial bias, gender bias, bias against people who speak with accents, people who have non-binary affect, all of those people are disproportionately negatively impacted by these kinds of evaluations. And while there is no data yet because it's been too soon, and most of the people who pay attention to these things predict at least that that will be even worse for faculty of color, faculty who speak with accents, faculty who have non-binary non-gendered affect, that they'll be, again, disproportionately harmed by the inclusion of student feedback in teaching evaluations. So, I mean, we should just keep that in mind. And then I have another point, but it's probably more relevant to the second question, and Susan said we'll talk about.

Senator Kalter: We'll come back to that. Thank you, Senator Horvath. Senator Mainieri had her hand raised, and then took it down. Do you still want to speak?

Senator Mainieri: No, I was just making sure that we remembered that Dr. Catanzaro had wanted to speak.

Senator Kalter: Yes, I’ve got it written down. Thank you so much, Senator Mainieri. Senator Blum, you’re next.

Senator Blum: Yeah, I just wanted to say I agree with Senator Torry. And then the remarks about bias, all right. And that's actually why I added, or proposed, I know that's not there yet, but that sentence about COVID was directed at that. I mean, you know, yes. Okay. I mean, do I think on the whole most DFSC members and most DFSCs or SFSCs are going to consider this. But I also think that that’s not, it's not an automatic that they're going to consider it, and I do feel like putting in language that makes sure that they consider is important, and I know we're not considering that at this point, but speaking in support of sort of the other Senators who echo those type of sentiments.

Senator Kalter: All right, thank you. I think now we can go to Dr. Catanzaro. Sorry to keep you waiting, Sam.

Dr. Catanzaro: No problem. I hope it ends up being worth the wait. There's one technical point I just want to bring to the Caucus’s attention, and you may want to just make a, what I believe is a non-substantive but technical revision to your motion. The requirement of using student reactions to teaching performance is also mentioned in two different articles: one article on the DFSCs duties and responsibilities, and in the article on performance evaluation. I sent those citations via email to Chairperson Kalter and Secretary Horst, so you've got it if you need it. So, I just wanted to make sure you're aware of that. It occurs in a couple of other places in the document.

And in light of the discussion, I do want to sort of echo at least a couple of the points that were raised briefly. One is, I'm glad to hear that many of you are making this the distinction between providing students the opportunity to give feedback, and instructors the opportunity to learn about sort of what's working for them, what's not working for them, especially, you know, given all the transition, right? Because I think as responsible scholars and lifelong learners, whether that information is used in our performance evaluation or not, it is very valuable for our growth as professors. So, there's that point. And I also think we would be remiss not to have somebody note that based on research coming out of the scholarship of teaching and learning, it might be considered a best practice that any use of student reactions to teaching in an evaluation be accompanied by something along the lines of what Senator Torry was saying: a reflective statement on what this feedback entails, putting it into context, how it might frame one's future plans for teaching. And the focus of the evaluation by the DFSC could conceivably be more on what we as faculty do with the feedback in that narrative, and less on what a mean score is, or what a distribution of ratings on a five or seven point scale might be. So, that second point might be a longer-term thing. And I think URC will be discussing that in due course as one of many options as we look at the evaluation of teaching. But I did want to remind everybody that that is an important consideration, if the student surveys do end up being used for evaluation purposes, the reflection and contextualization can go a long way toward mitigating some of the bias that Senator Horvath has so eloquently reminded us of many times (and for which I'm grateful) and also, you know, protect faculty from the vagaries of unexpected situations.

Senator Kalter: Okay, thank you, Sam. So, it looks like we've got at least three things to do. If we can put the motion back up on the screen, I think it'd be helpful at this point. So, we've got to look at what Senator Blum brought up. We’ve got to look at what Senator Cline brought up, and we've got to look at what Dr. Catanzaro just brought up. I think we should actually start with that last one. So, let's see. It looks like Cera has already put Senator Blum’s suggestion in there, but for now, what I want to do is, what Sam just sent myself and Senator Horst says that there is language in Article V.B.2.d and Article XVI.2. So, Sam, you can help me with this, but I think that in that sentence before the red sentence, we could put a comma, notwithstanding any language in Article V.B.2.d or Article XVI.2. Would that, Sam, take care of that concern? Is it that simple, or does there need to be more, given what those two things say? I don't know if Senator Horvath might have that up, he would know where to find it quickly. The ASPT policy is on the Provost website.

Dr. Catanzaro: Yeah, I think that does it, right? I don't think, I mean this is a technical point, I don't want it to become cumbersome and potentially confusing language. So, essentially, I mean, I would take that phrase to say that essentially that those provisions in those two articles are in a sense suspended and the requirement, university level requirement that student reactions be used is effectively suspended also.

Senator Horvath: I just have a question. Many departments and schools’ own ASPT documents have it in the document as a requirement, they don't just cite Appendix II language, they have it explicit in their own policies that student feedback must be considered. So, is passing this sufficient to ameliorate that problem? Or do you have to do something stronger to tell departments that if it's in their own ASPT documents they have to amend those or suspend them, something like that.

