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***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Senator Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: Just, again, a reminder, since there was an issue about this last time in the Caucus, that if you want to be recognized to speak, you should raise your hand through the participants screen and the raise hand function, or you can click on the yes or no button if for some reason the raise hand function is not available. Just remember that I can't see everybody’s screen, so although Senator Horst often raises her hand, physically, I can't always see that on people's screen. So just make sure to use those.

***Action item:***

Senator Kalter: We're going to start with our Action Item, or our first Action Item, I should say. In order not to take up another 52 minutes of our voting time tonight, the Caucus Executive Committee decided to have us send pools of candidates to the Provost for him to choose two faculty from each pool for each of the working groups for the Spring Retreats. When you vote in the Qualtrics form, please vote only for those candidates who you think should remain in the pool. You can abstain. You can vote for only one person. You can vote for two, or you can vote for as many as you would like to be in the pool. The Provost is going to take two people from each of the pools to seat on the working groups.

Senator Horst is going to call your name by role to verify that you have recorded your preferences and then Provost Tarhule will be sent both the names of the persons who received a majority of Senators endorsing their presence in the pool, and then also the number of endorsements received. And I first want to ask the Provost, just to confirm something about… We had a couple of chairs and directors volunteering, but we weren't sure whether to include them in the pools, whether they're being voted on as faculty, or if you have a different mechanism where you're going to include Chairs Council, chairs, you know, in the working groups as chairs. And so, basically appoint them out of the Chairs Council so that they would not be seated by the Caucus, but instead be seated by you. We wanted to make sure we had your preference on that.

Provost Tarhule: It's not something we had considered separately. If it's appropriate, I can ask your thoughts on that. I mean, it's not something that I had thought about leaving chairs out. I guess, to my mind, they could come from this nomination, but if for some reason, you decide that maybe this is not appropriate, I should appoint them separately; I can do that as well.

Senator Kalter: What I saw was that there would not be a chair on each of the working groups and that you might have a preference for that, that the university might benefit from having a chair on each of them, instead of just the possibility of a chair on two of them. So, that's one of the reasons why that question came up. It also is when we do things like Educate Connect Elevate, our Strategic Plan, we have representatives from the Chairs Council, and I think there's at least one other mechanism, it might be the Dean searches, where there's a separate seat for the chairs. So, we just wondered about it for this one.

Provost Tarhule: I'm sorry, my lack of familiarity with the process, that didn't really register very hard. But I think that's something we can address outside of this process. Whatever you think is best based on past practice, we’ll be able to deal with it.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Terrific. We'll talk about it then Friday and then again on Monday. Wonderful.

***Spring Retreat Working Group endorsement (2 faculty at large per group;*** ***Additional Caucus members may volunteer from the floor)***

1. ***Student Success***
	* Lumi Hartle, SED
	* Evelyn C. Baca, TCH
	* Tracy Mainieri, KNR
	* Aslihan D. Spaulding, AGR
	* Mallory Jallas, MIL
	* Tom Lucey, TCH

The Faculty Caucus endorsed with a majority vote of 14 or above: Lumi Hartle (17), Tracy Mainieri (21), Aslihan D. Spaulding (15), and Tom Lucey (23).

1. ***Faculty and staff success***
	* Nancy Lind, POL
	* Aslihan D. Spaulding, AGR

The Faculty Caucus endorsed with a majority vote: Nancy Lind (22) and Aslihan D. Spaulding (25).

1. ***Financial Model/Planning***
	* David Marx, PHY
	* Susan Kalter, ENG
	* Diane Dean, EAF

The Faculty Caucus endorsed with a majority vote: David Marx (21) and Susan Kalter (24).

1. ***Academic Programs***
* Dimitrios Nikolaou, ECO

The Faculty Caucus endorsed Dimitrios Nikolaou (27) with a majority vote.

1. ***ASPT/Evaluation Broader view***
	* Meghan E. Leonard, POL
	* Nancy Lind, POL
	* Janet Wilson, THD
	* Carrie Anna Courtad, SED

The Faculty Caucus endorsed all of the candidates with a majority vote: Meghan E. Leonard (17), Nancy Lind (17), Janet Wilson (18), and Carrie Anna Courtad (17).

