**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, October 12, 2022**

**Approved**

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

***Public Comment***- None.

***Associate Vice President for Faculty Development, Diversity, and Learning Search Committee election***The following nominees were unanimously elected as a slate.

Ama Oforiwaa Aduonum, MUS
Igor Kalnin, MUS
Martha Horst, MUS
Vishal Midha, ACC

***Associate Vice President for Academic Administration Search Committee election***The following nominees were unanimously elected as a slate.

Yun-Ching Chung, SED
Igor Kalnin, MUS
Lane Crothers, POL
Julie Webber, Pol

***Information Items:***

***ASPT REVIEW and other ASPT items from the University Review Committee (Members of the University Review Committee and interim Associate Vice President for Academic Administration Craig Gatto):***

* [***10.05.22.05 ASPT Review Appendix 2\_Teaching\_Comments for Consideration***](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/10.05.22.05%20ASPT%20Review%20Appendix%202_Teaching_Comments%20for%20Consideration.docx)

Dr. Buckley: Just a little background. There was a Provost working group that was formed a year and a half ago. Sam Catanzaro served on that. Miranda Lin was the URC representative on that working group. A lot of these suggested changes of Appendix II came out of that working group. The URC as a whole reviewed Appendix II thoroughly and made additional suggestions. That’s the document you have before you with the other changes that Senators Horst and Nikolaou have made. That’s what we are presenting.

Professor Strzepek from the Center for Civic Engagement also met with URC over a year ago to address the need for language regarding civic engagement and community engagement as well. So, some of that language was added as well.

Senator Horst: Professor Strzepek, could you walk through some of your suggestions and what is the motivation or background behind those?

Professor Strzepek: Sure. When we received the Carnegie classification for elective community engagement (which is a big process that we went through) one of the suggestions they had was that if we really honor and value civic engagement, we also need to recognize and reward it within the ASPT process. So, we started this process about three years ago, and we worked with our Civic Engagement Advisory Board, which is made up of faculty and civic engagement ambassadors, to get their feedback; and we defined civically engaged teaching, scholarship, and service. Then we just listed some additional ways that people could show that so that faculty who are doing this work can be recognized and rewarded. A lot of it has to do with providing mutual benefit to the community. I would be glad to provide some examples of that as well, if that would be helpful. I also want to point out that we do have these definitions on our website, and I could share those with people as well. But in terms of community-engaged teaching, that really gives students and faculty the chance to collaborate with community to address and define community goals, and then to engage in some type of structured reflection about that. That might mean changing your syllabus based on working with a community partner because you learned something different about the issue. And then community-engaged scholarship disciplines specific scholarships that helps to address a community goal. The community-engaged service is also a little bit different just from public service, in that it is a mutually beneficial relationship, not just a scholar going in to give a talk. Let’s say Lea Cline was asked by a group in Rome to, say, we are wanting to fix our murals or our statues, we have this problem can you come and do this research, and you help us in this way, in a disciplinary-specific way to your research serving with a community and mutually beneficial goals. Often, we know that this type of research takes longer sometimes, so we want to recognize that. Sometimes people are also getting feedback from their peers that are members of the community that are most affected by that problem. That’s another way you could get peer- review would be from a community group that you are producing that scholarship for. I’m happy to answer any questions you might have.

Senator Horst: Before we start going through all the lines of the document are there any questions for Dr. Strzepek?

Senator Mainieri: I received feedback from constituents and my own feedback as well and it was overwhelmingly positive to include these community experiences that can be really essential to a faculty member’s work. One of the comments that I did receive was that they were pointing out that some of these community driven or civic engagements activities appeared both in this document and in the other colors as well. Right. So, there was overlap. They were just trying to seek some clarification on when should it be counted as one of the three pillars and when should it be counted as another? I know that we are focusing on Appendix II, but this goes across all three is that they were seeing these additions, and sometimes they looked pretty similar for scholarship and service, for example, in providing guidance for faculty on how to count it and where.

Dr. Buckley: I believe we tried to fit it into each category as we felt it was appropriate. I think there was some overlap and I think that was pointed out in some of the comments that were added there. That is something we could revisit.