Senator Kalter: That's a great question, Senator Horvath. So, let's add that. So, I'm going to just finalize this language. And just to say, notwithstanding is all one word, so that we have that there. Let's go first, though, I'm going to write down that we have Blum, Cline, and Horvath to consider. So, Senator Blum, you had suggested that we say, “When they are used, the negative impact of COVID-19 on instruction must be considered.” Do we have any objection to adding that sentence as a friendly amendment to the rest?

Senator Horst: I think Senator Cline did.

Senator Kalter: Oh, that's right. I'm sorry, that's why we were here because we needed to do this as a formal motion. So, Senator Blum, do you want to put that on the floor as a formal motion?

Motion by Senator Blum, seconded by Senator Nahm, to amend the motion by adding, “When they are used, the negative impact of COVID-19 on instruction must be considered.”

Senator Kalter: All right, do we have any debate about adding this sentence to the motion?

Senator Nikolaou: I'm not sure if the sentence is needed, because if the preview says that you are not required to use student evaluations as a required item in your annual productivity report, if it is in your annual productivity report, it means that you selected to use the feedback that you have gathered from your students. And if you have chosen to use that feedback, you're going to give an explanation as to why and what you learned from that experience. So, I don't know if it's going to add anything, saying that we need to take into consideration the negative impact on the instruction because I'm assuming that if someone did really bad in the evaluations and they don't want their DFSC to see it in any way, they wouldn't include it there in the first place. If it was because of COVID or unrelated to COVID.

Senator Meyers: In response to Senator Nikolaou’s comment, it seems like it all hinges on whether we're leaving this decision up to the individual faculty or to the DFSC. If it's up to the DFSC, then I think that we need to leave the language in there.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Apologies, if that is an out of order thing. One of the things we can do, if it's a friendly to the motion to amend for Senator Blum, would be to make it contingent on what we decide next about that who-chooses. Senator Blum, would that be all right with you?

Senator Blum: Yes. I would agree, to me, that is critical.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And do you remember who seconded your motion, I think, it was Nahm, right? Senator Nahm, is that alright with you as a friendly?

Senator Nahm: Yes, it is.

Senator Kalter: Okay, terrific. One thing that I will just say in response to what Senator Nikolaou pointed out, I think in general he's right, but I can imagine a situation where a pre-tenure faculty member might not feel like they can use this. And so that impacts both this sentence, I think, and also the whole motion in general.

Senator Mainieri: So, to the earlier point, even though it was accepted as a friendly amendment, I have thoughts on this sentence, but I don't feel like we should spend time on it if we end up going in different directions. So, I'm wondering, can I… I don't know from Robert's Rules, can I put the motion on the table instead, for us to return to this debate until after we make that decision. It just seems like it's hard to know how to vote here, even if we make it contingent.

Senator Kalter: You're wanting to table the motion to amend the motion?

Senator Mainieri: Correct. Until after we decide on the other piece.

Senator Kalter: Wouldn't it be sufficient what Senator Blum and Senator Nahm just agreed to, that it would be contingent on what we decide about who chooses?

Senator Mainieri: Yeah, I'm just trying to decide if I want to spend time right now trying to offer some amendments on this wording, if it's not going to be relevant.

Senator Kalter: I think, in terms of order, it's fairly unusual to try to table a motion to amend, so I would offer the wording now.

Senator Mainieri: I'm going to reserve my comments then.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Do we have further debate on the motion to amend? All right. I see none. Um, let's let Senator Horst do her magic. Oh, I'm sorry, Senator Tarhule wanted to say something and so did Senator Lucey. Go ahead, Senator Tarhule.

Provost Tarhule: Thank you so much. I don't want to speak on the motion one way or the other, but to bring something to your attention that may be relevant to your discussion. Some departments had weighted how much, you know, teaching accounts for in the evaluation, how much research counts for, and so on. So, if you’ve created a system where some people can choose to take out teaching, but the weight is not changed, but other people submit that evaluation, it seems to me that you've got to give us some thoughts to how that's going to be used. So, within the same department, I choose to not submit my teaching evaluation, or I don't want them to be used. But the weight says teaching evaluations account for 40%, my teaching accounts for 40%, and the other person submits it, how will the DFSCs react, or how would they treat that differential. So, I just, I don't know if that's relevant or not, but I wanted to bring it to your attention.

Senator Kalter: I think that Sam and I can clarify that a little bit. So, there's a distinction between teaching productivity weights and the weight that a DFSC would put on the actual student reactions to teaching. Most of the conversations that I've been involved with over the last decade or so, nobody has wanted to put a specific weight on the student reactions to teaching, and we can kind of imagine why. You might have, you know, extraordinarily problematic comments that are being made by students, but if you only rated the student reactions to teaching at 10%, you would not be able to effectively address that, so the weight within teaching productivity that student reactions to teaching takes tends not to be, as far as I know, in any of the DFSC level policies, spelled out. What is spelled out, like in the English department, is the whole weight given to overall teaching productivity. And that's assessed, you know, in our normal system, including student reactions to teaching, but there's never any specific weight given to the actual student reactions, it's sort of the discretion of the DFSC. Sam, are you seeing that as well?