1. ***General Education***
	* Juliet Lynd, LLC
	* Lea Cline, ART

The Faculty Caucus endorsed all of the candidates with a majority vote: Juliet Lynd (24), and Lea Cline (23).

1. ***Internationalization***
* Antonio Causarano, SED
	+ David Thomas, KNR
	+ Dan Ozminkowski, THD
	+ Lumi Hartle, SED
	+ Iuliia Tetteh, AGR
	+ Jan-Ulrik Dahl, BSC
	+ Aysen Bakir, MKT

The Faculty Caucus endorsed all of the candidates with a majority vote: Antonio Causarano (17), David Thomas (18), Dan Ozminkowski (17), Lumi Hartle (16), Iuliia Tetteh (17), Jan-Ulrik Dahl (16), and Aysen Bakir (17).

1. ***Distance Education (including non-traditional students)***
	* Aysen Bakir, MKT
	* Aslihan D. Spaulding, AGR

The Faculty Caucus endorsed all of the candidates with a majority vote: Aysen Bakir (23) and Aslihan D. Spaulding (24).

1. ***Graduate Students and Research***
	* Phyllis McCluskey-Titus, EAF
	* Dawn M. McBride, PSY
	* Yun-Ching Chung, SED
	* S. Gavin Weiser, EAF
	* Aslihan D. Spaulding, AGR
	* Eric Peterson, GEO

The Faculty Caucus endorsed all of the candidates with a majority vote: Phyllis McCluskey-Titus (18), Dawn M. McBride (19), Yun-Ching Chung (18), S. Gavin Weiser (16), Aslihan D. Spaulding (15), and Eric Peterson (22).

1. ***Recruitment***
* Dimitrios Nikolaou, ECO

The Faculty Caucus endorsed Dimitrios Nikolaou (25) with a majority vote.

Senator Kalter: Alright, so you have wonderful pools from which to choose from, Dr. Tarhule.

Provost Tarhule: No, I just wanted to say thank you so much, Chairperson Kalter and the rest of the Caucus. We look forward to moving very quickly to making a decision. I have a full day tomorrow. So, I would anticipate maybe Friday or Monday to make a decision and contact those people. But I really appreciate this engagement. Thank you.

***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/school 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.  Departments/schools that do choose to change the format of their report requirements must address how doing so could impact faculty's 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.***

Senator Kalter: Excellent, excellent. And now we're going to move on to our continued discussion about pandemic stuff. The Faculty Caucus Executive Committee has suggested two Action Items. We'll start with the first one. And we'll see whether we want to put this on the floor. This one has to do with the format of annual productivity reports. So, I'll read this aloud. “Individual departments/schools may decide whether to follow the standard format for their departments annual productivity reports for the 2020 calendar year or to follow a different or abbreviated format. Departments/schools that do choose to change the format of their report requirements must address how doing so could impact faculty’s 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.” I will just say that that underline is simply because we had forgotten it on the first agenda. So, it means nothing, and it will be removed if we do put that on the floor. So, do we have discussion about changing formats, whether we want to allow departments to make this decision to abbreviate or make a different format for themselves?

Senator Mainieri: I would like to move to put this motion on the floor with the minor addition of a typo that school should be schools.

Senator Kalter: Oh, thank you. In the first line.

Senator Mainieri: Yes.

Motion by Senator Mainieri, seconded by Senator Nikolaou, to approve the ASPT exception.

Senator Kalter: Alright, so now we enter a debate. Let's debate whether to allow this, if we wish to, or we can just move to a vote. Do we have any debate?

Senator Pancrazio: Could you read the motion again in its entirety, especially, I want to hear the last phrase.

Senator Kalter: Absolutely.

Senator Pancrazio: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: And this is on your agenda, so you do have this on your agendas, and Cera sent around the updated agenda, but this was on both agenda, so it doesn't matter which one you're following. It reads, “Individual departments/schools may decide whether to follow the standard format for their departments annual productivity reports for the 2020 calendar year or to follow a different or abbreviated format. Departments/schools that do choose to change the format of their report requirements must address how doing so could impact faculty’s 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.”

