

**Academic Senate Faculty Caucus Minutes**  
**April 21, 2004**  
**(Approved)**

**Call to Order**

Senator Crothers called the Faculty Caucus to order.

**Approval of Faculty Caucus Minutes:**

**Motion:** By Senator Fowles, seconded by Senator Waterstraat, to approve the April 7, 2004 Faculty Caucus Minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved.

**Action Items:**

**Election of External Committee Members**

**Motion:** By Senator Coliz to approve the slate of nominations for the Senate external committees. The nominations were unanimously approved. The following faculty members were elected to external committees.

**Term Of Service: 2004-2007 (Unless Otherwise Indicated)**

**Athletic Council**

Tony Lorsbach, COE/C&I

Jeri Beggs, COE/MKT

**Don LaCasse, CFA/THE**

**(Term of Service 2004-2006)**

Christy Bazan, CAST/HSC

**Honors Council**

Mary Califf, CAST/ITK

Robert Preston, CAS/BSC

Lou Reifschneider, CAST/TECH

**Library Committee**

Marie Labonville, CFA/MUS

**Reinstatement Committee**

Sylvie Bouriaux, COB/FIL

Lori Adams, CFA/THE

Jim Cunningham, Milner

**Student Code Enforcement And Review Board (SCERB)**

Steve Landau, CAS/PSY

Kathleen Conley, Milner (Alternate)

Lori Woeste, CAST/HSC (Alternate)

**SCERB Grievance Committee**

Michael Lorber, COE/C&I

G.N. Naidu, COB/FIL

David Marx, CAS/PHY

**SCERB Hearing Panel**

Mary Campbell, CAS/SWK

Han Kang, COB/FIL

Mark Myerscough, CAST/ITK

Tom Portegys, CAST, ITK

**University Curriculum Committee**

Maria Canabal, CAST/FCS

Steve Vander Hoven, CAS/GEOG

Temba Bassoppo-Moyo, COE/C&I

Carlyn Morenus, CFA/MUS

***Election of Members of the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee***

By ballot, the following nominees were elected to the Academic Freedom Ethics and Grievance Committee for the 2004-2007 term:

George Rutherford, Physics

Scott Sakaluk, Biological Sciences

Robert Zant, Information Technology

S. Liane Stillwell, Philosophy

Eros Desouza, Psychology

Patrick O'Gara, Theatre

***Election of Members of the Panel of 10***

By ballot, the following nominees were elected to the Panel of 10 for the 2004-2005 term:

Gary Creasey, Psychology

Kevin Zhang, Economics

David MacDonald, History

Sabine Loew, Biology (On sabbatical May 6 – August 14, 2004)

Shang-Fen Ren, Physics

Paul Walker, Agriculture

Billy Lim, Information Technology

James Kalmbach, English

Sandy Zielinski, Theatre

Pat Meckstroth, Milner Library

**Note:** Professor Thomas Simon, Philosophy, was a candidate for the Panel of 10. However, Academic Senate members are ineligible to serve on the Panel of 10, per the *Senate Blue Book (Committee Structure of the Academic Senate-Supplement to the Bylaws Of the Academic Senate)*.

***03.19.04.01 Proposed Post-Tenure Five-Year Review Appeal Process From University Review Committee***

**Motion:** By Senator Crothers, on behalf of the Executive Committee, to approve the proposed post-tenure review appeal process. I would encourage that we not discuss the philosophy of post-tenure review right now.

**Senator Wang:** I understand that we are not supposed to discuss the philosophy of post-tenure review at this time, but does the Senate have an agenda to discuss this particular issue?

**Senator Crothers:** Yes, on several occasions, we have already agreed that we will engage in this and I believe that there are some proposals this evening to provide some timelines for when people will get back to us.

**Motion:** By Senator Armstrong to strike “serious concern” in the second sentence on page 2, X.A., between numbers 4 and crossed out five.

