**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, February 16, 2022**

Approved

***Call to Order***

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

***Honors Council election***

***Roy Magnuson, MUS, WKCFA (replacement for Dan Ozminkowski 2021-2024)***

Roy Magnuson was unanimously elected to the Honors Council.

***Information/Action Item:***

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

* ***02.11.22.02 ASPT REVIEW\_ Section IX\_ Current Copy
02.11.22.03 ASPT REVIEW\_ Section IX\_ Mark Up
02.11.22.01 ASPT REVIEW Section IX\_ ceb edits CLEAN COPY***

Senator Horst: We have Chairperson Buckley from the URC. We are reviewing Article IX, which we have seen before. The URC reviewed our comments, and they are now proposing this document. We are going to start with part A, and Senator Bonnell’s comment about the quote. Can you just articulate your intent as far as gender language in this document?

Dr. Buckley: Yes. Overall, the URC felt that we would go through and try to correct or remove any gender specific knowledge and make it gender neutral throughout the document.

Senator Horst: Okay. Very good. So, Senator Bonnell suggested a way to do that with the quote, which we appreciated.

Now, I’m going to item 5. This language stays the same, “Department/Schools will provide all faculty members with the Department’s/School’s, College’s, and University’s criteria for tenure. Under no circumstances should a candidate be promised or in any way assured of tenure.” So, that’s essentially the language as it was before.

In part C, you revised the language to say, “In certain exceptional cases an individual may be initially appointed with tenure, and thus is exempt from the requirements associated with the Illinois State University probationary period described in this section. Such individuals will have completed a probationary period at an institution with equivalent or greater standards for tenure at the department/school level and/or have earned tenure there.” My question is coming from Provost Tarhule. We had a conversation regarding whether or not we should clarify this concept of institutions with equivalent or greater standards for tenure. Should we clarify a Carnegie status as being an R1 or R2 institution?

Dr. Buckley: The URC did discuss that specifically and felt that it should be more open than that. We envisioned candidates coming in with tenure possibly from an equivalent institution, such as a peer institution like Indiana State. If somebody had outstanding credentials, then they would still be a possibility.

Senator Horst: So, where you say an equivalent institution, are you specifically saying that they’re an R2 status?

Dr. Trites: Because this is still controlled at the local level by the DFSC/SFSC, we thought it was quite possible for someone, say from Macalester College, a prestigious liberal arts, not an R1, not an R2, whose publication record far exceeds the average in a department and who has been on a heavier teaching load, might well be hired with tenure to a department’s or school’s advantage. So, we did not find it necessary to specify R1 or R2 because the DFSC/SFSC approves whether that person would have achieved tenure at ISU.

Provost Tarhule: So, how do you define a prestigious liberal arts college like Macalester?

Dr. Trites: I’m saying we don’t. If someone’s on a 4:4 and they have publication records that exceeds, for example, that the associate rate but they have a publication and grant record that exceeds any faculty member in our department of Oceanography, I think it would be to our disadvantage to, in the policy, stipulate that we’re not hiring anyone with tenure even if they’ve far surpassed people here when they’ve been on a higher teaching load. We thought it best to leave that to the faculty member on the DFSC to make that determination specific to their department or school.

Provost Tarhule: Rather than making it open at the start, would you consider defining a more clear benchmark? For example, the Carnegie classification and then creating this as an exception as opposed to leaving it open. Could you have this definition but create room as an exception for particular departments to consider those?

Dr. Trites: We did have that discussion, but I’m happy to recommend that we take it back to the URC and I’ll leave it to the chair of the committee.

Dr. Buckley: That would be fine to take it back and consider that.

Provost Tarhule: Thank you.

Senator Pancrazio: I wanted to recognize that I appreciated the weight that you were giving to the DFSCs, and I felt very strongly that that’s a pretty good approach to it because we, better than a particular ranking, are going to know what the standards are in ours. So, I really want to voice that I respect that aspect of the iteration. While I understand the concerns and issues of the prestige and all that. At the same time, I think that the DFSCs are also great on checking and balance on that system.

