**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, March 2, 2022**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

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

***Public Comment:*** None.

***Approval of Faculty Caucus meeting minutes 02/09/22***

Motion by Senator Nikolaou, seconded by Senator Nichols, to approve the minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved.

***Information/Action Item:***

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

* ***02.25.22.03 ASPT REVIEW\_ Overview***

Dr. Buckley: This was a request to add language under Definition of Faculty that would pull in a process for dismissal and appeals, which were applied for non-unionized/non-tenure track faculty. So, they normally would not be defined as faculty under ASPT, but only for these processes.

Senator Horst: Exactly. And this resulted partially through our review of a policy at the very beginning of the year, 3.3.9, which was deleted. And in the process of that we realized that there was no dismissal per se for non-unionized/non-tenure track faculty. So, through research it was discovered that the Constitution actually specifies the ASPT as the place to look for dismissal process for an NTT non-unionized faculty. At this point, we also have some language we’ve reviewed at the back of the policy.

Motion by Senator Nikolaou, seconded by Senator Pancrazio, to move to action. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Nikolaou: On page , where you added the sentence, remove the quotation at the end. And then, should it be the “hiring department/school faculty search committee” instead of having the apostrophe s?

Senator Horst: DFSC and SFSC, so it’s really just spelling out the acronym.

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

Senator Horst: Okay. So, we’re taking out the possessive, because for the hiring Department Faculty Status Committee or the hiring School Faculty Status Committee. We’re taking out the quotation and the possessive. The sentence reads, “This summative review is not required in those exceptional cases where an individual is initially appointed with tenure; in those cases, tenure is based on an assessment of that individual’s qualifications by, at a minimum, the hiring Department/School Faculty Status Committee.” So, it’s really just spelling out the hiring DFSC or SFSC is what you’re contending. It’s not a possessive.

Dr. Trites: Honestly, it can go either way. Throughout the document, we typically only say Department/School, DFSC/SFSC, but it is the FSC that belongs to the department or school. So, it’s actually one of those rare cases where it’s fine either way, but for the sake of consistency let’s take it out because that’s how we do it elsewhere.

Senator Cline: This is really a question across the floor to Senator Bonnell. We just took the word library out of the Sabbatical policy when referring to Milner faculty. There’s a section in this Overview, the last section that have provisions for Milner library faculty. Is it fine as it is or does Milner constituency want that removed?

Senator Bonnell: The reason why I asked to have it changed last time was actually for consistency, also because in that last document it was for sabbaticals. Sometimes it’s stated Milner faculty for one piece, then sometimes Milner and a little l library faculty. So, I either asked for it to be capitalized, but in this case, it was the easier thing to do just to remove the one “library” than to go back through and add. So, I don’t think it really matters. I mean, consistency is what I’d go with.

Senator Cline: Right. So, you’re fine with the way it is.

Senator Bonnell: Yes.

Senator Horst: Yes, it’s a consistency issue. It’s not the way we are referring to the faculty.

Senator Bonnell: Yes, exactly.

Senator Cline: So, is it correct to say Milner library faculty?

Senator Bonnell: I’m going to ask a question then. I don’t know as a matter of course, how do we refer to us throughout the whole document? Sometimes when I look at these things, I look at the changes, I don’t go back through the whole.

Senator Horst: This whole paragraph says Milner library faculty.

Senator Bonnell: I’m fine with that.

Dr. Trites: Alternatively, because there’s an indefinite article a there, then it would not need to be, it’s not specifying Milner Library, so it’s fine as is grammatically. I would defer to my colleagues in Milner about how to do it politely.

Senator Horst: Let’s just stick with the proposed changes as opposed to changing the entire document reference to Milner library faculty.

Senator Jordan: What are the implications…“In most cases, tenure is based on an assessment of that individual’s qualifications, at a minimum, the hiring departments…” this is at-the-moment of hiring.

Senator Horst: I think it’s implying it could also be reviewed by the CFSC. But at minimum it’s a review of the SFSC and DFSC.