Senator Horst: You talked about how many faculty contributions integrate two or all three areas; therefore, contributions may be recognized proportionally. Is that one solution?

Dr. Gatto: In the preamble before you get to those things, there’s a sentence that says “department/schools are expected to adapt these guidelines to their own unique situations…” so I think that gives the units freedom. So, in our discipline, scholarship isn’t reviewing manuscripts. That’s totally service in my discipline. So, you can’t go without publishing papers and say, well, I’m doing scholarship because I’m reviewing manuscripts. That would be definite. I think that gives units the freedom to define how they want. And it even says “proportion.” So, if you want to say at this junket that I just did is in all three, you can say it’s one third, one-third, one-third or this is 50% scholarship, 25%, and teaching, 25% service. I think that freedom is allowed there. I have to say I was not part of the group that came up with this. I came in later, but just reading that it looks like those freedoms are in there.

Senator Horst: All right. We do have comments made ahead of time. At this point, we will go through each section. Looking at lines 1-33, does the URC have any response to Senator Nikolaou or my comments on the side?

Dr. Buckley: As to the first question, that was something that was in the coral document. That could be something that could be changed to just “faculty contributions” if Faculty Caucus supported that. In line 15 and 16, (and Dr. Edwards may be able to remember some of this as well), I think that was to highlight and strengthen that these are illustrative rather that prescriptive. And I think “are not exhaustive” even though it is in line 18 as well, was put there to highlight that and strengthen that.

Senator Horst: Okay. And then regarding the proportion, is that something the faculty would declare?

Dr. Gatto: My assumption was that this was a guide for what the SFSC would do, and it would be their purview to do that. I think the faculty is always free to suggest when something should be interpreted, but I guess they have the final word.

Senator Nikolaou: I’m going to follow up on Senator Horst’s question about “may be recognized proportionally.” So, we might want to specify if it is the DFSC or if it is the CFSC that’s going to make that determination. If we say that the College of Arts and Sciences is going to determine it, compared to saying that Biology or Chemistry or Economics is going to determine the proportionate amount.

 Dr. Gatto: Again, I wasn’t part of the decision, but I personally, that decision should be defined by the faculty members that did the work. In this, my contribution 50% should be scholarship, 30%... The diversity of all the things we do for a body that has no idea what just transpired to come up with a demarcation allocation would seem crazy to me. So, I don’t know in other departments, but if you put your packaging—in both Biology and Chemistry—you have a narrative to write where you can explain those things, because the diversity, even within one discipline, because what we do is so vast that the faculty member articulates if it was a solo piece of work, this was pretty much research. That’s where it should be counted. So, we’ve always left that (in the two departments I was a part of) to the faculty member to articulate where they wanted things to count.

Dr. Buckley: I think that was common practice in Milner Library as well too, to determine where they felt the bulk of that work lay.

Senator Horst: Okay. Then we just need some language that refines that.

Senator Blum: In the way you’re describing it. The faculty member, at the time of submitting their materials, they would say this was valued at 50% allocation of my time on all this work, and then that would impact the merit document. It was a faculty member’s decision about how that works. Speaking from my own department, under the current ASPT document, that would not be a permissible thing. Not that it couldn’t be or shouldn’t be. Is that what you are describing?

Dr. Gatto: Yes.

Senator Blum: And basically, that there might be some years that you did so much scholarship it should be weighted very heavily that way, and maybe your teaching was there, whatever your load was, but you spent less time on it. That’s what we’re talking about here?

Dr. Gatto: Yeah. So, I don’t know if all departments do it, but in the two I was a part of, you have a two-page narrative that you could explain within the thing you are submitting where it should be counted and why.

Provost Tarhule: I think the URC should consider this point a little bit further, because that almost seems like the faculty defines what scholarship is. Shouldn’t the definition of what constitutes scholarship be done by the departments? What if there is a difference of opinion between what a faculty member says is scholarship versus what the department says? Whose decision or definition counts?