Dr. Catanzaro: Yes, I'm just making sure I wasn't muted. Yes. Generally, the weightings are for the three different categories, if you will, of productivity, teaching, research, service. I am aware of one department that actually weights how much the student reactions are used. And the reason I'm aware of that is because the chair just sort of gave me a heads up and said, does this seem okay? They revised it down this semester, right? So, there might be some of that. So, I think, assuming Caucus passes something about student reactions this evening, there may be some DFSCs that will want to revisit their policies, some may decide they don't need to. And while I'm not muted, I do think for those departments that specifically cite you using the student reactions in their local documents (the departments and schools) I think if they made clear to everybody that any university wide provision that might be passed tonight superseded that, I think that would be sufficient if they just wanted to save time because, you know, we don't want to have to go through a debate and revision, that is redundant with the university wide policy that would supersede it. So, that would be my guidance to departments and schools assuming that you did something about it tonight.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so in other words, Dr. Catanzaro, you're saying that if we pass this tonight, because we're making a change the university wide policy, that change will supersede and basically overrule any department policies that require student reactions to teaching?

Dr. Catanzaro: Correct.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And Senator Lucey, you had your hand up a minute ago.

Senator Lucey: Yeah, I had an additional sentence I wanted to put at the end of the proposed amendment. I didn't know if now it's time for that or if you'd rather that after a vote.

Senator Kalter: So, let's put it back up on the screenshare.

Senator Lucey: So, at the end, I'd like to suggest we include, “This requirement will be revisited each year the university is impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic or other global catastrophe.”

Senator Kalter: So, I'm going to make sort of a chair’s judgment here. It seems to me that that is of a different enough nature, that we need to have a debate over that one, and not just add it as a friendly amendment. So, let’s, if there's no further debate on this sentence itself, let's first do that and then go to… Please let's… Oh, that's right, you have to take it off the screen for Martha to do the votes. Do we have any further debate on Senator Blum’s amendment?

Senator Pancrazio: Yes, it's just a general statement that I'm uncomfortable for how legalistic the policy is becoming itself. I think, I’d be much more comfortable saying that we suggest that the DFSCs take into consideration reality, that of COVID. I think we could simplify it and contextualize their interpretation within the shift to online teaching. To me, I'm much more comfortable with that, rather than adding all this. I mean, it looks like a Supreme Court document, and frankly, I'm just uncomfortable with it.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so you're speaking against the amendment. Any further debate. Okay. I see none. It looks like we can move to vote.

The motion passes 10-8, with abstentions from Braswell, Lahiri, Lucey, Meyers, Midha, Tranel, and Horvath.

Senator Kalter: All right, thank you. So, Senator Blum’s motion passes 10-8. If we can now move to what Senator Lucey was saying, and then we still have Senator Cline’s also to look at. Now, it is coming up on 7:30 p.m. I'm wondering if we want to take like a three-minute recess? Is that good with everybody? So, Senator Lucey is saying yes. And so, you know, let's take about a three-minute recess, just so that we can get a little bit of a refresher, and then we'll come back at about 7:27 p.m.

The Faculty Caucus took a brief recess and then reconvened.

Senator Kalter: So, let's get back to it. If Senator Lucey is here, Cera, could you put the thing up on the screen again, and I'll ask Senator Lucey to remind us of what his suggested addition was.

Senator Lucey: Well, let me pull it up. “This requirement will be revisited each year the university is impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic or other global catastrophe.”

Senator Kalter: So, let's see. Before I asked you to put that motion on the floor, both Senator Pancrazio and Senator Mainieri had their hands up. So, let me go to them first and then we'll come back to putting that motion to amend on the floor.

Senator Pancrazio: I'm still not even sure how my hands up. I don't… no comment.

Senator Kalter: We can put it down. We're able to do that ourselves, the hosts of the meeting

Senator Pancrazio: Oh, okay. No comment. No comment.

Senator Kalter: Thank you.

Senator Mainieri: I was trying to get this in before the previous motion. So, I apologize, but I think I'm going back to what we added off of Dr. Catanzaro’s, and I think the number is off. I think it's the V.C.2.d. Because I was frantically trying to understand what part of the policy, but I think it's V.C.2.d is the one that talks about evaluation specifically. But I'd like to just clarify and make sure that's correct.

Senator Kalter: Okay, Cera, if you can just put that in yellow, and Dr. Catanzaro or Dr. Horvath might be able to check that for us. And let's go back then to Senator Lucey. Do you want to put that… Oh, I'm sorry, Senator Blum, did you have something to say before Senator Lucey puts his motion on the floor?

Senator Blum: Yeah, I just… I mean, the previous line says it's for the 2020 performance evaluation year only. And then this adds, this requirement will be revisited each year. I mean, aren't those the opposite?

Senator Kalter: Sounds like you're about to debate. So, I'm going to ask Senator Lucey to put the motion on the floor first.

Senator Blum: Okay, sure, sure.

Motion by Senator Lucey, that the sentence, “This requirement will be revisited each year the university is impacted by COVID-9 pandemic or other global catastrophe,” be considered as an amendment to this item. The motion did not receive a second.