Senator Jordan: Right. Just making sure this means that anywhere along the process, the provost or dean can deny tenure or if someone’s trying to hire someone with tenure. If the department is trying to hire someone with tenure that decision has to be agreed upon by the dean, the provost, and the president. It’s not listed.

Dr. Trites: I see your point.

Senator Jordan: It might seem obvious; I just want to make it clear is all.

Dr. Trites: I would accept that as a friendly amendment.

Senator Horst: Since we are in Action Item, could you clarify what kind of language you would like added?

Senator Jordan: Yeah. I’m sorry, I’m not really asking for language to be changed. I’m just fleshing out the implication.

Dr. Trites: The implication is that we will follow normal university processes. We could add, “…, following regular university processes.”

Senator Jordan: That’s fine.

Senator Horst: “Tenure’s based on the assessment of the individual’s qualifications following university…”

Dr. Trites: Please leave “at a minimum.”

Senator Jordan: Yes.

Dr. Trites: “…, at a minimum the hiring departments DFSC/SFSC, following regular university processes.”

Senator Jordan: Thank you.

Senator Horst: Well, let’s talk to our people who did the motion. Do you accept that as a friendly amendment?

Senator Pancrazio: It’s fine with me. The DFSC’s as they stand don’t make decisions, they make recommendations.

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Pancrazio: So, that is the normal process.

Senator Horst: Following regular university processes. Thank you very much. Is there any further debate?

Document 02.25.2.03 Overview of the Illinois State University ASPT system was unanimously approved.

* [02.25.22.04 ASPT REVIEW\_Section I](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/02.25.22.04%20ASPT%20REVIEW_Section%20I_.docx)

Senator Horst: I looked at my notes from last time, and I noted that we discussed, in quite a lot of detail, the inclusion of the word “professional” in the list of the term “conflict of interest refers to situation in which financial” adding the word professional there. I conferred with URC representatives, and they agreed to that edit. So, we will put the work “professional” in, “The term ‘conflict of interest’ refers to situations in which financial, professional, familial, or other personal considerations may compromise, or have the appearance of biasing, a faculty member’s professional judgment,”etc. I believe we’ve talked about all the other language.

Senator Nichols: Several of our constituents in the sciences wanted clarification. At the previous meeting, I asked Dr. Edwards and he was unable to give me a clear answer. Does being a co-PI on a grant in which the assessing party gets salary, does that constitute a financial conflict of interest that they would need to recuse themselves?

Dr. Trites: Are you talking about if two people are in the same department, ones on the DFSC…

Senator Nichols: Or if they are not and some are on the CFSC. If they are co-PIs on a grant in which the person on the assessing body draws salary from that grant. Is that a conflict of interest? Will they be expected to recuse themselves?

Dr. Trites: I would find it to be the case.

Senator Nichols: Because that would potentially cause staffing problems in Biology for the SFSC because there are so many large, interconnected grants in our unit.

Dr. Trites: That could be addressed in your units’ individual documents, and I would recommend that it be so.

Senator Nichols: Right. But we couldn’t make it less rigid than the wording in this. Right. This is the overreaching document, so we would have to have something that could be tighter, but it couldn’t be looser than this.

Dr. Trites: You could redefine that being co-PIs on a grant is a scientific and scholarly arrangement, not a financial arrangement, for example.

Senator Nichols: But it is.

Dr. Trites: Yes, it is, but I don’t want to take financial out of there. What this is really talking about is that you and I hold the patent on widgets, and you shouldn’t be assessing me for anything when, if you vote for me, it increases your pocketbook. If you already hold the grant, that’s different.

Senator Nichols: Yeah, but their likelihood of getting a competitive renewal probably increases if the person was granted tenure or promotion at the academic unit. There would be a financial interest of my co-PI having as good an academic record as possible.

Senator Horst: Isn’t it whether your judgment is compromised, and you could perceive like if you were going into like a jury, you can say I can still make a fair and impartial assessment?