Senator Horst: Are there any other questions? Okay. Great. So, we’ll move to part D.3. I note that the Faculty Caucus suggested including the sentence, “The timing of this review should be stated in the Department/School ASPT document.” And you did not accept that change? “Each candidate for tenure will undergo a formative mid-probationary tenure review conducted by the DFSC/SFSC in the candidate’s third or fourth year in order to assess the candidate’s progress toward tenure.” And then we suggested, “The timing of this should be stated in the Department/School ASPT document.”

Dr. Buckley: I believe we assumed that would take place in the departmental or school document. It may need to be specified in the document. We may have missed that. The decision will be made at the local level.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, potentially you’ll reconsider that and add that in?

Dr. Buckley: Yes.

Senator Horst: Okay. All of the other language is what was presented previously. Then we have 4, which is that language from your draft that you presented on December 8. I’ll just note that in my letter I noted that there was no consensus among the Caucus, and it remains very controversial. But I know that the URC’s coming back with that language. Could you please summarize your committees work on this language and why you are proposing this again?

Dr. Buckley: We still felt that it was an important option for us to consider. We felt it would still add to the credibility of ISU to require external reviews for promotion and tenure, and it should be considered at least and voted upon. We did add a few things that would specify that the details would take place at the department/school level as far as the number of reviewer names, the information that would go forward, and there were a few other things like that. I think the primary change was we specified the number of reviewer names that candidates would submit to the DFSC/SFSC which would take place at that local level then, and could accommodate smaller department or schools then.

Senator Horst: Are there any further questions or any further information you would like?

Senator Garrahy: I guess I heard that the URC wanted to keep this as an option, and my consideration is what about the option for a department or school to not have this?

Dr. Trites: I believe that meant option in front of the Senate.

Senator Garrahy: Okay. I apologize.

Dr. Trites: Chairperson Horst, may I make an observation?

Senator Horst: Sure.

Dr. Trites: Dean Diane Zosky polled the 16 departments in Arts and Sciences, and I believe Senator Jordan was at that meeting when that conversation took place. I was charged with gathering data about what the effect was on tenure ability in the College of Arts and Sciences in the 15 years this has been in place. Not one department reported, remembered, or had on record any faculty member being denied tenure solely because of external letters. And perhaps Senator Jordan, who was at the meeting and I was not, and I only got the final result which was you asking the deliberative body to find out the data, how many people did this harm? and the answer is none. So, perhaps Senator Jordan you would be willing to contribute more to that conversation?

Senator Jordan: I’d be happy to. Coming from the Department of Psychology within the College of Arts and Sciences, the colleges have required external evaluators as long as I’ve been chair. Not only that, but departments had to decide whether or not they would require the use of all external letters, probably seven or eight years ago. Our department decided to do that. So, for me, I assume the variability in this policy exists across colleges then, because within the College of Arts and Sciences they all require external letters. As an experienced chair, if you get a letter that isn’t perhaps sparkling, you’re the chair, you’re representing your faculty member and your DFSC, and you make the best case for that faculty member. So, I’ve never had an instance of anybody from a CFSC or a dean commenting to me, “that was a good letter,” “that was a bad letter,” you know in terms of the external letters. I’ve just never had a conversation about it. It doesn’t seem to be an impediment and it’s something our faculty value, that sort of external validation of their qualifications.

Senator Horst: Again, we are in the information stage. We have this as Information/Action, but at this point are there any further questions for the URC?

Senator Bonnell: Sorry, this is kind of an odd question, but some of this language in IX is similar to VIII. And when we talked about VIII, which was December 8, we talked about this idea that each department should be allowed to determine their will was important. I asked about this idea of, in my mind it’s called legislative intent, and you supported articulating that. But that didn’t appear in this because we talked about it in VIII. So, I know this is a really odd question, but are you still committed to that even though when we talked about it under section VIII?

Dr. Trites: When you say legislative intent, what do you mean?