Dr. Gatto: This document does say that the department will adapt to these criteria. So, the department does define it. What I was articulating was in the cases where this piece of work is spread over different parts. It’s not totally research, it’s also if I publish a paper with my students, the students I mentored in that work, that part could be teaching and should be articulated as teaching. The manuscript that was the core product, so for two years I was working at it, I was mentoring students, that was teaching. When the manuscript comes out, that would be research. So, the department does define the things, but on those things you have done that could go across, the faculty has the impetus there to say, “I think this was 75% scholarship and 25% teaching.” And that really came from the two departments that I was a part of. The teacher ed, high school chem ed, or the bio ed, my DFSC members would say, “Well that’s just teaching.” No, in that discipline which is different than all our disciplines in the department, it was clearly scholarship. So, it’s those nuanced things, it wasn’t ‘I’m not doing any research, so I want you to count this as research.’ That didn’t happen.

Provost Tarhule: I’m familiar with the model that you are defining. I think a slight nuance is where you begin to quantify the actual allocation into different buckets. I think the two-page narrative should be just that. It should be a narrative that helps the CFSC/DFSCs understand and contextualize; because when the faculty member begins to actually put numbers, I think you are creating an opportunity for the review committee to disagree with that. What if they don’t agree with this? So, I think that the narrative should be a narrative that helps the reviewers to contextualize what this person has done, without actually saying 25% goes to here and 10% goes in that bucket. That would be my suggestion.

Senator Blum: I think I misunderstood what you were saying at first. Now, I see you’re talking about how to distribute things that are cross categorical. That actually is a departmental problem we have. Also, I think that in Appendix II, no matter what it is, it was sort of coordinated, for example, should you put it under service or should you put it under… A lot of a coordinators duty cuts across some of these things. I think the idea is to be flexible, both for the department and for faculty members. If you are doing a ton of service that’s related to curriculum development, for example, it might make more sense to put that under service than it would teaching, but then for other faculty members, it might make more sense to put it under teaching, depending on how it plays out.

Dr. Strzepek: I think the point of this is not to punish people who are doing this community- engaged work that often does take longer. So, if they can count in different ways, it recognizes and rewards that community engagement. I do think it is good for the faculty members to be able to explain that. We know a lot of times disproportionally this type of work is done by faculty from minoritized backgrounds who are asked to do disproportional amounts of service, and that it’s also their scholarship and they can’t count it. So, I think this is really something that rewards this type of work. There are definitions in there of scholarship, (inaudible) that it needs to be disciplinary related too. Obviously, we know there are different types of scholarship that would count as well. But I think from our peer institutions we have a lot of evidence to say that this type of recognition really does help us recruit and retain faculty from diverse backgrounds; faculty feel like their work is rewarded, and that their scholarship is not only seen as service but that they can provide a community benefit as well.

Senator Horst: All right. Now we come to the Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching. There are six comments from Senator Nikolaou. Did the URC have any response to those? Senator Nikolaou, can you just summarize what you were saying about this paragraph?

Senator Nikolaou: I’m saying that there are some statements in here that don’t seem to belong in a policy document. When we say, “growing research demonstrating the benefits of high impact educational practices,” what is this research that we are referring to? And if we are talking about criteria for the evaluation of teaching, I’m expecting that we are just going to list what are these criteria we are going to use to evaluate the teaching. That’s why I say that I’m not sure what the purpose of the first big paragraph is; because the paragraph where it starts with “Therefore, teaching is here defined…” it seems like that’s where we start, because it says that “teaching is defined as faculty and student etc..” And then we just list the teaching activities and then all the criteria that we can use for the evaluation of teaching. That was my main question in general for the first part. Why are we trying to justify that teaching is important? Then there is one part where it kind of makes it sound that we say something is important and then in-class instruction might not be high impact. So, there are some of these statements that seemed more subjective instead of statements for a policy document.

Dr. Buckley: I can respond to that. The bulk of that initial paragraph was from the original coral book. We did add language. I think a lot of it was in recognition of changes brought on by COVID, out of classroom activities and learning. So, I think that was kind of in response to that. So, we could go back and relook at that.

Senator Mainieri: I echo Senator Nikolaou’s comments here. But I do think that right in the middle of this paragraph, “any mechanism” through “instruction but also any forms of teaching,” period. I think that part of the paragraph is important to explain why all of these categories are here. That we recognize that teaching can happen in a variety of activities, technologies, modalities, and locations, and that the expectation is that there is a variety of those thing being considered rather than just traditional crossroads.