Senator Nichols: But people are terrible at the meta-cognition needed to determine when their decision making is compromised. Right. The human brain is great at rationalizing why the bad decisions we make are the right decisions at the time. We’re asking individuals to determine if they are able to make the decision in an uncompromised fashion. And then we are going to assess that from the outside, they should reasonably recuse themselves or not. So, I think the wording that compromises their judgement doesn’t make any sense in the realm of neurophysiology to me. We’re just asking an awful lot, and in some disciplines there’s so much connection between finances and grants, that I think it gets really grey in those areas.

Senator Horst: Thank you.

Senator Pancrazio: Just a question. When the committee put the word financial in, was it meant specifically to deal with the issue of me bringing it up in the Senate? Can we fine tune some phrasing on that? When you have staffing issues, I think, you have to have…

Dr. Trites: It’s a valid point. We were talking about lining our own pockets by promoting somebody. And if somebody could help us find elegant wording.

Senator Pancrazio: Would external financial connections, not including… I’m not quite sure how to address that.

Dr. Trites: Yeah. I’m throwing it back to Senator Nichols, what would you like to see?

Senator Horst: This definition actually came from the Academic Integrity policy. That’s the source of this definition of what a conflict of interest is. When we originally reviewed this, the frustration of the Caucus was that there was not a clear definition.

Senator Nichols: Would we still be able to put in an exclusory phrase about, financial interest does not include external grants, awards…

Dr. Trites: Can we cover that since it’s such a limited… the reason I’m suggesting that being a departmental or school guidelines, I don’t think there is any problem at all with narrowing that definition in the School of Biological Sciences. I don’t think it needs to be here for the entire university because I think we’re talking about something different. If the Caucus disagrees with me, by all means, let’s add even more words.

Senator Horst: Could we have “financial interest shall be defined by the department ASPT documents?”

Dr. Trites: But then we’re putting the burden on every single department to define what that means.

Senator Horst: “May be defined?”

Senator Nichols: I like that much better because I’m not entirely comfortable saying academic units are allowed to pick their exemptions from this policy. I think it’s better to say when and under which part of the statement, they may choose. I much prefer what Senator Horst proposed.

Senator Horst: Are there any further questions?

Senator Midha: I think that the point here is that if there is any conflict of interest then the person should recuse. So, maybe it’s worth discussing about conflict of interest, we should actually reformulate the part where we’re saying that they shall recuse themselves from any discussion or vote. So, it could be something like they should consider discussing with their department…

Dr. Trites: Yeah, that’s the thing we are trying to get away from actually. And the chair of the URC has suggested a simple and perhaps elegant solution. “The term conflict of interest refers to situations *in which certain* financial, professional, familial or other personal considerations may compromise or have the appearance of biasing.” So, what I like about adding “in which certain” financial, professional, familial, or other personal considerations may… I feel like that leaves the definition open to what the department or school wants it to be. And it also doesn’t put us back into departments and school and individuals decide if they are going to recuse themselves or not.

Senator Horst: But certain familial, so I just choose not to recuse myself?

Dr. Trites: Well, I don’t think you have to if it’s your second cousin and you can be impartial.

Senator Horst: Or certain personal relationships?

Dr. Trites: It doesn’t say personal relationships. Personal considerations could include the fact that Chad smacked my car last week.

Senator Horst: Senator Nichols, so you have a reaction to that as opposed to the other language?

Senator Nichols: I think I like the option that you have proposed.

Senator Horst: Financial interest may be defined by the department ASPT documents.

Senator Nichols: Yeah.

Dr. Trites: Only financial? Not professional or personal?

Senator Pancrazio: Are we talking about scholarly? Earlier I think we emphasized aspect might create that space for grants. We’re not talking about an external contract providing, we’re talking about scholarly, so that might be…

Dr. Trites: I don’t know where you want that word to go. Scholarly. I like the idea. I want to understand what you’re saying.

Senator Pancrazio: Never mind.