Senator Kalter: We’ll go now then to Senator Cline’s question about who chooses. Senator Cline, I don't know if you've had time to craft language about that, and we might have competing language because some might want the departments to choose, some might want the individual faculty to choose. I guess I personally, given what I said before, would suggest that we debate about individual faculty being able to choose.

Senator Cline: Sorry, I haven't come up with language, but I think it's a topic that we should discuss.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, okay. So, let's discuss it without putting a motion on the floor yet. Do people have views about if we pass this motion and the student reactions to teaching performance do not have to be one of the two factors considered in evaluating productivity, would it be a department decision or an individual faculty decision?

Senator Nahm: I have a question that's related to this, it goes back to something that Dr. Catanzaro said. So, if we pass this motion and there is no university level policy that requires student evaluations, does that prevent a SFSC or DFSC from having that? Does it like automatically revoke that, or does the DFSC still have the ability to retain that as part of their policies?

Senator Kalter: My understanding from what Dr. Catanzaro said is that it revokes it. That our removing that as a requirement would supersede any department level policies that would require it. And other than that, Senator Nahm, essentially faculty, for all of the other factors that are associated with teaching productivity (and Senator Horvath can maybe confirm this for me) essentially faculty decide which of those factors they want to include. So, for example, if you work as a master teacher, you can include stuff about that, if you want to look at alumni reactions and submit those you can do that, if you want to submit your syllabus and those kinds of materials, you can do that. So, in our processes for, I think, you know, universally the idea is that faculty get to choose, except for, you know, during a normal year, except for that student reactions to teaching part.

Senator Horvath: That's not quite correct. I mean, some departments require peer evaluation. Some departments require that faculty submit course materials. So different departments and schools specify different things as being required. The one thing they all specify as being required is student reactions to teaching, because that's in here, but different departments require different things. And let me also say, Senator Mainieri is quite correct, it’s V.C.2.d.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so we’ll change that letter on there. So, Senator Horvath, while I still have you sort of unmuted, Senator Nahm’s main point there was, would it, an individual faculty member be able to choose not to turn in their student reactions to teaching, even if, for example, they had a department that required peer evaluation of teaching.

Senator Horvath: My understanding was Dr. Catanzaro said he would advise departments that the resolution you might pass tonight would supersede their requirements. And the way it usually works is chairs and DFSCs ask Sam for his opinion about these things, Sam consults with the URC and then tells us where things stand. So, I mean, I think if Sam says what you would do would supersede the departments, then I think that's what would happen.

Senator Kalter: All right, great.

Senator Nikolaou: Going back to if it is departments or individuals, I sit more in favor of individual faculty choosing if they're going to turn in as one of the two or three requirements that they have for the teaching, and it could actually say when we have the motion, we could still have it somehow phrased so that it says that departments/schools are still required to collect student feedback, student reactions to teaching performance, but individual faculty can choose whether to use it as one of the two factors for their evaluation. So, that we include at the same time that you still have to gather the information, which means that we still want the feedback from the students to see, you know, what worked, what didn't work. But then it's up to the individual faculty if they choose to use it as one of the two required items.

Senator Kalter: Let me have Cera screenshare again and maybe we can get that language up and see if it's considered a friendly amendment. Senator Nikolaou, first, I'm thinking that that would go best just at the end, I'm thinking. Is that your sense?

Senator Nikolaou: I guess it could. Or if it could say that for the 2020 performance evaluation year only, yeah, departments/schools are still required to collect student reactions to teaching performance, but individual faculty can select whether to use student reactions to teaching performance as one of the two factors.

Senator Kalter: I'm going to stop… I would caution us to take any of that that's there out. I think we need to make a very clear statement that ASPT Appendix II, and those other two clauses, are overridden, but that perhaps we could put it right after that sentence and say…

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. That’s fine.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So, in between… I'm just trying to think if it should go before or after the Blum amendment.

Senator Nikolaou: Probably before, because we say that for those who are going to turn it in, then they would need to consider the negative impact of COVID-19.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so let's see. If you can read your amendment, again, that'd be great.

Senator Nikolaou: Oh, it was not actually written. Okay. So, I guess “the departments/schools are still required to collect student reactions to teaching performance, but individual faculty can select whether to use them.”

Senator Kalter: Go a little bit slower for Cera. So, “to collect student reactions to teaching performance, but individual faculty…”

Senator Nikolaou: “Can select or can choose whether to use these student reactions as one of the two required factors,” or evaluation factors, or something along those lines.

Senator Kalter: Okay, wonderful. Thank you.

Senator Cline: Two quick things. I was under the understanding that the last sentence Blum amendment was not adopted.

Senator Kalter: I think that it was adopted. I'm pretty sure it passed.

Senator Cline: All right, it passed, never mind.

Senator Kalter: Senator Horst, do you have that record?

Senator Horst: It passed 10-8.

Senator Cline: Got it. Sorry. My question for you, Nikolaou, is that practical to have every individual faculty member? I mean, that would require another kind of process, I guess, depending on their department and how selection would have to happen. You know, we don't really have that kind of a rigid of a process in my school, so I don't, I can't kind of conceive and how that would occur. It seems to me we're creating, kind of, an administrative process that hasn't existed before when people have to select, because we don't select, which to me just presents a lot of stuff, and we know that the student evaluations are one of the major factors. So, I might suggest that that wording, maybe it's a bit too specific.