So, that whole sentence. Continuing with the next sentence, “Moreover, scholarly teaching contributions likewise may focus not only on traditional classroom instructions but also on,” and maybe change the word here, on the variety of ways that we teach, or something, period. I think those two sentences are really crucial to signify that the expectation is that there should be diversity in the way that we’re looking at teaching.

Senator Horst: Professor Strzepek, there’s this sentence at the end. Is that sort of sentence needed? “Notably, “community-engaged” teaching, which creates reciprocal value,” etc., etc. is that particularly needed for the Carnegie designation, or is that something you would like to advocate for?

Dr. Strzepek: I think it would be helpful. So that when we share this document, we were told it would be helpful to have agreed-upon institutional definition of what civically engaged teaching is. So, in the original document, we had a definition of it. But the idea was to have a common definition of what that means. But if people think that’s understood in the Appendix, I think that would be okay. I do think it comes up in other pieces, but the idea of putting it there was to recognize the definitions.

Senator Horst: I see.

Senator Mainieri: I did want to follow up on that. I do think the definitions are important, particularly if we have university-agreed definitions. So, in the list where that first comes up, maybe consider adding a link to where the definitions are housed. So if SFSC/DFSCs are looking for further explanation on how the University and the leaders of our civic engagement movements on our campus, they need clarification, they know where to find that information.

Senator Horst: Yeah, but the ASPT document in particular, really operates as a paper document in some ways. It also lives digitally, but a lot of people do carry their books.

Senator Mainieri: Right. Links should say for definitions please go to the civic engagement website, which would work in a paper text and also a link.

Senator Horst: Certainly.

Dr. Strzepek: And we can certainly do that when we pass it. (inaudible)

Senator Nikolaou: I understand the purpose of the sentence. It gives the impression that we are singling out one specific type of teaching over the others. And that’s why recommended deleting the sentence or, if we want to keep it the potential rewording, that makes it more pertinent to the standards of excellence that are defined by each DFSC/SFSC. Instead of saying in general that annual evaluations will recognize faculty activities. With the wording, we are saying we are going to reward them depending on what the DFSC/SFCS has agreed upon.

Provost Tarhule: Could this specific example of the types of activities that constitute teaching be problematic? I’m looking at “teaching contributions likewise may focus not only on traditional classroom instruction but also on other forms of teaching such as conducting laboratories, mentoring interns, and” so on. Specifically, student advising. Is that teaching or service? So, there’s a bunch of things here that in some departments, it may make more sense for them to be considered under teaching, and other departments/disciplines it might make more sense for them to be considered under service or under other categories. I wonder if this is a generally accepted bucket of listing of all the things that every department understands to be teaching? Or could there be variations, in which case, is it better to not be so specific, especially in a policy document?

Dr. Gatto: I think the list is there to provide flexibility that can filter down to the departments and they can pick and choose. So, I don’t think it’s eliminating the use of any of these things.

Senator Horst: Is student-advising a new item?

Dr. Buckley: It appears it would be.

Senator Horst: Advising, supervising, guiding, and mentoring. I’m looking at page three, and then it says training and supervising students, but that’s added language. So, is student advising new?

Dr. Buckley: I did find it in the coral book, so it was existing language it was just rearranged.

Senator Pancrazio: I was going to provide an example of why advising would be pertinent in one particular situation. For example, in faculty-led study abroad programs, the responsibilities of those faculty that take students abroad usually require their own recruiting, their own advertising, sitting down with students and advising them on the schedules (and this is something that’s not done by the departmental advisors or by UCollege). They have to articulate courses, and liaison with foreign institutions. So, in that sense, we don’t have any other language for it. There was a big push in Illinois State University to recognize that type of service that faculty were doing. So, in that case, I think the word advising is an adequate one. We could also say coordinating, managing, and all the different activities that go on in study abroad programs.

