**Faculty Affair Committee Meeting – MINUTES**

**Wednesday, September 9th, 2020 at 6:00 PM**

**VIRTUAL MEETING per state law and Governor Pritzker’s Executive Order**

**Attendees:** Craig McLauchlan, Maddy Small, Susan Kalter, Mary Hollywood, James J Pancrazio, Grant Chassy and Sheryl Jenkins

**Call to Order at 6:03**

**TOPICS OF DISCUSSION:**

1. Sabbatical leave policy
2. Integrity in research and scholarly activities policy
3. NTT faculty classifications policy

**Senator Pancrazio**: Sabbatical policy was brought to executive committee, there was a lot of discussion about it and wires crossed about the purpose of discussion, in favor of not reinventing the wheel

**Senator Hollywood**: Look over the points, make it less lengthy

**Senator Pancrazio**: Look at phrasing that stirred up discussion in caucus,

Central objection that came from faculty affairs was objection to notion that the sabbatical leaves were in cycles, notion of the cycle was that it was given, however we were saying that it was a competition in the sense that someone had to apply and win an award in order to go (turned into an entitlement), but didn’t make connection to cycle. Committee therefore saw it as there was a gap in sabbatical leave and applying for another one. There were also concerns that if someone who had been on campus for 16 years, and had not taken a sabbatical and could “catch up” by “banking” sabbatical time would then put pressure on other faculty members which then created a divide between chair’s understanding and committee members’ understanding. But then we can deal with those one by one, but that’s the central issue.

**Senator Hollywood:** Took the time to look into it, 7-year cycle was the biggest issue apparently

**Senator Pancrazio:** If a person decided to take a sabbatical in say their 9th year, they were wanting for a reduction in the waiting period for the next sabbatical. It’s an issue of intentions about choice, whereas some faculty members feel obliged to not take them (ex: people at the CenterPoint of their department). If the person chooses not to apply, why should we give them a decreased wait time? If someone applied and was rejected, maybe there was in issue with their proposal and wasn’t a worthwhile investment? Rather than open the can of worms, stick with the wait time

**Senator Hollywood**: Person unable to take sabbatical ever brought up due to reasons outside their control?

**Senator Pancrazio**: Rejected the notion that there was a cycle, but acknowledged that life happens, (ex: faculty member stuck in Tuscany apartment during lockdown and was unable to fulfill sabbatical)

**Senator Jenkins:** Colleagues or themselves not applying for sabbatical due to devotion to the department getting in the way, not usually a personal problem.

**Senator McLauchlan**: Reading the minutes, marked up 3.8 copy before or after discussions?

**Chairperson Kalter**: May I speak on process? This policy was sent first to the senate, there was a long discussion, executive committee noticed that students were no longer interested in the senate with it, exec decided to then send it to the caucus for more in depth discussion. All policies start as an information item to collect info for committee from the discussion, then they need to decide if they can incorporate the suggestions from the full Senate or Caucus into the policy. When FAC sent it back to exec right as the pandemic was starting, exec identified that there were 21 points that had been raised by faculty Senators, but only about 5 had been addressed by FAC. Committee’s work is to make it easier for senate and caucus to get it through, have to discuss all the issues in committee and figure out what we accept, modify and reject, then, if Senators on the floor want to, they can make motions to amend for anything that the committee rejected and see if the majority of the Senator or Caucus agrees, if it’s what the Senate wants. I object to the 7 year cycle, notice that there’s been miscommunication about if it’s an entitlement. I think we need to go through each of the points and decide what to do with them first, tell the exec why we decided what we did to make it as efficient as possible in Senate and Caucus.

**Senator Hollywood**: Do we want to look at integrity or work on sabbatical and figure out how to clarify

**Senator Pancrazio**: Do we have a copy?

**Senator Hollywood:** Cera sent them out in her last communication

**Senator McLauchlan:** Are there issues with 1.8 is that why it’s being brought back

**Chairperson Kalter**: It’s been in process for a while, combination that it is on the cycle for review and Kathy Spence in Research Compliance had identified issues with sequencing, policy review began with myself, and Kathy and John Baur, started through committee, not sure why it has not come, but remember another policy had to come through

**Senator McLauchlan**: indirect policy and supplemental income coming through, supplemental to get in compliance with federal register, indirect policy allowed discussion, distributed as general revenue twice a year, office interested in revisiting

**Chairperson Kalter**: went into new year and got dropped, committee was close to finishing though

**Senator Hollywood**: Brought these up because we could move forward without reinventing the wheel on them, have to figure out the order

**Senator Jenkins**: Go for lowest hanging fruit, sabbatical is a monster, maybe the points will be easy to go through, maybe not, but preference to start with the simplest one