Great. Do we have debate?

Senator Blum: One thing I kind of want to speak against this in its current form, right, is it seems like it doesn't go far enough. I mean, the way it’s stated, is that it gives you the option of not requiring those things, and it seems like regardless you should have to do those things as a DFSC or SFSC. I mean, so my sort of problem with it as it is, is that it allows a school or department, not to consider those things.

Senator Kalter: Can you clarify the “those things,” what “those things” refers to?

Senator Blum: Yeah, so it says, “Departments/schools that do choose to change the format of their report requirements must address how doing so could impact faculty’s visibility…” So, it seems like they're not consider… I mean, I guess I don't understand. It doesn't. It seems like, is it the changing, the format is going to change it or I'm not sure I understand. All right. The issue is that it is, in fact, it's almost imperative that it's going to change it. I'm not sure how… Yeah, I don't understand how changing it, and “the format required must address how to” could impact the faculty’s visibility for awards or possible increments. So, it seems like the other way around, you know, both could be true.

Senator Cline: I mean, I'm not quite sure if I'm agreeing with Craig or not, but I would just like to say that my concern about this in the way it's written, first I'd make a small grammatical change to the last sentence and say, and to make arrangements. But there is no sort of range of impact there, right. So, it says that if you do make this a change, whether that's abbreviating, delaying, because I think that's what you were talking about last time, Craig, is that if they delay submission, how does that enter into the kind of annual award process and things like that. So, if you do make those delays or changes, you're going to have to address how that's going to affect people and make arrangements to mitigate those. But there's no, like, range, there's no appeal process. There's no, like, what is that arrangement and will that arrangement be satisfactory to faculty. I suppose that's my issue is that they're stating this necessity and requirement that if you make a change, you must mitigate the negative effects of those changes. But there's sort of no acceptable range or appeals process if a faculty member doesn't feel as though that has been effectively done. It just seems a bit demanding and vague at the same time.

Senator Kalter: I'm… Before I go to Senator Mainieri, let me clarify two things. One is the grammatical thing. I think that you want to add the word “must” rather than the word “to” before “make,” because it actually says departments and schools that do change, choose to change the format of the requirements, must address. And then if you follow parallel, it's “must make.”

Senator Cline. Yes, ma’am.

Senator Kalter: The second thing is that there are actually two… One's not an appeal, but it is a safety. So, anytime a department changes its rules, that has to get approved by the CFSC. So, that's one part, is that CFSCs would be monitoring these kinds of changes and making sure that, you know, they're actually making real good faith and beyond good faith actually effective arrangements to mitigate or eliminate the impacts, right. But the appeals process also always stands. So we don't eliminate any of the standing ASPT performance evaluation appeals processes in doing this at all. And so, there would be appeals available in the normal ASPT process, and none of this would get rid of that. It may be, Senator Cline, that you're referring more to how awards are not exactly… they're not exactly part of that appeals process, right. Because people are discovered for awards through ASPT processes, but not as part of ASPT processes. But just to reassure that those ASPT appeals process do not go away just because we make this relatively small change. So, I just wanted to clarify that for everybody, that doesn't eliminate the rest of the 70-page book that we have to follow.

Senator Cline: So, I just wanted to say, like, I understand that the regular appeals process is still in place, but, and let me just sort of say for the record, I do not fear this in my own school. This is not sort of reflecting my own anxiety, but I have anxiety for people in other schools that if the DFSC/SFSC make decisions that a person doesn't feel, in fact are mitigating, you know, the impacts, that I'm not sure that they can necessarily appeal that. You know what I mean? I understand that that final appeal, given their decisions on their annual report, certainly that's still in place, but I'm not sure that I necessarily think that the way that this is written that there will be uniformity and a sense of fairness across schools and departments on campus. And maybe it's just sort of the anecdotal information I have from friends in other parts of the campus, and I'm not really sure that this would give them much comfort.

Senator Kalter: Yes. Gotcha. And I'm not arguing one way or another. I'm just trying to clarify ASPT processes. The only other thing that I forgot to say is that it's not just the DFSC that gets to change this. Basically, the entire department would have to vote on those kinds of changes, right. So, it's not the DFSC gets to decide, it's the department would have a discussion and then vote.