Senator Kalter: So, hold on a minute, Senator Cline, let me just have Cera put it back up so that we can (while you're talking) we can see what you're talking about. Because I just… I figured out what you meant, and I think that you're onto something here…I'm…

Senator Cline: Yeah, Cera, could I ask you, could you make it larger? And the screen just like yeah, for the old people. (Laughter) Thanks. It makes it a lot easier. Departments/ schools, so I would say if we go back to the original language, for 2020 performance evaluation year only, the requirement that student reactions to teaching performance must be one of the two factors evaluated may be removed. That would be something…

Senator Kalter: Again, I think it's not advisable for us to change that sentence. But what I think that you're saying down in the other sentence is that instead of saying, “can select whether to use” is, “may choose whether to submit those reactions to their DFSCs,” right? In other words, so you weren't here in the spring, I don't think, when we had this discussion, but we were talking about how we would have collection of reactions to teaching. But that they would go, instead of going to the DFSC, they would go to the faculty member and then the faculty member would choose whether or not to submit them with their portfolio for the year. So, I think that that's what you're getting at.

Senator Cline: Yeah. They may elect to submit or not submit, leave the language to somebody else, but I think, yeah.

Senator Kalter: It looks… Cera, I would write that in as, “but individual faculty may choose whether to turn in these student reactions to teaching performance with their annual productivity reports to be included in the factors by which teaching productivity is evaluated.” Okay, so let's see. I think we want to go to Senator Nichols next.

Senator Nichols: Yeah, and mine was just wording as well, that it might be shorter if we go with something along the lines of “inclusion of student reactions as one of the factors for evaluation is the prerogative of the individual faculty member.”

Senator Kalter: Let's see, are you thinking that that would… let's put that up and compare them so we can sort of visually see them. Can you say that again for Cera, Senator Nichols?

Senator Nichols: Yeah, “inclusion of student reactions as a factor for teaching evaluation…”

Senator Kalter: Hold on, she's gotta go to a different part of the page. Hold on. Sorry.

Senator Nichols: “Student reactions as one factor for teaching evaluation is the prerogative of individual faculty members.”

Senator Kalter: I think you may be right that that is more concise and yet still gets the job done. Let's go to Senator Seeman.

Senator Seeman: I just had a question. Since we're saying you have to have at least two factors to consider for evaluating teaching, other departments that only have two factors as it currently stands, so they may just have the student reactions plus one other factor that they'll consider. So, now you're saying that the student reactions to teaching is optional. Are you potentially leaving departments that only have one factor that they're using to consider evaluating teaching?

Senator Kalter: Let's go to Dr. Catanzaro about that question. It's an excellent question.

Dr. Catanzaro: I would say there shouldn't be. That is, the university ASPT policies make very clear, I think, that there are many factors. The most likely examples are listed in Appendix II and Appendix II is illustrative not exhaustive. The only required one, pending this motion that you were currently crafting, is the student reactions. All the others are implied as being the prerogative of the faculty member. So, one might submit a sample assignment, one might submit a sample syllabus, one might submit a grading rubric. Any of those are acceptable as the second. And I would imagine that most faculty in practice submit more than two, but there are only… two is the minimum.

Senator Kalter: Let me read to everybody, I just pulled up our Appendix II. So, the other factors that are suggested, but as Dr. Catanzaro said, they’re suggested not comprehensive:  
  
2) Favorable teaching ratings by peers through review of instructional materials;   
3) Favorable teaching ratings by peers through classroom observation;   
4) Favorable teaching reactions by alumni;   
5) Evidence that the faculty member's students experience cognitive or affective gain as a result of their instruction;   
6) Syllabi from various courses that feature clarity of instructional objectives, clear organization of material, and equitable and understandable criteria for the evaluation of student work;   
7) Breadth of teaching ability as this is illustrated by effective teaching in different classroom settings, effective teaching of different types of students, preparation of new courses, or significant modification of established courses;   
8) Evidence of meritorious supervision of students in independent studies, internships, clinical experiences, laboratories and fieldwork;   
9) Creditable advising and mentoring of students in their preparation of research projects, theses, and dissertations;   
10) Significant involvement in sponsoring student organizations and co-curricular activities; 11) Development or review of teaching materials (textbooks, workbooks, reading packets, computer programs, curriculum guides, etc.);   
12) Development of new teaching techniques (videotapes, independent study modules, computer activities, instructional technologies, etc.);”

I think everybody gets that one this year.   
  
13) Service as a master teacher to others (conducting teaching workshops, supervising beginning teachers, coaching performances, etc.);   
14) Recognition of meritorious teaching by winning teaching awards;   
15) Submitting successful competitive grant proposals related to teaching.

So, it sounds from that list to me like we are probably covered. Let's go to… Senator Seeman, did you have anything else?

Senator Seeman: No, that was it.

Senator Kalter: Awesome.