**Senator Borg:** What is Senator Armstrong’s reason to strike it?

**Senator Armstrong:** I don’t know what a serious concern is in that it does not tell you what is meant by “failure to devote a significant effort to the review is a matter of serious concern.”

**Professor Schwartz. URC Representative:** This statement was in the original document. The point being, that because we are doing an overall review of things in this process it is something that people ought to take seriously. It could involve changes in what a person might be teaching or in other assignments within the department.

**Senator Armstrong:** I agree with that sentiment, but the last sentence says somewhat similar things in a positive way as opposed to a negative way.

**Senator Swindler:** There is one obvious reading of the second clause in the second sentence in that if a faculty member does not cooperate enough with the review process to enable the DFSC to do its job, then that person has raised a serious concern.

**Senator Armstrong:** What is a serious concern?

**Senator Swindler:** The obstruction of the DFSC’s function.

**Senator Crothers:** That could be contained in a more systematic review of the post-tenure review process.

**Vote on Motion to Strike Sentence, Page 2, X.A.:** The motion was unanimously approved.

**Senator Waterstraat:** If this process was not to be punitive, but with us wordsmithing this process with an appeal process, are we turning it into some that could end up being punitive?

**Senator Crothers:** One reason that we sent it to URC was because in the absence of an appeal process, at least one person alleged that it was being abused.

**Senator Waterstraat:** I remember that issue, but now that we are taking it to the level of appeal, we are giving something teeth that never had teeth before.

**Senator Crothers:** There did appear that there was a punitive effort made against this individual.

**Senator Waterstraat:** Couldn’t we have just rejected it?

**Senator Crothers:** We don’t have any say over that. That is totally within the college ASPT process. We set the rules, but we have no oversight on how the ASPT process works out.

**Senator Pereira:** Whenever the DFSC or CFSC has an opportunity to make a statement about any faculty member, it can become punitive. That is why an appeal process is necessary.

**Professor Schwartz, University Review Committee Representative:** We need some level of protection for faculty members.

**Senator Riegle:** I intend to vote “present” because just by agreeing to support these changes, the thinking about

the whole process changes. By nature, a formative evaluation would not have an appeal process. While the policy is better with an appeal process, I think that the entire review process should be eliminated.

**Senator Armstrong:** It is my understanding that the entire process of post-tenure review is under review.

**Senator Crothers:** The caucus has agreed to look at this and the Provost has agreed to do an audit of departments.

**Senator Armstrong:** I think that we can deal with this in a motion that is separate from the issue before us right now, which is the revision to post-tenure review itself. We should make a motion for a thorough review of this process to affirm its developmental nature and to place a timeline on that. If we can't get rid of this, we should change it to the point where we are happy with it.

**Senator Fowles:** I approve of the revision to the process that the five-year review should not be inconsistent with the annual reviews, as I think that that statement protects the attack mode that some people might feel.

**Senator Reid:** I was struck by Senator Armstrong's comment; if we can't get rid of this, who says that we even have to have post-tenure review?

**Senator Crothers:** I am ruling that discussion out of order tonight, because we will be engaged in that dispute in the long term.

**Senator Wang:** My question is in response to Senator Waterstraat's comment about the question of whether we are turning this into a punitive process. In reviewing, this document as whole, I don't see that there were punitive abilities in the first place. The only place that I think that would be close to punitive actions is if you are referring to page 3, item 3C, which speaks to the DFSC or CFSC providing consultation and development of a plan for remediation. This is different from tenure and promotion, which can result in dismissal.

**Senator Reid:** On the last page, in the last sentence, it reads, "the summative reviews by the DFSC and CFSC will assess to the extent the plan has been acted upon until the deficiencies are eliminated." So, the DFSC summative evaluation has teeth. Once they have come up with this report from the DFSC for summative review, they can use that report to punish faculty. What if the deficiencies are never eliminated?