Senator Mainieri: I just wanted to… From my understanding, right, this is only talking about the format, not timing. Right. So, this wouldn't have any impact on allowing departments and schools to make decisions on pushing timing back. So, I think for me, in the discussions from last time, it became clear that all the dominoes that can fall in terms of pushing back the timing seemed hard to overcome. So, this, in my understanding, only focuses on the format of that report, as opposed to the timing of when it's due.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. And just to clarify for everybody. So, this verbiage came from Senator Mainieri writing down some stuff that Senator Blum had said at the last meeting, and then shaping that into this kind of a motion.

Senator Blum: I just wanted to, with the suggested language changes, I went back and reread it a couple times, and I am starting to understand better that it's a formatting. And so, to me, the language now makes more sense. But, I mean, I concur with… I think there are other floating issues around that are not necessarily related to format about whether people are considering COVID issues in DFSCs. All right, so I think maybe it's more appropriate… so, inherently I don't find anything wrong, you know, I sort of retract my statements a little earlier, I find anything inherently wrong with the statement itself, all right. I think my concern is really not particularly related to this particular motion. All right, and sort of some of the things that have been voiced.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And just to clarify that also. So, if you look down on your agendas, you'll see that we still have a schedule of things that we have yet to discuss. And so, some of the, I don't know, Senator Blum, whether some of the things that you're thinking of are included in that, but remember that we have, for example, to talk about things beyond tenure and promotion and how productivity is being assessed. That right now, it's scheduled for the November 4 Caucus to discuss. And then… So you can look on the second page of your agendas.

Senator Horst: I would like to speak in favor of the language. There's just no way that a department could have known about all these bizarre circumstances of this year when they came up with the conditions for the annual reports, and they did that last year. So, this just allows more flexibility for the departments, and will be… it's a local decision. So, I think it just gives the ability for people to make local decisions about what they want to do in this crazy year.

Senator Stewart: Really just a question. I'm just wondering, do DFSCs get to, according to this change, demand a shortened report? Because I'm wondering if a faculty member, say, was worried about applying for a service award, could submit their full report, even if the DFSC requested an abbreviated one.

Senator Kalter: I’m going to put that actually to Senator Mainieri perhaps because of being the main drafter of this. I'm wondering if you think your language accounts for that or if there's perhaps a friendly amendment that we could put on there to mitigate against that, so to speak.

Senator Mainieri: Well, perhaps it could be, because I think…I guess to Senator Stewart, are you saying that individual faculty should have the option to do that?

Senator Stewart: Yeah, it seems to me that I'm generally in favor of allowing DFSCs to, you know, request shortened reports, but if a faculty wants to submit the full ordinary thing, it seems like they should be allowed to do so. And that mitigates, at least for those who take that into account, that mitigates concerns with shortened reports for those who are applying for promotion or wanted to apply for award or something like that.

Senator Mainieri: So, if the wording in that first sentence was, individual departments/schools may allow faculty members to follow the standard format for their department’s annual productivity blah blah blah, or to follow a different or abbreviated format. So, instead of saying decide whether to follow, decide to allow faculty to choose. Is that addressing the concern?

Senator Stewart: Yeah, I think that would address the concern, at least it would make clear whether this is a required change or an optional thing.

Senator Mainieri: For me, that’s not a friendly amendment. I think that would be a needed amendment to be put on the floor to be considered. I think it changes the intent of the statement.

Senator Kalter: I'm going to ask Cera if she can screen share and make that proposed friendly amendment on the screen. And while we're doing that, let me go to Senator Pancrazio.