Senator Cline: I might suggest that the wording as it is now, leaves enough leeway for the Department of Biological Sciences to determine what may compromise. Because the terminology is the term “conflict of interest refers to situations in which financial, familial, or other personal consideration *may compromise*, or have the appearance of biasing a faculty members professional judgment.” So, in my mind that leaves it open for the department to define what “may compromise” and your department… I imagine in the Arts there are colleagues that have shows together, some work together that co-create work. There are lots of ways that that can be applicable in other areas besides Biological Sciences. I think it’s for each area to define what “may compromise.” My understanding is that the wording is fine, and that Biological Sciences can make that determination for themselves, as Arts and Theatre and others could as well.

Senator Nichols: My point is that I don’t think we can argue the main point way. I think it reasonably could, and I guess that’s my problem. Looking from the outside, I don’t see a way in which it couldn’t reasonably be interpreted that it would compromise someone’s judgement.

Senator Cline: I agree with you, but could there be an internal departmental process? If we are going to come to a situation where half of the department is in on one grant and there is a personal financial stake for each of the participants in the grants, I think it would have to be a local decision about whether individuals are compromised.

Senator Horst: Right. Maybe that’s where the “financial interest may be defined by the department ASPT documents.”

Senator Cline: Right. I’m just saying I’m not sure how we can word it differently that could cover both the concerns. I think you are correct, but I wonder if there might be… I don’t mean to be punting it into your department, but I think only you all can discern how you can assess rather that’s an actual risk or whether it’s an acceptable risk. Right.

Senator Nichols: I don’t disagree, but I would feel more comfortable with the statement in there that it does come back down to the academic unit to make that determination.

Dr. Trites: Is it okay if I ask you to repeat the sentence that you’re suggesting?

Senator Horst: We haven’t added it yet, but I think we’re taking out the “certain.”

Dr. Trites: Yep.

Senator Horst: “If a faculty member has a conflict of interest that compromises their judgment regarding an ASPT matter, they shall recuse themselves from any discussion or vote on that matter. The term “conflict of interest” refers to situations in which financial, professional, familial, or other personal considerations may compromise, or have the appearance of biasing, a faculty member’s professional judgment. Financial interest may be defined by the department ASPT documents.”

Senator Nikolaou: And this is going to go after we cite the policies? Because if it goes before we cite the policies, then we are going against the policies that were there.

Senator Horst: Yes. It would go after the policy citations. Does that make sense?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. Or if we want to say like “in special cases” or “in special circumstances”, so that it is not going to be as common. Because it’s not going to happen to many departments. So, it’s not going to be the norm where every department going to be defining their financial interests.

Dr. Trites: That is covered by the word “may.”

Senator Horst: Point of question, besides Biological Sciences, are there any other departments where this would be problematic?

Senator Blum: Yeah. I don’t see it as problematic, but in the sense that we have people that work collaboratively on grants, but we have people that work collaboratively on everything. Right. Not just grants. So, there are benefits through collaboration that one gets, or we invite you to work on a book chapter, or all kinds of scholarly activities. So, to me I was okay with the “may,” at the same time understanding it. Maybe there would be specificity that grant work or collaborative financial grant work doesn’t necessarily constitute a conflict of interest. So, that actually specifically states and addresses the concern, rather than going around and trying to define it.

Senator Horst: But it could be broader. It could be in the Arts. It could be that we do a show together or we cut an album together. We’re in a string quartet and we make an album together and we’re making money. Do I have a conflict of interest?

Senator Holland: My general experience has been that if faculty think that there is some kind of conflict of interest, they are going to jump all over it and the DFSC is going to know. At which case, the DFSC can step in with that “may” type statement. Also, if we’re dealing with financial, then I could also add, there’s these other personal considerations…. I just don’t like him. How are we going to handle that kind of thing? Are we going to start putting clarifications on every single line or are we going to let our colleagues have the flexibility that’s broadly needed in any given consideration? I’m basically advocating that “may” is probably enough and not the additional line, because my experience with faculty is if there’s a conflict of interest, or a perceived one, you will hear about it.

