

*Faculty Caucus Minutes*

*April 13, 2005*

*(Approved)*

***Call to Order***

The Senate Chairperson, Lane Crothers, called the meeting to Faculty Caucus immediately following the Senate meeting.

***Approval of Faculty Caucus Minutes of 2/23/05 and 3/9/05***

**Motion:** By Senator Schlenker, seconded by Senator Plantholt, to approve the Faculty Caucus Minutes of February 23, 2005 and March 9, 2005. The Faculty Caucus unanimously approved the minutes.

***04.04.05.01 University Review Committee Revisions to ASPT Policy – Proposed Changes for 5-Year/Post-Tenure Review (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

**Senator Crothers:** The main order of business is the changes that were referred to URC to consider regarding the post-tenure and/or five-year review. Another set of revisions will be coming to the Senate Executive Committee on Monday regarding the timeline/calendar for promotions and tenure decisions. We have Priscilla Matthews, the Chair of the URC, with us to describe these changes. Questions concerning the ASPT process now belong to the Faculty Caucus to decide, not the full Academic Senate, so we are the legislative body in this context. URC has referred its recommendations to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

**Professor Matthews:** Based on the recommendations of the Faculty Caucus last April, the University Review Committee did look at post-tenure review over the course of this past academic year and culminated in the draft that you have before you. Our emphasis was to accentuate the positive and planning benefits for both departments and individual faculty members.

The first major change was from the requirement that the review be every five years to giving departments/schools the option to do a shorter review, maybe a three or four-year review. The decisions would be up to each department and school, but it would follow the same basic process in that it would summarize the past three to five years of activity. The other major change is that it coordinates planning on the part of the individual and the department if resources are necessary. The resources would be available, possibly to remediate any problems, although that is certainly not the emphasis. We are emphasizing coordination of planning between the individual, department and the dean and the allocation of resources to support a new venue or mediation. I want to emphasize that the thrust is very positive and not on any for remediation. I know that there have been some concerns in the past that this not be used as a “club”.

**Senator Reid:** The policy, as revised, simply states that after tenure, a post-tenure review will be conducted. Does that mean that there might only be one post-tenure review?

**Professor Matthews:** The intent was for it to be on a regular basis, whatever the department or school chooses.

**Senator Reid:** You might want to insert the word “periodic”.

**Provost Presley:** These revisions emphasize the sentiment that every annual review after tenure is, in fact, a post-tenure review. This gives departments and schools the option to stick with the five-year periodic review, if they want to do that, but no one has to do that.

**Senator Reid:** Could one say that one's yearly review is a post-tenure review?

**Provost Presley:** The yearly review would be sufficient as a post-tenure review unless your department requires a five-year review and unless the yearly reviews turns up insufficient merit two years out of three.

**Senator Hammel:** On page 3, in the second paragraph, it reads, "Illinois State University acknowledges that tenured faculty, especially full-professors..." We do not have "full" professors.

**Provost Presley:** That is sort of a colloquialism; that is why it is not capitalized.

**Senator Hammel:** Could you point me to the part of the document that gives the power to make the decision about the five-year/post-tenure review to the department or school?

**Professor Matthews:** I believe that it is the very first paragraph, Part V, Section C2, "Post-tenure or five-year performance policies, procedures and criteria shall be part of DFSC/SFSC policies."

**Senator Hammel:** Is it your understanding that the decision is going to be made by the departments or the schools and that that would preclude some sort of a college-wide policy for a five-year review?

**Provost Presley:** That is exactly what it says in the second full paragraph, "Individual academic departments *may* require, as a feature of their internal ASPT guidelines, a five-year review."

**Senator Crothers:** I am not sure that that precludes the college because department and school FSC guidelines have to be consistent with college guidelines; thus, a college could impose it as an expectation.

**Provost Presley:** The definition of consistent does not necessarily mean absolutely parallel in every detail.

**Senator Wang:** Referring to page 1, number X, does the school or the department have an option to conduct a post-tenure review?

**Senator Crothers:** No, as I understand it, the language is being changed to recognize that the annual review is by definition, if you are tenured, a post-tenure review. Departments would have an option of having summative reviews.