Senator Pancrazio: I mean, I'm generally inclined to allowing my colleagues, their kind of sense of judgment right now, because we all are kind of in the same boat. So, I'm not overly concerned with that. This situation that I've had is similar to that situation that others have had. And I'm also very cognizant that those that are giving childcare and are having their kids come in and interrupt their classes and things like that is a constant. I mean it even made the New York Times. So, I think some very strongly worded statements from our administration and deans to letting people know that, hey, we need to remember we're all human beings who probably could solve this. The one concern I have about the current wording, it says any other important ramifications. That does presume we know what those ramifications will be and perhaps they may not be immediate and I think they may be further down the line. So, I'm kind of wondering, I mean, how… I'm not always convinced we know what the outcomes will be, and what those possible ramifications are, but I think we know what the immediate problem is, is that our schedules have been very interrupted. Our whole teaching rhythm has been unsettled, and perhaps some are only beginning to get some semblance of rhythm. Again, but I do know that people are facing constant interruptions and difficult to find that type of alone time which they need to actually concentrate. So, while I'm in favor that we should be reminding DFSCs that they really need to take the human factor involved. I don't believe we know all the ramifications. I don't think we ever know what the cards are going to be dealt. So thank you.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, I’m going to go to Dr. Catanzaro, because Senator Cline has had one bite at the apple already, so she’ll go after that.

Dr. Catanzaro: Thank you. I'm not sure I understand how changing the format. Right. So, I'm not sure I understand what's envisioned in terms of changing the format and how that could adversely affect evaluations, because the format is just the way to organize the information. And in any format, you know, some faculty will fill it out to 25 pages, and some will have five pages, in my experience. So, I would imagine the format as sort of identifying what is minimally required. So, speaking to Senator Stewart's concern. But perhaps I'm misunderstanding what departments… because I'm not familiar with every department and school’s sort of format. But I guess one way to phrase my question is, what is the problem we're trying to solve?

Senator Cline: Thank you. Sam, I think I might be able to clarify a tiny bit. So, sitting here thinking about this discussion from before. I think that it's possible that this first question that was asked a while ago might have actually fed into the problem’s structural versus timing. So, when I brought up issues having to do with the differential considerations, having to do with awards and things of that nature, I was really thinking about timing. Because when we had that debate, we were discussing whether we should give people the allowance to postpone the submission of annual dossiers, etc. And so, this amendment as it's written seems to bring those two things together, the structural issue in first sentence and the timing issue in the second sentence, and maybe I'm misconstruing it but that seems to be a little bit clearer to me now. Again, my concern about differential treatment in terms of our addressing, you know, the awards and various forms of promotions and raises and things of that nature, that was really vested in the issue of the timing of the submission. And I'm concerned a little bit about, although I appreciate the sentiment, I'm concerned a little bit about creating the possibility for differential format within. So, if we put that wording that Senator Stewart requested, that would be in a sense forcing departments to allow differential formats and I'm not really sure that they would like that very much to have that instruction. So, anyway, maybe other people don't agree with me, but I think maybe what our issue is, is that one sentence of this motion was addressing one question and another was addressing a separate one

Dr. Catanzaro: Thank you.

Senator Peterson: Thank you. One of the things that I've been trying to, I guess, rectify in my head with this Action Item, and I appreciate it. I like the idea of giving the DFSC flexibility or the SFSCs giving them flexibility. I'm thinking back to what we passed last Caucus meeting where we made it so that any changes the DFSC or SFSC made are retroactive to the beginning of January. And I wonder, to some degree, if that doesn't already speak to this. Because we're allowing them to make changes that go back, and they can make whatever change they want, whether it is a format change or requirements of what they're looking for. And maybe to some degree a timing change. I don't know if this adds anything to what we've already done. I'll leave it at that.

Senator Horst: Susan, I would like to hear your opinion on what Senator Peterson just said.

Senator Kalter: I was just going to give it. Actually, I was waiting for further debate from others, but I was going to argue that this actually does add two things. I think, almost every department is going to read what we did last time as about criteria changing, rather than about format changing. And so, I do think that this… I am going to argue in favor of passage of this motion because I think, I don't know, somebody else said it, people are tired and I've been sort of an advocate for allowing people to be tired, and maybe sort of, from my point of view, finding some roadblocks in trying to take the load off of people's backs. And I think this would be a very good way to take some of the load off of people's backs. So, a couple of times ago, we talked about how in my department, we have to rewrite our CV, we have to write an essay, we have to do like, you know, whatever it is a 10 to 25 page report, we have to turn in, you know, artifacts and etc etc. And frankly, having sat on our DFSC, we all are amazing. There are very few people on this faculty who do not pull their weight. This has been a really hard year. And so, I would be strongly in favor of sending this signal to the departments and schools and to individuals. You know, we recognize that you did a lot, just put it in one document, or get your departments to vote to put it in one document, rather than having a whole, you know, regular process. Because I personally do not find that reassuring, I find it demanding to pretend that this is a normal year and that we all have the amount of time that we, you know, that we usually have. I would argue in favor of this.