Senator Smudde: I just wanted to throw in an idea which might or might not help. In that sentence that says the term, “ ‘conflict of interest’ refers to situations in which financial, professional, familial, or other personal considerations…” after the word consideration I’m suggesting we put a parenthetic word mark that says “(any of which a department/school may define)” because that list that’s given any of them could be defined that way or none of them.

Senator Nikolaou: If it goes before the parentheses it means now that if we add anything else beyond what is defined in the other policies then we are adding something on the ASPT which is not consistent with university policy. And university policy would dominate over the ASPT. So, it doesn’t make any different there.

Senator Smudde: Yep. I understand.

Senator Horst: Are there any other questions? All the other changes we have reviewed. We did add a sentence here, “In order to preserve the integrity of the process and avoid biasing the committee, faculty members shall not state their reasons for recusal.” I think that was Senator Otto who suggested we have a transition there. So, that was the transition that was crafted by the URC.

Senator Cline: Did we agree on the extra sentence?

Senator Horst: I don’t know if there’s a consensus frankly about the extra sentence. So, if we move to Action then we could have a debate and vote on that sentence.

Motion by Senator Cline, seconded by Senator Nikolaou, to move to Action Item. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion by Senator Nichols, seconded by Senator Novotny, to add “financial interest may be defined by the department ASPT documents.”

Senator Holland: I’m somewhat reluctant to add something specifically for financial, just because I can consider other things equally likely to cause problems. And also, in the next paragraph down it says that faculty members have the right to request that a member recuse themselves.

Senator Nikolaou: I’m going to say that even though I understand why it would make sense to add it, if we add it, again, if we look at 1.8 it doesn’t say that schools and departments can define what is financial, which is the university policy, so it wouldn’t apply for the ASPT.

Senator Cline: Can you read the sentence again?

Senator Horst: So, after “(see [Policies 1.8](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/conduct/1-1-8.shtml), [3.1.3](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-1-3.shtml), and [3.1.44](https://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-1-44.shtml)). Financial interest may be defined by the department ASPT documents.” Is there further debate?

The motion to amend was approved.

The motion to approve Article I of the ASPT document was unanimously approved, as amended.

* [02.25.22.05 ASPT REVIEW\_Section VII](https://academicsenate.illinoisstate.edu/documents/02.25.22.05%20ASPT%20REVIEW_Section%20VII.docx)

Dr. Buckley: This section in part B refers to the letters of assignment. Professor Trites, Professor Horst, and I had some conversations about this via email today. The URC recommended reinstating the original language and then adding in “prior to the state of course registration,” to clarify that there are basically two processes going on. One is assignment of courses and faculty find out about that. Then in the second paragraph we propose changing the date to August 15 instead of March 15 and that is when the actual written annual assignment letter would come out, by August 15.

Senator Horst: I also indicated the Provost’s preference not to talk about reassigned times. So, I believe the sentence we crafted over email, so everything that’s highlighted in purple, “The Chairperson/Director shall communicate to all faculty members in writing and in a timely manner, prior to the start of course registration each semester, the courses they are expected to teach.”

Dr. Buckley: And stop at that point.

Senator Cline: I just want to be sure I understand the word registration. Registration would imply the semester before. Right. So, our students are registering for the fall semester soon. So, this letter then would be issued to us in April for the fall of 2022.

Senator Horst: Right, which I think is common practice now, so you know what you are teaching in the fall.

Senator Cline: I just wanted to make certain.

Senator Horst: I understand what you are saying, because which registration is it?

Senator Cline: Because if it’s registration, presumably one would have to have the ability to stop the registration process if they don’t agree or there’s some conflict. So, that just concerns me, timewise.

Dr. Trites: I think the original intention was common practice, was for you to know what you’re teaching before course registration opens. And then if, say, we have to close a section because it didn’t make, my class didn’t make, so now I get reassigned to something else. My assignment letter in August will make it very clear that what I was asked in the email prior to course registration, written clearly and in a timely manner, is different than my actual assignment letter. So, I don’t know a lot of department chairs who don’t communicate with faculty about what they are hoping they can teach, the ideal schedule, and I don’t know a single department chair that doesn’t end up shifting courses around once they see what the enrollment trends are. Does that help, Lea?