Senator Horst: Thank you. Moving on. I just had a general comment. I noted that the common teaching activities have expanded quite a lot, so I was not sure if that term was still appropriate. So, I’ll just throw that out there. On page three, we have added information under group instruction, advising, supervising, guiding, and mentoring, and developing learning activities. Are there any comments or questions about that section?

Senator Pancrazio: Speaking of study abroad, I would like to ask that the committee consider in the section entitled Advising, Supervising, Guiding, and Mentoring, I think at some point they should include the study abroad programs just because of the types of activities that faculty…. I don’t see it in that section. Likewise, in Developing, there is a mention of study abroad programs, but for me, developing is basically the initial groundwork to start a program. However, the actual nuts and bolts of maintaining a program and managing a program and coordinating it is pretty extensive. The amount of work for a faculty-led program, they work 24/7. If there is a crisis, they have to respond to their students immediately. An addition of one word (in line 100) it says “Developing,” and I would say “managing.” I think they use that language on line 98, managing or coordinating is better. I don’t think we’ve got enough words to recognize faculty-led programs, and all the work that they do.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, expanding to managing and developing study abroad programs?

Senator Pancrazio: I would say coordinating.

Senator Horst: Coordinating and developing student abroad programs.

Senator Pancrazio: Developing is there. But the actual coordinating on site is pretty serious work.

Senator Horst: let’s go back to Group Instruction. Advising, Supervising, guiding, and Mentoring, and Developing learning activities. Are there any comments about those three sections?

Senator Novotny: I’m just wondering, by distance learning, you’re talking about online, right? or no? Under developing learning activities.

Dr. Buckley: I would assume so.

Senator Novotny: Okay. I was just wondering why that was broken out. Item one, where it says developing, reviewing, distant learning courses. And then you have developing and managing distant learning courses. Well, you develop and manage courses whether they’re online or face to face. I’m just wondering what the thinking is for that.

Dr. Strzepek: I think that was already in the document. That wasn’t a change we proposed so I can’t speak to that.

Senator Novotny: It’s a small point. I was just wondering.

Senator Horst: The concept of designing and redesigning courses now has taken on a whole new meaning, I think is her point, now that we’ve all done that in different modalities. So, do we really need to break out the activity in different ways?

Senator Mainieri: I wonder here, first of all, just replacing distance learning, wherever it comes up with “online” at this point. But I do think that there is merit in leaving online separate, and maybe in order to distinguish it, I see that distinction here, but developing and managing online curriculum or programs. I feel like there is a lot of activity on our campus looking to create new online programs, those type of things, that I think that work should be recognized separately. So, that could distinguish that there.

Dr. Edwards: I think that’s existing language, and it seems like developing online courses is somewhat different skillset, activity skill. So, maybe on a separate line. You could throw distance learning or online course in next to regular courses. But I think it makes sense the way it is now and have that as a separate line. You do want to put it on equal footing with traditional courses, I think.

Senator Horst: Any other questions on these three sections?

Senator Carney: Just on group instruction number 6 says, “Facilitating student learning in collaborative/community-engaged group projects or community partnerships.” Especially in the School of Theatre and Dance, we use collaborative and community-engaged in different ways, and they’re not always synonymous. So, I’m wondering if we can say collaborative and/or community-engaged projects in that line?

Dr. Buckley: Yes, the URC will consider that change.

Senator Horst: All right. Moving on to Developing as a Teacher. My comment is, Does the added language apply to all examples of professional development activities? If I attend a Canvas workshop, am I remaining current on Inclusive educational practices? “Attending professional development activities to enhance teaching skills and remain current on evidence-based and inclusive educational practices.” I note that you added that clause, and would it be enough just to attend a professional development activity to learn Canvas, for instance?

Dr. Buckley: Nothing is quantifying in that statement.

Senator Horst: You’re adding these prescriptions and descriptions to the kind of professional development activities, and there are all kinds of professional development, such as those to enhance. But the way it’s worded now, it seems to be very specific type of development activity.

Dr. Gatto: The precursor for the whole thing says none of this is to be prescriptive.

Senator Horst: That is true. But if I’m a chair and I’m looking at these, is it only certain kinds of development activities? I’m just wondering why that’s singled out.