Senator Peterson: Thank you. And thank you for that clarification as well. I sit on our DFSC now and I do appreciate it. And one of the things that we've talked about this, because we've had some conversations about format as well, are the things that we have to forward on to the CFSC then as well. So, do we need to address that aspect at all as well? Because we may allow the DFSCs/SFSCs to make changes, but if the CFSC is still going to require certain documents, then that kind of goes beyond what we're allowing the departments and schools to do.

Senator Kalter: Would you suggest, Senator Peterson, adding, where it says individual departments/schools… to say something like, if they do that, the colleges should accept that or…

Senator Peterson: I think something like that would be acceptable, because then it allows the DFSCs to think about these changes without the limitations that if we make the changes are the CFSCs going to allow them to occur.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So, would you prefer to put that near the top or at the end, some sort of sentence and do you have sort of wording that we could consider?

Senator Peterson: You know, I think maybe a statement towards the end. Since the CFSCs have to approve these anyway that the CFSCs will look favorably upon DFSCs recommendations for the year, or something to that effect, that just kind of encourages the changes and the CFSCs are going to, you know, they're still going to need to review them, but they'll be more favorable towards these changes, given the period we're in.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so maybe something like CFSCs should approach department/school changes with as much flexibility as possible?

Senator Peterson: That sounds favorable to me.

Senator Kalter: Let me just reread that. So, CFSCs should approach department/school changes of this nature with as much flexibility as possible. Alright, is there any further debate?

Senator Horst: Could we see the other… was Cera going to type up the other amendment, can we just see the text.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. Cera, I was wondering if you have that now or at least maybe screen share what we have

Ms. Hazelrigg: I did not hear what Tracy said.

Senator Kalter: Let's see if we can just screen share the agenda. And while you're doing that and putting that part of the agenda visible. Senator Nikolaou, you have your hand raised.

Senator Nikolaou: I had a question following up on what Senator Peterson mentioned. If there is such a clause, shouldn’t it have been in our previous… on what we voted previously? Because when we said that we are going to allow the departments to make changes to their ASPT document, the CFSC will need to approve the changes that the departments propose. So, why didn't we say something similar there where it's going to be like the bulk of the changes, and it is specific to just the format. So, for example, if the CFSC should just look favorably on changing the format, but they should just ignore the substantive changes? And I'm also thinking in terms of we didn't have something similar for the tenure and promotion cases. We didn't tell the CFSCs look at all these favorably. We said that they will need to be approved by the CFSCs.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Senator Nikolaou. The only thing, by the way, that I can think of why we didn't do that is because they kind of saw it coming. Whereas the formatting changes they might not have seen coming, but that doesn't negate the point that they are there to approve not just to do whatever the departments want. So, if we do put something like this in, we may want to make sure that we preserve their ability to approve or reject.

Senator Pancrazio: Yes, I'm uncomfortable telling another committee how they should view something. I think it's part of shared governance that they should be able to develop their own impression of that. So, I'm uncomfortable telling them that they should see it in a particular light. I think if a department wants to make that request and send that to the CFSC, I think it is kind of always been the CFSC’s prerogative to vote in favor of, or against that, or to ask for changes. So, I'm kind of uncomfortable with telling another committee how they're supposed to see something.

Senator Meyers: I was going to say the exact same thing. So, thank you. I’m uncomfortable telling the CFSC what they should do.

Senator Kalter: Let me go back then to Senator Peterson because it came up with your concern. What are you thinking now after hearing this discussion?

Senator Peterson: I would be fine, removing it. My concern is just that the DFSCs, the SFSCs may make these changes. But again, if the CFSC is going to require the same documentation that they have in the past, then those changes are moot, because you're still gonna have to ask your faculty to produce the same documents that have to be forwarded on to the CFSCs.