Senator Bonnell: Most of you know, I’m a documents lover, and so I think about things like what’s the intent. And you were committed to the idea that what we decide today in 2022, people are probably not going to remember that in five years from now, and that’s when we talked about the idea, like, yeah, you’re committed to Milner establishing its own policies because we are unique in many ways. And again, that doesn’t appear here in this language, but I was wondering if you talked about it in URC?

Dr. Trites: We did. And that is intended, and we can certainly make a note here as part of this discussion to make sure that the language about, especially Mennonite and Milner, that that language is incorporated. So, thank you for the reminder. That was us, not you.

Senator Horst: Can you elaborate a little on what kind of language you are looking for?

Senator Bonnell: The example that we used last time was when you think about scholarship, there are people who are doing scholarship in the library that their peers may not be working at another institution where the librarians have tenure. So, it’d be a really small pool for them to choose from. The people who have talked to me about this, they really want it to be open that those people, external reviewers, don’t need to have tenure at another institution. Does that make sense? That’s one example.

Senator Horst: Sure.

Senator Cline: I know we’re not in the debate phase, but I suppose I have a question about data gathering. You said you were charged with that, and the questions were targeted at and discussed with the College of Arts and Sciences, which is an area, of course, on campus that already have those sorts of stipulations. But I wonder what kind of data gathering you have done about the other colleges that are not currently using this, and the sort of general faculty feedback? My baseline concern is how this process has gone about despite lots of consternation. We don’t see much changing. My concern is that each college, having its own policies and procedures, that this didn’t happen at the college level to talk through these things. And I think that’s going to be the baseline problem for me as a Senator representing my college, is that my colleagues in the college feel that this is not something that they have elected.

Dr. Trites: Okay. I really want to follow you because you were asking about data gathering and then it became policy setting, which in my mind is not the same thing as data gathering. I’ve been listening to the voices here and I’m hearing a lot of voices also from chairs and directors. I can’t say that we have gone to, say for example, the CFSCs, because that partly to me doesn’t feel like something I could do in my job. I think perhaps URC might take it upon themselves, but I think that would kind of be an aberration of my role here as a supportive administrator. So, that’s why the one college I talked to is the one that has this policy required. But if you’re asking, “Have we talked to the CFSCs yet?” the answer is still no. I’m not precluding that by any stretch of the imagination, I’m just not sure that I heard that directly asked as a request of the URC.

Senator Horst: Professor Buckley, could you give us some perspective? For instance, when the URC did the major disciplinary articles, what sort of vetting did the URC do when they were proposing those major articles? Did they just write them in the confines of the URC, or did they do any sessions with the faculty?

Dr. Buckley: I’m unaware since I was not on URC at that time.

Senator Horst: Senator Holland, when the URC did some major revisions under your role as Senate chair, did they vet it across different colleges?

Senator Holland: I don’t recall specifically what the URC did. We had extensive debates starting in the fall and going all the way through to the spring about every single change. And in some instances, we ended up having the colleges vote on how they wanted to handle things, such as the recusal of people in a particular department from the CFSC on their tenure cases.

Senator Horst: The URC is charged with this language and I’m not sure that it’s part of their tradition to introduce it to the broad faculty.

Dr. Trites: That’s my understanding is that every college is represented on the URC, and those representatives go back and talk to the colleges, and that’s an information gathering source. But to my knowledge—don’t mean it’s never happened—but I’m unaware of the URC, for example, holding meetings with the CFSC of any college. The policy says, for example, if there’s a CFSC that wants the URC to review their policy they can, they can ask that of the URC. But there’s nothing that goes the opposite direction, that the URC can ask something of the CFSC.

Senator Horst: We have 15 minutes. We have some language in front of us, and it is our job to represent different viewpoints, and it is our final job to ratify the language. Is there any further information that we can request for the URC representatives?

Senator Torry: I have a question regarding language. I’m looking at section 4 F where it talks about what the evaluator be provided. And it says, “including resources available to the candidate at the time of employment.” I don’t know if that means “oh, we have CTLT and we have Milner Library.” When you say resources, what are we thinking about?

Dr. Trites: Specifically, I think we were all thinking about course load and startup funds.