Senator Horvath: I just wanted to reiterate, I mean the coral book says that you have to have two among that list, but many ASPT departmental policies specify which two you have to have: peer review of teaching, students response to teaching, or three, right, peer review, student response, and you have to submit a representative sample of your course material. So, again, many departments are more specific about what's required in the coral document.

Senator Kalter: So, what we're doing here, I think, we're basically superseding any department level policy, if we were to put this up, that is. Any department level policy that would include in that stuff that you just said, the student reactions to teaching, but we would not be superseding, if they require peer observation and stuff like that. That would be their job to look at that and see because American Association of University Professors is actually recommending that teaching observations, you know, be suspended for this year. I actually applaud departments that have peer observation of teaching as built into their, you know, normal processes because that is, as you know, Senator Horvath, that is the sine qua non of evaluation of teaching. But I think that we're covered is what you're saying. (Pause) Okay. Okay. So, does anybody want to argue for my incredibly verbose language over Senator Nichols’ very concise language. (Pause) I don't even think we needed a moon countdown for that. Senator Cline.

Senator Cline: I would just advocate for the shorter the better.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. 10-9-8-7, nobody wants to defend verbosity. Excellent. All right, let's replace that sentence, Cera. So, we're going to… I think we need to keep in the part that says departments/schools are still required to collect, to keep with Senator Nikolaou’s point there. And it's that part of the sentence that needs to be replaced. And actually, you might want to demagnify that just a bit while you're doing that so that we can kind of help you. I think it's after “but inclusion of student reactions as one factor, etc.”

And let's see, I think I saw a Senator Meyers raising her hand and then Senator Mainieri.

Senator Meyers: Yeah, I am opposed to leaving this up to the individual faculty member, because I'm concerned that will create chaos for departments. I'm comfortable giving DFSCs the option to change what they do, but I'm nervous about a kind of top down directive that is one size fits all for departments.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so I'm trying to remember where we are in terms of debate. Have we accepted this as a friendly amendment, or do we need to do a motion to amend with this language? Can somebody remind me where we are, Senator Horst, it looks like you might be able to.

Senator Horst: I mean, it sounds like Senator Meyers is asking for vote on the amendment.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Okay. And Senator Mainieri.

Senator Mainieri: Yes. I would also ask for a vote on the amendment. I oppose the amendment portion that leaves it up to the individual faculty members and would feel more comfortable if it was a unit level decision that faculty vote on.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so yes. Now I'm remembering, you’re refreshing my memory that we decided to discuss before putting a motion on the floor.

Motion by Senator Nikolaou, seconded by Senator Horst, to amend the motion to add the sentence, “Departments/schools are still required to collect student reactions to teaching performance but inclusion of student reactions as one factor for teaching evaluation is the prerogative of individual faculty members.”

Senator Horst: You know I'm in favor of the motion because I think it's basically making the teaching evaluations up to the individual faculty members, like a lot of other factors. So, there's never a one size fits all, except for the teaching evaluations, everything else is up to the individual faculty members, and this is making that basically another component of that list of Appendix II.

Senator Kalter: Okay, thank you. I'm also going to speak in favor of the motion because I believe that it goes with the spirit of what the Caucus was discussing in the spring of 2020, and so is simply extending that into a fairly trying semester.

Do we have further debate? (Pause) All right. I’m seeing none. Let's go to a vote first on the amendment to add that sentence. I should say the motion to add that sentence, the motion to amend the full motion by adding that sentence.

The motion passed 12-11, with abstentions from Braswell and Horvath.

***Discussion:   
Third in a series of pandemic-related ASPT discussions and/or information items (see tentative schedule on the next page):***

***Action Item:***

***ASPT policy currently states in Appendix 2 under Teaching Productivity that “Departments/schools must use two or more types of factors to evaluate teaching performance, one of which shall be student reactions to teaching performance.” For the 2020 performance evaluation year only, the requirement that student reactions to teaching performance must be one of the two factors evaluated is removed, notwithstanding any language in V.C.2.d (DFSC/SFSC duties) and XVI.B.2 (Performance Evaluation). Departments/schools are still required to collect student reactions to teaching performance but inclusion of student reactions as one factor for teaching evaluation is the prerogative of individual faculty members. When they are used, the negative impact of covid-19 on instruction must be considered.***

Senator Kalter: All right. So, now we go back to debating of the main motion. All right, so “ASPT policy currently states in Appendix 2 under Teaching Productivity that ‘Departments/schools must use two or more types of factors to evaluate teaching performance, one of which shall be student reactions to teaching performance.’ For the 2020 performance evaluation year only, the requirement that student reactions to teaching performance must be one of the two factors evaluated is removed, notwithstanding any language in V.C.2.d (DFSC/SFSC duties) and XVI.B.2 (Performance Evaluation). Departments/schools are still required to collect student reactions to teaching performance but inclusion of student reactions as one factor for teaching evaluation is the prerogative of individual faculty members. When they are used, the negative impact of covid-19 on instruction must be considered.”

Do we have any further debate on that motion?

Senator Horst: Is that, I had a note about a Horvath clause to be added.

Senator Kalter: Senator Horvath, do you recall what that might have been? I feel like we might have covered it already.