Senator Kalter: And, Dr. Catanzaro, do you have any views about whether they're likely to be amenable to this or not.

Dr. Catanzaro: Could you repeat the question, Senator Kalter, please. I'm not sure caught all of it?

Senator Kalter: Yes, so Senator Peterson is bringing up, you know, that while the departments may decide to follow an abbreviated format, the colleges may still insist upon a non-abbreviated format. Do you see that as a likelihood or is it likely that the colleges will say, yes, let's follow the lead of some of our departments and accept abbreviated or different formats for annual productivity reports this year, given the circumstances?

Dr. Catanzaro: I think I have a couple thoughts. And again, I don't know the department and college level policies, all of them. If a college has like a college wide format, then the conversation should happen… about abbreviating it, preform should be college wide. So, I think that's one caveat.

Another thought is that if a DFSC changes its (or SFSC) its local requirements. And I think that would include the format, that gets reviewed and approved by the CFSC. So, CFSC eventually… and there may be some dialogue, the CFSC might say, well, are you sure you really want to leave this out, right, there might be some give and take. But eventually CFSC approves it. So, they might approve something that's longer than what the department originally wanted but there won't be any disconnect between what the department is requiring and what the CFSC is expecting because of that.

And finally, for annual productivity reports, the CFSC really doesn't get involved in the evaluation of any faculty members. They're involved in sort of setting and approving how the department wants to conduct the evaluation. The CFSC doesn't get involved in the evaluation of individual faculty until it comes to an appeal. And there's already a provision that if the CFSC (and I forget the exact wording), but if someone's appealing an evaluation that they think is unfair or has missed something, then their materials would go to the CFSC whatever they've submitted, and they have the opportunity to submit sort of a statement in favor of their appeal and supporting documentation. And the CFSC has the opportunity to say, you know, we'd also like to see X, Y, or Z to sort of adjudicate this appeal. So, the CFSC won’t routinely be asking for faculty to submit material to be evaluated. And they would only ask a faculty member to do so when that faculty member is asking for additional consideration of their performance, and likely will be more than happy to say, sure, I'd love to show you how my DFSC was wrong here. So, unless I'm not understanding Senator Peterson's concern about the CFSC expecting or wanting something different from the DFSC, I'm not sure I'm understanding how that in practice would be a major concern.

Senator Kalter: Okay, so the wording here is not inherently a problem? Because you did say that colleges should be talking about this college wide.

Dr. Catanzaro: Only if there's a college wide format…

Senator Kalter: I see.

Dr. Catanzaro: …that all departments adopt.

Senator Kalter: Okay, good.

Dr. Catanzaro: And I apologize for the complicated sentence structures.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Yeah.

Dr. Catanzaro: So, the added sentence, the final sentence, from my perspective, it makes more sense to me to emphasize that when CFSCs are considering appeals, they need to consider those in the context of what a department requires, be it in format or in how they do their evaluation or other aspects of that, that they've already approved. So, I'm not sure, you know, approaching the DFSC/school recommendations as favorably as possible could potentially be problematic if members of this CFSC, you know, look at a particular appeal. I'm thinking about the appeal scenario. And say, well, we do think that on this particular case, the DFSC missed something, right. We're not presuming any motivations, but we just, you know, we're going to find in favor of the appealing faculty member, which would contradict that sentence. The CFSC has got to be an arbitrator that may well view a DFSC recommendation unfavorably.

Senator Kalter: I'm a little bit confused. It almost sounds like you're saying that everybody has to do the standard format this year.

Dr. Catanzaro: No, no, I'm saying the depart… I mean, I have no problem with this provision that makes it explicit that departments may choose to alter their format. I would imagine that such alterations will go through that process of CFSC review and approval, because it's an ASPT change. So, that sets up how the evaluation is to be done. Then evaluations are done and DFSCs make recommendations. This person is satisfactory. This person is unsatisfactory performance. Some of those will be appealed. The CFSC’s job is to adjudicate those appeals, not to approach the DFSC’s recommendations favorably but to weigh the merits of the appeal, and perhaps disagree with the DFSC. Unless, you know, if recommendations here is referring to the DFSC’s recommendations about the format, then I would suggest maybe using a different word. Because the ASPT policies refer to the decisions that DFSCs and SFSCs make when evaluating faculty as recommendations because technically everything's advisory to the President.