Senator Torry: Okay.

Dr. Trites: I think it would behoove us to have a sort of boiler plate, but I think that was really coming from the department and schools that it really makes a difference if you get a $15,000 startup package in Physics versus if you get a $500,000 one. And so that’s more what we had in mind was things with a dollar sign in front of it.

Senator Torry: That was my question -- to make sure that’s what that included; because not only is it the money but how that money is required to be spent. So, for instance, I’m only aware of my department, hired in August, money had to be spent by June 1 whether it’s $15,000 or $500,000. Most R1 universities do not require that type of spending. So, I’m not allowed to warchest, which puts me at a big disadvantage.

Dr. Trites: Yes, it does.

Senator Torry: So, these are all the nuances, sort of the devils in the details, of why we get nervous when you say, “well, at the SFSC/CFSC they haven’t come to us.” I don’t know if they understand actually what you are doing here, and what’s being requested because those details need to be vetted out a little bit.

Dr. Trites: I think that’s a very friendly amendment for us to add at a minimum the word financial resources, but I welcome language, like institutional and financial resources and how they must be expended or any language that you have that would help us get more specific.

Senator Torry: I don’t know if that’s the same across departments or colleges. I have no idea.

Dr. Trites: We really were talking about just the things that you named, right. Startup. Course assignments (meaning how many hours you are teaching) and startup funds. I think any chair or director would instinctively say they get $15,000 a year for each of three years, but I don’t think that most of them would think to say but they can’t warchest it, right.

Senator Torry: Right. Is that the same across departments or not?

Dr. Trites: The funding model here has typically been, unless you could trade dollars in a large college like Arts and Sciences against the next fiscal year, it’s typical what you described.

Senator Torry: So, particularly in colleges where PhD is a terminal degree, I would say warchesting is probably more likely. In colleges where PhDs is not a terminal degree, I’m asking external evaluators with PhDs who don’t understand that very subtle nuance; this is the devil in the details that make us nervous. I’m not against it, I just want to know when this is going to go to departments so we can vet what is important for our department, because we know what’s best to expect more faculty. Because I’m not in the College of Applied Sciences where I have a PhD as a terminal degree. That’s all I’m saying.

Dr. Trites: I’m a little stuck on, I know that in, for example, Fine Arts, an MFA is a terminal degree, and your college… I’m blanking a little bit.

Senator Torry: Typically, Masters.

Dr. Trites: Okay. That’s good for me to know. I do think there is language in here, and I want to make it very clear, that says that this must be hammered out at the school, department, and college level. So, I really welcome any devil in the detail language that you can think of that will help us at the University level, because that’s really helpful for us to think about. But I would think in those colleges where the terminal degree is not necessarily a requirement for tenure and promotion, or even promotion to full, that had jolly well better be in those CFSC documents. I just don’t know how effectively we could do that for every college at this level. So, if you could help us think of language that works for the whole University and then we do our part of assuring that it gets put through so that there’s local control, that would be so helpful.

Senator Horst: So, you have institutional and financial resources as a starting point.

Provost Tarhule: I want to make three quick comments if I can. I’ll begin with a caveat. I come from exterior schools where external reviews are required for everybody, it wasn’t a debate. So, I just want to say I may be biased here, but I also do want to say that I don’t have skin in the game as a Provost. I don’t have a particular preference. I think it’s up to departments and colleges how they decide to handle this. So, I genuinely am not pushing a particular point of view. But because of my experience of coming from other schools where this has been done, I guess I’m just trying to provide perspective and information based on that experience for departments as you think through what you want to do. I’ll make two comments.