**Senator Pancrazio**: Could go off of memory about what was addressed and discussed previously and what was not.

**Chairperson Kalter**: Is there a majority in the caucus that’s in favor of what is in the points?

**Senator McLauchlan**: How investigative are we? Should I ask Janice about this? Concern about practice hemming you in, spirit is that you’re on ½ pay for the year, but there are large implications about being a part time states employee in terms of HR and practicality not policy

**Chairperson Kalter**: Significant equity issues raised on the floor of the caucus and the senate, with diversity and inclusion and the tendency/lack of tendency to create inequalities in sabbatical, anyone who says it’s an attempt to turn sabbaticals into an entitlement is not understanding the suggestion, points raised about reason to skip sabbatical, and question about being eligible to apply vs entitlement to receive it, discuss what we will send forward as our recommendation

**Senator Hollywood**: if we start with sabbatical policy, we have to go through all the points

**Senator Pancrazio**: Integrity may have been in the queue for the second half of the spring but did not get discussed – McLauchlan is responsible for research integrity, make sure that the unit chair circulates the information to get input about technicalities from the unit

**Senator McLauchlan**: Would be happy to have my office take a look at the policy and bring it back with some mark ups, might take a minute to get through the 21 points on sabbatical so could do this in the meantime

**Senator Hollywood**: Gather more information on integrity in order to decide what we will actually do, so we should wait to make the decision on prioritizing

***Discussion on procedural addressing of integrity policy for Senator McLauchlan gathering information and gathering markups from his unit***

* Ability to answer questions, process for bringing it in?
* Bring straight to committee internally first, then bring it to exec after
  + Send it to Mary too for it to be numbered for ease of process as it moves through
* Kathy could be brought into a committee meeting for her to answer questions

**Senator Hollywood:** Have Craig gather information and bring it back, not sure if we could get through both

**Senator Pancrazio**: Not so sure, question of family and elder care disproportionately falls on female faculty, in some other policies there’s a “stop the clock” mechanism, women still have to take sick leave to have a baby (which is not sick leave), is there a way to address these issues as they come up without getting into the notion of cycles? The people who are most privileged already will take advantage of those, and could be leveling the playing field through this, doesn’t create that kind of banking (not really going to happen in practice), does address that and acknowledges that in cooperation with being a faculty members, we are also parents and relatives, do provide that “stop the clock” for tenure

**Senator Hollywood**: If we decide to adopt sabbatical, we would have to see what language we can put in, would take a long time to get through

**Senator Pancrazio**: Fresh on people’s minds, wouldn’t want to let down colleagues

**Senator Hollywood:** non-tenure track issues of classification and evaluation, more of a housekeeping thing, would be determined based on an association that no longer exists, so would need to change that name to bring it in line with the appropriate contract

**Senator Jenkins**: Not sure how NTTs are evaluated, in our college received a letter saying that faculty were expected to teach and research during the contract, and contents of the letter would be a part of the evaluation, misunderstanding on application to tenure vs non-tenure and the application to the evaluations, doesn’t seem fair if the tenure are “immune” from administration’s evaluation and it falls on NTT

**Senator Hollywood**: Milner and nursing not members of the NTT union, they are separate

**Senator Jenkins**: Expectations of job during pandemic sounded punitive/threatening in communication, clarification after and back pedaling on language, NTT primarily still evaluated by college admin

**Senator McLauchlan**: University wide email from the provost, tried to conform to university language, over the summer, intention on behalf of Provost, was that in the spring we suspended a lot of things to try and move online, the spirit for the fall

***Zoom meeting ended abruptly at 6:50 due to unexpected conflict with start of Senate Zoom***

***Discussion continued via email***

**Ex-Officio McLauchlan:** Do we have “editorial” changes, or something similar?  Would we propose updating the name to be editorial, if so?

**Senator Hollywood:** It could be editorial or even for compliance as the NTTFA is no longer the name of the faculty union, and does not exist in the current contract with the NTT faculty.

**Chairperson Kalter:** Cera and I are working on making sure that "kick out of meeting" doesn't happen again.  Apologies.  Makes no immediate sense to me that Zoom allowed 5 meetings at once under Cera's username, then kicked us out when #6 came online!!  🙂 We were having a good discussion too!

**Senator Hollywood:** We are so close to senate I think we ran out of time.

Here are the actions we need to take.

Craig will get more information for the integrity issue and get back to us.

After we have that information, we can decide which issue we will address as a committee. I think we all agreed to the housekeeping change to the NTT Evaluation page. I will look into other issues that may be involved there.

I move to adjourn.

***Meeting adjourned at 6:58 PM***