**Provost Presley:** The second paragraph indicates, I believe, four or five ways in which post-tenure could occur with this policy: 1) The URC recognized the fact that some departments are happy with the five-year review, so you don't have to change that.

2) The annual evaluation is a post-tenure review. 3) People who receive insufficient merit for any two years of a three-year period during the annual process would be required to undergo a post-tenure review. 4) Your department may require it every five years.

5) Finally, tenured faculty may wish to voluntarily submit dossiers for post-tenure review at certain junctures of their careers and those junctures are described on page 2.

**Senator Wang:** In my mind, a post-tenure review is three or five years; but I can see that our annual review is also considered a post-tenure review. Conceptually, how do we distinguish that?

**Senator Crothers:** You can conceptually consider them the same.

**Senator Wang:** I think it would be an advantage to faculty if you have a clear conceptualization in terms of what you are talking about. I understand now, but because of the wording, the annual review is also considered as post-tenure, but how do we make the distinction?

**Senator Crothers:** It strikes me as a socialization function. If you change the language to post-tenure or five-year review, then you are making the analytical distinction that all of your annual evaluations, once you are tenured, are post-tenure and then there is the option for the bigger one.

**Senator Reid:** Even one of you used the word 'summative' to try to make it clear. One of the problems now is that I have a post-tenure review every year, but now I am going to have another post-tenure review. Let's say I have had two insufficient merit ratings in my annual post-tenure review; now I am going to have a non-annual post-tenure review. So, it would help to add a word like a "summative" post-tenure review.

**Senator O'Donnell:** I agree; if you happen to be a department or school that considers the annual reviews to be sufficient and then you are unfortunate enough to receive the insufficient merit rating two out of three years, do you have two post-tenure reviews in that year? Which one is the punitive one?

**Senator Reid:** Couldn't we use the word summative?

**Provost Presley:** This document can't really deal with some of those things at that level of detail because there is a departmental ASPT document.

**Senator Reid:** But you are using post-tenure review in two very different ways. On the one hand, you are implying that I am not going to just have an annual post-tenure review; I may also have a non-annual post-tenure review or multi-annual post-tenure review.

**Senator Crothers:** This year, I did my five-year review and I did my annual review.

**Senator Reid:** Right, but they weren't both called post-tenure reviews.

**Senator Wang:** Exactly, your annual review and five-year review are different documents, so how do you conceptually make that distinction? This discussion really demonstrates that there is confusion. Once you send this out to general faculty members, you are going to have even more confusion and an implementation disaster.

**Professor Matthews:** Whatever language we come up with should reflect that the longer term review, if desired, is an accumulation of the previous reviews. Maybe you want to call it a cumulative post-tenure review to distinguish it from the annual post-tenure review that we are all required to do without fail.

**Senator Crothers:** Since essentially you are serving as our referring committee, please discuss that with the URC in the next few days. We would want this back in two weeks as an action item.

**Senator Boser:** I like this document and I don't share the confusion over post-tenure review, annual or not. We do a merit dossier; it just happens. I like the idea that it is voluntary and I think that we can make that distinction.

**Senator Crothers:** It may or may not be voluntary; there are circumstances under which it is compulsory.

**Senator Wang:** I can also see the advantage of identifying this annual evaluation in the document because we are facing external pressures, politically. This document clearly indicates that we have this oversight of the annual review.

The ASPT policy will be revised by the University Review Committee, per the recommendations of the Faculty Caucus, and will come before the Caucus as an action item on April 27, 2005.

***Panel of 10 and AFEGC Committee Nominations***

The vitae for the nominees for the Panel of Ten and the Academic Freedom Ethics and Grievance Committee were distributed to the Faculty Caucus members in their packets. Two additional vitae from Milner Library were distributed during the meeting. There were six nominees for the Panel of Ten and six for the AFEGC. The elections to the Panel and the AFEGC will be conducted by the Faculty Caucus on April 27, 2005.

***CTE Faculty Representative***

Senator Adams reported that Dianna Jones, CAST faculty representative on the Council for Teacher Education, has resigned from the University. Therefore, the College of Applied Sciences and Technology will need to nominate an additional candidate for this position.

***Adjournment***