The first is to think about the idea or concept that is practice. As I understand it, the URC is trying to set a concept and the concept is we should use external review. The specifics on how that is done, I think the departments will set. So, it’s the same, like we decide that before we hire a tenure track faculty member, we’re going to do an interview. That’s the concept. How we interview, the department decides that. So, at point, and correct me if I’m wrong, the idea is salary to concept that URC thinks it would be good for departments to consider external review. And departments still have the right to say how and who is going to do that. I hear the questions, and it’s fairly easy when we consider something new and difficult like this, it’s very difficult to go down a path where you can easily end up in paralysis. For example, we are published. Everybody writes publication papers. Nobody, the journals don’t ask you what your resources were when you got hired or when you started working on that paper. So, somebody from R1 was saying that papers somebody from the original school was writing paper, nobody knows what the resources you started with was. It’s that you’ve been published. Does it make sense. So, I think it makes sense with that wording, not too much about the details. We can scale a point where this is something that many universities do very comfortably. So, if you just keep in mind that the departments will set up what it is they want and how they want to do it, just as you do with your tenure, just as you do with your handbook, just as you do with any interview process, that would be important.

Finally, I would say, and generally this came up when we discussed some of this with the deans. In my administrative experience, which goes back many years, I would say I have an order of magnitude more issues with internal colleagues review than an external review. Any time anywhere, any issue that I have had to do with departments I can’t tell you how many times deans come to me and say, “well, that vote turned up this way, but let me give you the reason for it. It happened this way, but this is what you need to know about the personalities.” The idea that external reviews will somehow damage you is a myth. You are far at greater risk because of history and the reactions and relationships you have with colleagues in your department that they’re going to put your review in an external review, that is a fact. And you can ask anybody in my position. I can tell you right now how many issues I have dealt with at this institution where it’s all about the personal dynamics and who voted what and who is on what side. Things that you don’t get with an external review.

I would say, keep in mind—and this has happened too, in this last review cycle, two times—where CFSC votes one way, a DFSC votes another way for tenure. In one case, it was we want this person, one committee says, “we want tenure.” The other committee say, “no.” Or the other way around. Guess who breaks that tie? Me. Right. So, if we have that situation, I get to break the tie. Based on what? I don’t know anything about Music or Economics. I took an economics class; I barely passed. But here I am making a decision about tenure in an area I don’t know. In those situations, it would really benefit me to get another third neutral voice. Somebody who had no skin in the game. All they’re looking at is the scholarship. I think the fear is understandable. The nervousness is understandable. Maybe the way that we went about discussing this could have been improved. But believe you me, this is not about making life harder for people. Having seen this in practice over 20 years, I think if we ever get it passed here, you’ll wonder why we didn’t do it much earlier. It’s far easier. The complications you face now are far worse than having to deal with an external review. And understanding that you set the rules. This is a concept. I think that if we can get it passed, that nervousness and focus on the issue at hand, you’ll be far better off. Believe me.

Senator Pancrazio: I want to thank Provost Tarhule for your comments. I appreciate the honesty, and you’re absolutely right. I think even in my own case, I think it was the external reviews that really balanced out some of the personality views—apparently people that don’t know me like my work better. At the same time, I think some of the anxiety is dealing with the idea of being evaluated by standards that are not our own. And one of the things my department has done very well is to articulate very clearly the context, and I think Roberta talked about that a little bit. Talking about the context, talking about the situation of faculty. But that is something that comes directly from the chair, directly from the DFSC, directly from the department, that explains what our situation is and makes it very clear to the external writers/reviewers that they are not to evaluate us based on their standards but on that context. And in that sense, it is an extra step, but at the same time, I think it has probably worked out for my benefit. Thank you.

Senator Jones: I wanted to just quickly state that this policy is general enough to apply across the University. At the same time, department DFSCs are clear, they have to specify what the criteria are for external evaluators. Those criteria need to be expressed to the evaluators what they are. And as I was reading this I went through our letters in our policy, and it’s very much tailored toward our department because of the constraints placed on DFSCs, CFSCs, and chairs and directors in this policy. It just looks very general at the URC level (at this level); but when you get down to actually executing these constraints in your department or school, it does reflect your department and school’s standards.

Senator Horst: That’s where the specificity comes in.

Senator Novotny: Beginning in section D. 4, I see the terms used, “peer evaluators and potential reviewers.” So, evaluators are reviewers? Am I right to assume that those are the same thing? Okay. My main question is something my constituents brought to me is that this language, it’s always discussed in plural, evaluators or reviewers. Was that purposeful? The reason I ask that, they are concerned in some instances they were only going to be able to find one person.