Dr. Buckley: Because this is the teaching section. It was just meant to specify that the professional development activities to enhance teaching skills, that’s, I guess, pretty broad for an education category. I don’t think that phrase limits the types of activities.

Senator Horst: So, there could be other types of professional development activities that could count?

Dr. Buckley: this is a teaching section so if it was for scholarly it would be in the other section.

Senator Horst: But it also says “and remain current on evidence-based and inclusive educational practices.” So, what if I’m remaining current on technological instruction?

Dr. Buckley: I think that would be under enhancing teaching skills.

Senator Nikolaou: Or to follow up on that, what if I’m implementing an innovative instructional strategy that no one else is using yet? So, when it says, “and remain current on evidence-based and inclusive…” Well, there’s not going to be evidence-based, because I’m just developing a new strategy. So, the part where it says, “to enhance teaching skills,” it seems that it can incorporate anything else, but then when we add, “and remain current on,” it seems that we are restricting it into a specific subgroup.

Dr. Buckley: Would an and/or serve better there?

Senator Horst: I think so, because it really seems to be limiting the type of professional development activities, which the original language doesn’t.

Dr. Buckley: It’s designed to be illustrative. I think we may have missed getting those two things tied together there.

Senator Blum: Just to this particular sentence, I don’t want to add anything that’s already been said, but I as just curious. I’m wondering why evidence-based? and was there a reason for inclusive educational practices? What was the reasoning behind those additions? I think it’s already been pointed out, you have this enhanced teaching skills language already. Was there a specific reasoning that the URC wanted to add those—evidence-based and inclusive—specifically.

Dr. Buckley: I don’t remember the specifics. It may have been a suggestion from Dr. Trites last year.

Senator Horst: Why did the URC decide this?

Dr. Strzepek: I believe this language also originated from the public work group that Yojanna Cuenca-Carlino was also helping to advise, and the same framework for inclusive teaching excellence was specifically interested in working on inclusion and belonging in the classroom. I do believe an and/or would be okay here. But I think the focus is on how do we make our classrooms a more inclusive spaces for student learning, and they wanted to highlight those evidence-based practices that are in the framework of inclusive teaching excellence, that specifically say how we can make our classrooms and environment where students from different backgrounds can learn.

Senator Horst: Any other questions on this section?

***Adjournment
Motion by Senator Webber, seconded by Senator Pancrazio, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.***
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| --- | --- |
|
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| --- |
| **2022-23 FACULTY CAUCUS ROSTER Wednesday October 12, 2022** |
|

 |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  | **Caucus** |  |
| **Name** | **Attendance** |  |
| Blanco Lobo, German | 1 |  |
| Blum, Craig | 1 |  |
| Bonnell, Angela | 1 |  |
| Carney, Lania | 1 |  |
| Cline, Lea | 1 |  |
| Garrahy, Deb | 1 |  |
| Gudding, Gabriel | 1 |  |
| Hammond, Tom | 1 |  |
| Harpel, Tammy | 1 |  |
| Hollywood, Mary | 1 |  |
| Horst, Martha | 1 |  |
| Lucey, Tom | 1 |  |
| Mainieri, Tracy | 1 |  |
| McHale, John | 1 |  |
| Midha, Vishal | 1 |  |
| Nichols, Wade | 1 |  |
| Nikolaou, Dimitrios | 1 |  |
| Novotny, Nancy | 1 |  |
| Palmer, Carl | 1 |  |
| Pancrazio, Jim | 1 |  |
| Peters, Steve | 1 |  |
| Samhan, Bahae | 0 |  |
| Schmeiser, Benjamin | 1 |  |
| Smudde, Pete | 1 |  |
| Tarhule, Aondover\* | 1 |  |
| Torry, Mike - EXCUSED | 0 |  |
| Valentin, Rick | 1 |  |
| Webber, Julie | 1 |  |
| Vacant - 1 CAS SCI Faculty | 0 |  |
| Vacant - 1 COB Faculty | 0 |  |
| Vacant - 1 COE Faculty | 0 |  |
| Vacant - 1 Faculty Associate | 0 |  |
| Kidwaro, Fanson (chairperson rep) | 1 |  |
| **QUORUM IS 17 (\*=NV)** | 26 |  |