Senator Cline: It helps but I have never received such a letter. It’s all done verbally. There’s no formal letter.

Dr. Trites: We’re not saying formal, we’re just saying in writing.

Senator Cline: Okay. In writing.

Senator Horst: You should know what you are teaching in advance.

Senator Cline: I do, but I’m just saying I don’t get that communicated to me by my director. So, I just wanted to be sure I understand this flow, because this is not a flow with which I am familiar.

Dr. Trites: Yes. The advantage for you or anyone is if you got the email and then the chair or director is changing things on you, and it’s a problem. It’s not because of enrollment, it’s because they decided somehow that you should be an expert in something you’re not an expert in. Having it in an email gives you recourse that you wouldn’t have.

Senator Otto: I actually have a similar question to Senator Cline about this term registration. I wonder if we aren’t actually talking about preregistration, that that might clear that up a little bit.

Dr. Trites: We don’t call it preregistration here, Senator Otto. We call it advanced registration. And the whole registration process is from advanced to late is all covered by the term registration.

Senator Otto: I understand that, but as we were just speaking of, it is highly problematic for people not to know what they are teaching before late registration when that happens to some of us. So, it just seems like we could qualify that term so that it was when the schedule is turned in, basically. When the schedule is turned in you have faculty on the schedule.

Dr. Trites: It is different. What we are talking about is advanced registration rather than when the schedule is turned in. There are some departments where if I’m a chair I turn in my schedule for spring in July, I think, but if I turn it in for the fall… In other words, there are months that pass between when the scheduling is turned in and registration opens.

Senator Otto: Yes. I understand that. But there is a point at which students begin to register for what’s on the schedule. And I’m thinking that we qualify this with that point. I understand that we… because I did the scheduling at my previous institution, so I understand how far out we are on turning in the schedule and on making changes to the schedule. But it seems like when students are registering is what we’re talking about. And the earliest part of that would be preferable.

Dr. Trites: Senator Horst just asked me if adding the word “advanced” course registration would be suitable, and it would be. Yes.

Senator Horst: Absolutely.

Senator Otto: Thank you.

Senator Jordan: It seems to me that this pretty much only applies to fall semester in that you have to give a faculty member an assignment letter in August that’s for the entire academic year. You don’t give a new assignment letter every semester.

Dr. Trites: Well, you’re supposed to if it changes.

Senator Jordan: But everyone is supposed to get an academic year assignment letter at the beginning of that fall semester. So, by default, people will have been informed by August what they’re teaching in the spring in the assignment letter. My question is this, would it be sufficient once registration begins to send the schedule out to the faculty? Would that constitute sufficient evidence for written documentation of what they’re teaching?

Dr. Trites: Not in all departments because too many places they’re still moving things around and saying staff, staff, staff. I don’t think all departments have that information.

Senator Jordan: What I’m trying to get away from is sending individual emails to individual faculty indicating what’s on the schedule when registration opens Mondays. Of course, they’re going to have it amended if a course changes and things like that, on an individual basis. So, instead of doing fifty emails regarding the fall schedule, I would argue it would be sufficient to send out the current schedule for fall when registration starts for fall, and then take care of individual differences after that.

Dr. Trites: What you are suggesting would still be in writing and in a timely manner.

Senator Jordan: That’s what I was asking. Thank you.

Dr. Trites: There’s nothing here that says individual emails. That’s just one way that it’s handled. I’m not happy with the “verbal.” I’m trying to get away from that.

Senator Peters: This may be just a clarification too, in terms of a schedule that one is given. Does that include laboratories too? So, for example, I can see this applying for a lecture course or something like that, so you’ll know if you’re teaching. But what about being assigned laboratory classes to teach as well? Because sometimes we might know that we’re going to be teaching two labs, but we don’t know if it’s in, for example, General Chemistry I or General Chemistry II until a couple weeks before the semester begins.