Senator Horvath: No, I think you wanted me to verify the citations to the document, which I did. Senator Mainieri had been correct.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Any further debate. (Pause) Alright. I see none. We are ready to vote on this motion. Senator Horst, do your magic.

The motion passed 14-9, with Nahm abstaining.

***Sense of the Caucus Resolutions***   
Senator Kalter: All right. Terrific. We now are almost done with our work for the night. We're going to move on to our Sense of the Caucus Resolutions. I had given one to Cera, but I'm not going to put that on the floor in the interest of time. It's eight o'clock. But there is one from Senators Horst and Mainieri to start us off, and then we will also entertain any from anybody else. So, I think you sent that to Cera to screenshare. So, let's put that one up. And does one of you want to want to read it for us.

Senator Horst: Okay, I'll read it, this is from Senator Mainieri and myself.

Whereas the COVID-19 pandemic has disrupted everyone’s personal lives in unexpected and drastic ways and placed enormous stress on everyone;

Whereas events of the 2020 calendar year have disrupted or halted research agendas and teaching plans of Illinois State University faculty;

Whereas disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic may have differentially and disproportionally impacted faculty with children or other care responsibilities, faculty with COVID-impacted health concerns, BIPOC (Black, Indigenous and People of Color) faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and other vulnerable groups in ways that we are just beginning to understand;

Whereas faculty during this stressful year have been called upon to devote unforeseen time to learning new teaching modalities, reworking courses, and devoting significant time to shared governance;

Whereas the Provost has urged DFSCs/SFSCs to ‘review and revise their ASPT policies in ways that account for [COVID-19] disruptions and their impact;’

And whereas the faculty of each unit has the ability to revise ASPT processes, if it is their will;

Let it be resolved that the Illinois State University Faculty Caucus supports the Provost’s recommendation of flexibility in faculty evaluations.

Further, it urges departments/schools, under the leadership of the D/SFSCs for tenure-track and tenured faculty and chairs/directors for other faculty, to develop and approve exceptions to standing departmental ASPT and other evaluation policies that will allow them to approach evaluation of performance for the 2020 calendar year for all faculty flexibly with respect to unexpected changes in the balance of teaching, research and creative activities, and service (such that work performed may not match faculty assignments as determined prior to the pandemic) and flexibly with respect to the measures that will be used to judge productivity/performance for all ASPT and non-ASPT faculty;

we also urge that departments/schools consider developing exceptions to allow flexibility in the format of annual productivity reports submitted to D/SFSCs by faculty.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you.

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to approve the Sense of the Caucus Resolution.

Senator Kalter: All right, so do we have debate over this resolution?

Senator Blum: Yeah, I just want to speak in favor of the resolution and think it's well worded, and captures the discussion in the Senate and I think in the Provost Office, as well as all through many faculty member and also the sentiment on the DFSCs that I'm aware of, and departments. So, I think it’s a good capturing of ongoing discussion. So, I want to speak in support of it.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. I saw Senator Pancrazio with a hand clap. Was that a speaking in favor?

Senator Pancrazio: No, I have a comment.

Senator Kalter: Oh, thank you. Okay.

Senator Pancrazio: Yes, I think, in the previous motion that we just passed, we've basically said now that the reactions to our teaching performance will be optional. Do you think that we could actually say something about how the COVID crisis has disrupted the lives of our students? There are 20,000 of them, and I think we would be remiss if we would leave them out of this. Their lives have been seriously disrupted and, with all respects, I'm here for them. I mean, I'm at the end of my career, and I'd like to see them go on and have a good career. So, I think we should probably say something about this in one of those whereas statement.

Senator Kalter: Cera, do you want to scroll up a little bit, first of all, so we can see the whereases. So, Senator Pancrazio, where it says, “everyone's” do you want us to make that more specific? Is that what you’re asking?

Senator Pancrazio: As a University, and I don't want to sound aggravated here, but I think we should say something that has disrupted students’ lives immensely. And I think, you know, take just, for example, the students that are in the College of Education that are going to have to do student teaching online is, to me, is painful and I think we should just… disrupted our students lives. I think we could certainly say everybody's lives. But I think, as a university, we owe it to the students to mention that.

Senator Kalter: And I'm also wondering, Senator Pancrazio, if you want that to be a different Sense of the Caucus Resolution, or if you want it incorporated into this one, in which case Senator Horst and Senator Mainieri would have to say yes.

Senator Pancrazio: No. I just… I've made my statement. I'd rather see how… I may be the only one who has that response. But I thought that that would… I'm just pained to see two, kind of two motions, one of which says, we're not going to listen to what students… we're not going to take their comments, or we don't have to, and then one in which we really just talk about ourselves and I think, matter of fact, I think we're a very privileged class to be able to keep working. I think that those that are working construction certainly can't work from home. So, I think that the reality of us being at an institution that is dedicated to education, I think we have to talk about students.

Senator Horst: It could say stress on the entire university community, including students.

Senator Kalter: Senator Mainieri, is that friendly to you?