Dr. Trites: We did initially discuss that we though a minimum of two should be the norm, and that was our original conversation. We haven’t changed that yet because it hasn’t come up yet. We want to leave that, however; that’s one of those details that would need to be shaped in the college, especially the CFSC language. I would add that that’s where I find it important for Milner and Mennonite that we get those stipulations in place for those two more unique colleges.

Senator Novotny: I appreciate that. Their point was seeing it in the language before it gets to the point that talks about what the college, the individual areas, will decide. The language earlier is always plural, and the people were telling me that we would interpret that that we have to have more than one.

Dr. Trites: And that was our original intent, yes. So, we can take that as a conversation point back to the URC, it is time for us to address that more specifically, especially in the case of Milner and Mennonite.

Senator Novotny: Thank you. Mennonite, I think, would appreciate that.

Dr. Trites: You bet.

Senator Horst: Is that something you would do when you reviewed the CFSC documents, their corrections?

Dr. Trites: I want to really give close reading credit to Mennonite, they get A+s in Professor Trites English class today, and I mean that, really, in all gratitude, because you read that very close. We did initially put it in the plural, and we have not revisited that again. If the URC is saying there must be a minimum of two in all cases, we need to clarify that, and if we are saying less than that is acceptable in, for example, the two smaller colleges, then we need to be clear about that, and we have not addressed that topic since probably October.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, to recap, in C we had the question about defining a clear benchmark and then making an exception, the R1 R2 proposal, and you’re going to take that back to the URC.

There was an addition in D.3 about the timing of this review should be stated in the department/school ASPT document.

We just had a clarification regarding whether or not you clearly do want two reviewers. You are using the plural.

Dr. Trites: As it is now, I do think, especially for Milner and Mennonite, we need to revisit that.

Senator Horst: Okay. There was a question from Milner regarding legislative intent and I’ll just say it that way.

We had a question regarding potential adding language “institution and financial resources” or clarifying that. Those are the main points I’m remembering.

It is 9:32 p.m. We have four more meetings with this Caucus. Certainly, we can extend it to discussions with next year’s Caucus, but then it’s a different dynamic. So, it would really be wonderful if we could pass or vote on some of this language.

Senator Midha: I just have one comment and point of clarification actually. First of all, I’m not opposed to this external reviewers point. And Provost Tarhule actually gave us an area where he would find those external reviews useful, especially in the case of a tie. Now, given that, the external letters or reviewers are only for scholarly activities. So, if that is the intent, are we giving scholarly activities tie breaking power even though we are a teaching institution?

Senator Horst: Your question is to Provost Tarhule?

Senator Midha: To Provost Tarhule or Dr. Trites.

Senator Horst: It’s a holistic review, correct?

Dr. Trites: I’m not involved in the decision of the tie breaking so I will defer to Senator Tarhule.

Senator Midha: Maybe I’ll reword my questions. What I meant was, that if that was the intent, that letters are to be used for those purposes…

Dr. Trites: That was not discussed at the URC.

Senator Midha: Okay.

Provost Tarhule: So, a review has three components; research, teaching, and service. And these people are reviewers, they are not decision makers. They just provide an additional insight that goes to the research. That’s it. They don’t make any decisions. When their comments and insights come back, the DFSC integrates those perspectives in their discussions and in their decision making. You are not going to take an external reviewer’s comment and decide, “on basis of that you don’t get it.” No. They’re not making any decisions. They’re providing what they think, and what the CFSCs and DFSCs are then taking that into account as they make a decision.