Senator Kalter: I'm just going to note that we're going past our usual hard stop time. But let me go to Senator Blum for comment.

Senator Blum: Yeah, this is kind of a technical question, and I was looking through the ASPT and it's just probably faster to ask Sam. All right, so is the method of collecting, in my department we call it data gathering form, was the method of collecting data on faculty performance supposed to be part of an appendix to the departmental ASPT, or is it… So, I'm a little unclear about whether… Does the CFSC approve it? I mean, I didn't pick up on the… Just quickly on the university ASPT that it explicitly states that unless in fact these documents should be like, for example, being an appendices to any department or school’s ASPT?

Dr. Catanzaro: I forget what they call the data collection.

Senator Blum: Yeah, we call ours data collection form, I'm sure other departments or schools have different names for it, but it's just the form. Right. It's not the criteria.

Dr. Catanzaro: That, I mean, in some departments that may or may not be labeled as an appendix, but, essentially, it's a part of the department or school ASPT policies. There’s not as standard university wide format for that. And I don't know, you know, apart from say colleges that are effectively one department, you know, Milner Library and Mennonite College of Nursing, I don't know if any other colleges have a standard annual productivity report format across all their departments and schools. If they do, then there's a college level conversation to be had, but I think their local documents. If they're part of the ASPT document, then they get reviewed and approved by the CFSC.

Senator Kalter: I am going to suggest, unless there are objections, that we table this for the evening, work out some of the kinks that might be being brought up and adjourn for the night.

But I do want to say one thing about the next potential Action Item, just that it's on our radar screens. The one that reads, “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.” And then, the motion part of this would be, “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.” Right, so want to put that on your radar screens to discuss among your constituents. I have heard from two types of constituents, one are the ones that we were on sabbatical or what have you in the spring, and so this is their first online teaching experience ever. And so, attempting to give them the same consideration of first-time online teaching that we gave to people in the spring, even though it's a little bit of a different circumstance. The second one is from people who were pulled online involuntarily at some point between August 3 and I think it was like sometime in September. So, I just want to make sure that that's on your radar screen.

Motion by Senator Blum, seconded by Senator Mainieri, to table the ASPT exception. The motion was unanimously approved.

Provost Tarhule: May I make a quick comment before you adjourn?

Senator Kalter: Absolutely.

Provost Tarhule: Yeah, and I'm making the comment partly because of what I’ve observed here, and also, again, just for information sharing. I was at that institution for 18 years where the annual productivity report was a maximum of two pages and there was only one for the entire institution of 30,000. The school had 30,000 students, more than twice the departments we have, and there was only one form and it was only two pages long and that worked really well. At my second institution, the annual productivity report was capped at four pages and that seems to work very well. So, if we have an annual productivity report that is so convoluted we feel that we need some relief at a time like this, as we think about a post-COVID landscape, and what we have learned, and what has been revealed to us about our processes, there might be an opportunity here to look at what other schools do and to see if there's another template out there that we would like to copy.

I make this comment also because I think the Teaching Award nominations forms here are way more complicated than anything I've ever seen. So, it seems to me that we complicate things too much. It doesn't need to be this complicated. There are simpler ways of doing things to make life easier for all of us. So, I'd like to invite you—look we've spent a whole evening trying to find relief to a problem that we know is too complicated in a year when we may have no raises. It doesn't need to be this complicated. I think this should be an opportunity for us to take a look at, do we need a form that is that complicated. How is it that some schools can get away with two pages and make it work for the entire institution and we have something that is this complicated. All of these types of revelations to me are opportunities to revisit the things that we do, the policies, and to see if there are easier ways of doing it. So, I just wanted to put that on the table, maybe for future consideration.

Senator Kalter: Your words are quite welcome to my ears and I have several reactions, clap, thumbs up, heart, joy, and ta-da that I want to put up on my screen. I’ll refrain from doing so. But I could not agree more. Thank you, Dr. Tarhule.

***Adjournment***
Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Peterson, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.