Senator Mainieri: I certainly consider it a friendly amendment from my standpoint. Senator Pancrazio, I think your comments are really important, and so I'm going to echo maybe Senator Kalter’s suggestion that, you know, if this is something that we feel strongly about, I feel like it does warrant a separate Sense of the Caucus Resolution to acknowledge that. But certainly if we want to include it here, I consider it a friendly amendment.

Senator Kalter: What I'm observing there, Senator Mainieri and Senator Horst and Senator Pancrazio, is that this one seems focused on DFSCs/SFSCs, ASPT processes, which is the charge of this Caucus. If you look at our charge, it's almost entirely ASPT. And that it might have greater weight if it weren't embedded in something that then immediately flips back into discussion of almost entirely faculty concerns. So, that's why I'm wondering if we want to have two resolutions, one that commits to students and ones that commits to faculty.

Senator Mainieri: And, Senator Pancrazio, if you're interested in that, I would be very happy to partner with you on that for a future meeting.

Senator Pancrazio: Well, I think it might be relevant to take into consideration also the members the SGA to see what they have to say, because I think I got the impression that they wanted to have a say in that. But I just… a simple statement that said disrupted our student’s lives would be sufficient. I just kind of… I'm pained to see that we have a document that is just only about the situation of faculty, because without students, we wouldn't be faculty. However, you all want to do it, I’m fine. I said my piece.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so I'm going to leave it to Senator Horst and Senator Mainieri to decide whether to include that as a friendly.

Senator Horst: That's fine. And maybe, comma, including students

Senator Kalter: And, Senator Mainieri, is that acceptable?

Senator Mainieri: Yes. Like I said earlier, it's an acceptable amendment from my standpoint, and I appreciate Senator Pancrazio’s thoughts as well. I think they're incredibly important.

Senator Kalter: And I'm also wondering if we want to, instead of saying “including,” say “especially.”

Senator Horst: Sure.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Do we have further debate on this resolution?

Senator Garrahy: Senator Kalter, I would just like to say thank you for your addition of “especially” because “including students” kind of stuck out to me in a not so positive way. So, I do appreciate that inclusion of that order.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. It's really hard for me to sort of keep talking about that because I keep thinking about what it would be like if any of us were going through this as students right now. It would be very, very difficult. And some of them have had their entire senior year of high school, and their first year of college disrupted in very awful ways. Any further debate on this? (Pause) All right. I see none.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: Alright, the motion, the resolution passes. I also want to encourage Senators Mainieri and Pancrazio to work with our student government to create a Sense of the Senate Resolution that speaks more to the overall situation, and we would welcome to see that on the floor at any time. Do any other Caucus members have any Senses of the Caucus that they would like to offer?

Senator Garrahy: Senator Kalter, I would be more than happy to work with Senator Mainieri and Senator Pancrazio on a statement.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful, thank you, Senator Garrahy. Any further? (Pause) So, if there are no other Caucus members that want to offer Sense of the Caucus Resolutions, I just want to say a couple words.

Executive Committee was not able to identify any items that we needed to talk about with respect to the November 18th topic on the tentative schedule that had not already been addressed with Caucus action and/or Provost advisories. I just want to check and make sure that nobody thinks we missed anything. In other words, the November 18th was, let me read that, “Advisories regarding the assessment of productivity with respect to teaching, scholarly and creative, and service productivity beyond those faculty within the specific context of tenure and promotion.” So when we first started this, we thought that perhaps we might need to separate those. But when we talked about it on Monday, we couldn't find anything. Does that seem all right with everybody? (Pause) Looks like yes.

And so, another thing that I just need to check in with everybody about, are there any other, besides the one that Senators Garrahy, Mainieri, and Pancrazio are going to work on, are there any other pandemic related topics for the Caucus? (Pause) And I do just want to mark, by the way, thank you two, Senators Horst and Mainieri for making sure that we did not neglect our non-ASPT faculty. You will have noticed that the Resolution is about consideration for non-tenure track faculty and even though Senator Hollywood was not able to be with us tonight, I just want to mark that, and call the Provost’s attention to that as well, because I think that we all, as Senator Pancrazio said, we are privileged, very privileged to have our jobs, to not have, you know, to be all full time employed. And I think that we're all pretty worried about our non-tenure track faculty and not only their workload and their future prospects, but their stress. Right? And sort of what they're going through right now.

And then the last thing that I wanted to ask, I think that we have completed the tentative schedule of discussions related to ASPT and this pandemic for the semester. In other words, I'm saying that I hope that we won't have to call another Caucus except to do elections. But if anyone believes there remain items to address prior to the end of fall semester, please do contact us as soon as possible. We have, this is a special October meeting, we have the possibility of a meeting on the 21st, but we would have to call that by Monday, then we have November meetings, and a December meeting. And so, if you notice anything that the Caucus needs to address, please make sure to call that to our attention.

Any further discussion before I do entertain motions to adjourn? (Pause) It’s 8:17 p.m. The only last thing I want to say is a huge amount of gratitude to all of you for the incredible amount of time that we've spent this year on all of this, remembering that it's in the service of our fellow faculty, and so thank you very much for joining us tonight, and, Senator Pancrazio, do you have something to say?

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