**Senator DeSantis:** On page 3, at the end of C, it reads, 'In the future summative reviews...shall assess and evaluate the extent to which the plan has been acted upon until the deficiencies are eliminated'. There is no possibility that the deficiencies won't be eliminated, so there are no consequences.

**Senator Reid:** This document does not say one way or the other whether there will be consequences.

**Senator DeSantis:** It assumes that one way or another they will be eliminated.

**Senator Reid:** I assume that in some cases, they won't be eliminated and this process will carry over to the next five years.

**Senator Crothers:** This comes to the issue of summative reviews. If you get insufficient merits in a row, you are vulnerable for punitive consequences. If we think about this more broadly, one of the things we should consider is faculty development money for remediation purposes.

**Vote on Post-Tenure Review Proposal:** The Senate Faculty Caucus voted in favor of University Review Committee's addition of an appeal process, with the exception of nay votes from Senators Waterstraat and Adams and a vote of "present" from Senator Riegle.

**Motion:** By Senator Armstrong, seconded by Senator Borg, as the Faculty Caucus has already agreed to a review of the five-year post-tenure review process, I move that a complete and thorough review of the process be conducted by the URC in conjunction with the Office of the Provost to affirm and reinforce that post-tenure review is a positive developmental process and that the results of the review be returned to the Senate no later than March 1, 2005.

**Senator Jerich:** Your motion states that the post-tenure review must be established as a development process. If we were to establish the concept that post-tenure review isn't actually needed, what is the difference in what you are proposing?

**Senator Armstrong:** This would at least give us an opportunity to ask that question. Someone is going to have demonstrate in a revised policy that this is worthwhile.

**Senator Jerich:** Could the motion be amended to consider whether or not post-tenure review should be continued at ISU?

**Senator Armstrong:** It is my understanding that it is required by the Board of Trustees.

**Senator Crothers:** The Caucus would have to empower the Chair of the Senate to discuss the need for post-tenure review with the Board of Trustees. I would be reluctant to do so because a well-designed post-tenure review essentially provides development help for people who need it and it provides us with information on the state of assessment.

**Provost Presley:** The issue is if you were empowered to go to the Board and argue with them about whether this is necessary or not, you would not have the information to do it. That shows how flawed the current procedure is. If the Board is serious about post-tenure review, what we really need to have is a post-tenure review that is not punitive indiscriminately and which is not based on surveillance of behavior, but serves the interest of the faculty member and the institution. The current process apparently does neither of those, because you have no information to go forward with. It is rather easy at this point to see what features of post-tenure review have made it a positive and well-regarded experience at those institutions where it is so. Target reviews, not cyclical reviews, are one thing that is done. Another thing that is done is making it to the advantage of a faculty member who may have problems by providing them a small budget that will enable them to deal with those problems. There are probably 20 to 25 characteristics of a good PTR system that are now known. It would be a fairly simple matter to get AAHE experts to facilitate revisions to our post-tenure review and put something together reflecting those best practices.

**Friendly Amendment:**

**Senator Reid:** The motion to review the process does not allow for modification of the process. It just states the review is to determine if it is a developmental process. I would like to see added a consideration of modification.

**Senator Armstrong:** A complete and thorough review can take those things into account. However, I will add to the motion a review and "revision". The seconder, Senator Borg, agreed to the Friendly Amendment.

**Call the Question:** By Senator Borg. There were no objections.

**Vote on Motion for the Review of the Post-Tenure Review Process:** The Faculty Caucus voted unanimously in favor of the motion by Senator Armstrong to review/revise post-tenure review, as revised by the Friendly Amendment from Senator Reid: "As the Faculty Caucus has already agreed to a review of the five-year post-tenure review process, I move that a complete and thorough review and revision of the process be conducted by the University Review Committee in conjunction with the Office of the Provost to affirm and reinforce that

post-tenure review is a positive developmental process and that the results of the review/revision be returned to the Senate no later than March 1, 2005.”

***Adjournment***