Dr. Trites: Just to be clear, the only thing that’s adding and changed from existing policy is “prior to the start of course registration.” So, I want to make clear this isn’t a new policy.

Senator Horst: It’s standing language.

Dr. Trites: We’re just trying to speed up and make sure that faculty know what they are teaching. So, I can’t answer your question because I don’t know how labs are assigned. But I can say that this policy is not a radical change.

Senator Horst: They’re adding back in language that they deleted. So, this is standing language in the current ASPT. Correct?

Dr. Trites: Correct.

Senator Blum: I was going to offer that we get assignments actually three times a year. So, we have one prior to spring, one prior to fall, and then we have summer assignments. I guess it’s just done differently in different departments. But that’s how it’s done in our department.

Dr. Trites: Just to clarify, we had taken this out, and now we’ve put it back in. So, what is there is current practice, or supposed to be.

Senator Horst: The URC is now proposing August 15 as the date when we will receive the annual assignment letter. Can you talk us through again your philosophy on the timing?

Dr. Trites: Part of this that was changed earlier, there was confusion about communicating with you about what courses you’re teaching, the actual assignment letter. So, now we’re really trying to clarify two different things. And the department chairs and directors can’t write the assignment letters as early as March 15, but they can by August 15. So, if we’re communicating and writing it in a clear manner what you are supposed to be teaching before, and I’d be fine adding in “advanced course registration.” That should be different and then that gives the chairs until August 15 to finalize everything.

Senator Horst: Just for my clarity, there’s a lot of different colors here. Is this all what we’ve seen before? Is there any new language in D? And could you walk us through what your changes are?

Dr. Buckley: The only change in D was we removed the “that are pertinent to the faculty members professional duties” based on feedback from Faculty Caucus and then we added in the “or elected.” So, “to which they are assigned or elected…” to cover both service assignments and duties to which people were elected.

Senator Nikolaou: I think that those guidelines are also new language, right? In the middle of the paragraph: “Those guidelines shall also provide examples of the types of the professional activities (e.g., civic engagement or community service in the faculty member’s field)that should be reported in the annual activities report (see Appendix 2).”

Dr. Trites: I think… wasn’t that in here the last time we discussed this?

Senator Nikolaou: I don’t think so. Because at some point there was something about civic engagement, community service. Then we said, “Why are we giving specific examples within the policy?” Then we removed it. But now it reappears.

Senator Midha: I have a question about part B from my constituents to seek clarification on “the proportion of time commitment expectations.” The point made was is that proportion being tied to the assignment for courses? For example, if you said teaching is 40% that means that research is 40% and service is 20%. Would they get 1:1 salary or would it be 40% teaching salary?

Dr. Trites: Those are always calculated and negotiated on a case-by-case basis. So, we don’t want to make it policy.

***Adjournment***

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | 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 | 0 |
| Meyers, Adena | 1 |
| Midha, Vishal | 1 |
| Nahm, Kee-Yoon - EXCUSED | 0 |
| Nichols, Wade | 1 |
| Nikolaou, Dimitrios | 1 |
| Novotny, Nancy | 1 |
| Otto, Stacy | 1 |
| Pancrazio, Jim | 1 |
| Peters, Steve | 1 |
| Samhan, Bahae | 1 |
| Schmeiser, Benjamin | 1 |
| Seeman, Scott | 1 |
| Smudde, Pete | 1 |
| Stewart, Todd | 1 |
| Tarhule, Aondover\* | 0 |
| Torry, Mike | 1 |
| Valentin, Rick  | 1 |
| Vogel, Laura | 1 |
| Jordan, Scott (chair rep)  | 1 |
| Vacant - 1 CAS SS Faculty | 0 |
| Vacant - 1 CAST Faculty | 0 |
| Vacant - 1 Faculty Associate | 0 |
| **QUORUM IS 17** | 27 |
| \*(Provost Tarhule - NV) |  |