I would also say, Senator Novotny, with respect to your comments about one reviewer, I think that’s not a good idea. Think about submitting a manuscript. You send me the manuscript for review, what if the journal rejected or accepted it on the basis of one review? And a tenure or promotion is too important to put all the weight on one person. Your entire future would then be decided by what one person thinks. But, you know, nobody has the absolute truth. It’s the integration of different perspectives that you’re really looking for, just like a journal. You submit a journal article, you have three reviewers, one may say no, two may say yes, the editor decides “okay, I’m going to go with this piece.” So, when you are sending out these reviews, I would strongly encourage you to tell your colleagues, “don’t think about only one review.” And when people say, “we’re not going to find reviewers,” that’s not true. Everybody in your department publishes. How do they find reviewers? So, who is reading the work? If you have ever submitting any work for publication before, that means there’s enough people who know your stuff. That’s why they’re publishing it. That’s why they’re reading it. So, I think you may be underestimating the extent to which your work is being circulated.

But to get back to your comment, Senator Midha, no it’s not about a tie break, it’s just getting an additional perspective to one component to the review. I would hope that the review also takes into account service, takes into account teaching. And if you wanted to get somebody else to comment on the teaching, you know, you could do that. If you wanted to get somebody to comment on service, you could do that. But no one perspective determines. It’s a holistic review.

Senator Midha: Thank you for the clarification.

Senator Blum: You’ve referenced a couple times a tie breaker, and I think that’s kind of where it came from as a possibility. But I am intrigued by the idea, would these letters go to the Provost’s Office? Or would you just have to rely on how the CFSC/DFSC/SFSC integrated it into their recommendation letters?

Provost Tarhule: I would get the whole package in that case. So, when the letters come back, they go to the department, and the CFSCs read this, weigh it, and then people make their decisions based on what they have read, what they are seeing from these external reviews plus their own comments. And so, in that case, let’s say that we needed to have a tie breaker—and frankly, that doesn’t happen a lot but it does happen—I would be looking at both the internal letters and the external letters, and trying to get ideas on personal dynamics here that I might not be aware of, and about these external letters that are based on the scholarship. They’re only commenting in your area. And I think we are thinking too much about numbers when people say, “well, people are going to judge us against the quantity.” Most of the time all they’re doing is commenting on the quality of your work and its relevance in the discipline. It’s not about saying, “you don’t publish six papers, we require eight papers, and therefore you don’t qualify.” That’s not how it works. It’s simply somebody saying, “Is this person doing good research work in their field? Is this person doing relevant research that is peer regarded or of quality reputable if somebody at this level would be reading?” That’s the way it works. So, I think it’s really that we need an educational process, maybe we need a discussion process. But generally, it’s a beautiful process, and the chances that this would trip you up are considerably less. I would bet my last dollar on that. They’re considerably less than that of your internal dynamics or relationships in your department are actually going to trip you up; and that happens much more than people realize.

***Adjournment***

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

Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Caucus |
| Name | Attendance |
| Avogo, Winfred | 1 |
| Blum, Craig | 1 |
| Bonnell, Angela | 1 |
| Cline, Lea | 1 |
| Garrahy, Deb | 1 |
| Harpel, Tammy | 1 |
| Holland, Dan (rep Marx, David) | 1 |
| Hollywood, Mary | 1 |
| Horst, Martha | 1 |
| Lahiri, Somnath  | 1 |
| Lucey, Tom | 1 |
| Meyers, Adena - EXCUSED | 0 |
| Midha, Vishal | 1 |
| Nahm, Kee-Yoon | 1 |
| Nichols, Wade | 1 |
| Nikolaou, Dimitrios | 1 |
| Novotny, Nancy | 1 |
| Otto, Stacy | 1 |
| Pancrazio, Jim | 1 |
| Peters, Steve | 1 |
| Qaddour, Jihad | 0 |
| Samhan, Bahae - EXCUSED | 0 |
| Schmeiser, Benjamin | 1 |
| Seeman, Scott | 1 |
| Smudde, Pete | 1 |
| Stewart, Todd | 1 |
| Torry, Mike | 1 |
| Valentin, Rick  | 1 |
| Vogel, Laura | 1 |
| Jordan, Scott (chair rep)  | 1 |
| Vacant - 1 CAS SS Faculty | 0 |
| Vacant - 1 Faculty Associate | 0 |
| **QUORUM IS 17** | 26 |
| (Provost Tarhule - NV) |  |