

**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**  
**Wednesday, September 22, 2021**  
**Approved**

***Call to Order***

***Elections:***

**University Curriculum Committee replacement**

Guang Jin, HSC (fall 2021 replacement for Tonya Pierce, CAST, 2021-2024)

The individual was unanimously elected.

**Director of the Graduate School Search Committee faculty endorsement**

Jason Wagman, CAS Soc Sci

Kevin Meyer, CAS Humanities

Josh Brown, CAST

Somnath Lahiri, COB

Kristin Carlson, WKCFA

Cherrill Stockmann, MCN

The panel was unanimously approved.

**Illinois State University Annuitants Association Board member election (1 Faculty at large)**

April Anderson-Zorn, MIL, 2021-2023

The individual was unanimously elected.

**Academic Planning Committee confirmation**

Maria Boerngen, AGR, 2021-2023

Rose Marshack, MUS, 2021-2023

Mary Dyck, MCN, 2021-2023

Mindy Ely, SED, 2021-2023

Madeline Trimble, COB, (Replacing Edgar Norton) 2020-2022

The panel was unanimously approved.

**ELECTION: Academic Affairs Committee Representative to Academic Planning Committee**

Dimitrios Nikolaou, ECO, 2021-2022 as AAC representative

The individual was unanimously elected.

***Distributed Communication:***

***09.15.21.07 Charge for the NTT/TT Ratios and Instructional Capacity Ad Hoc Committee***

Senator Marx: The AABC prepares an annual report on the Academic Impact Fund. In 2020, we didn't issue a report (we could blame it on COVID). Before that we were looking into a lot of issues that were going on with the AIF, trying to get information, so we didn't issue a report. This year's report was the result of having gotten information on a lot of aspects of that. The result of that, we wanted to look further into some of these issues.

First of all, we were reporting that there was a drop in the ratio of tenure track faculty to non-tenure track faculty. That's been going on for a long time. From the very beginning of the AIF, we've had a decline. Just over the last 10 years, it's decreased between 3%-4%.

The 2008 AABC report, which was approved by the Senate, had recommended that the ratio be increased to 75%, and we're currently at 68%. So, it's quite a difference. That was one issue.

Another issue has to do with the fast increase in spending on instructional capacity; and that money does come from the AIF. In the last five years, the spending has doubled. In the prior five years, it was declining slightly. I don't want to indicate that it was declining in a huge way, but it was declining for five years. And then all of the sudden, the last five years, it has doubled. So, this is of great concern in terms of the health of the AIF. So, we'd like to have the ad hoc committee (you have the charge before you) look at the use of non-tenure tracks across all schools and departments on campus and gather as much input as they can about how NTTs are used at comparable universities, and from national studies. So, that's charge #2.

Charge #3 relates to instructional capacity, it's use, how it pertains to the AIF, and make recommendations to the Caucus as well as the Provost's office for clarification of that definition; what counts as instructional capacity and what doesn't. Because the definition has become obscured over time.

We want to look at what has happened as far as budget reductions on the use of NTTs and graduate assistants in terms of the funding sources that are used and how those personnel are used. And really look at what has caused this large increase in instructional capacity spending.

Finally, try to determine a desired goal for each college. I don't know if it would reach down to the department level, but I don't think we would have a single value for the whole university. I suspect that colleges will have different needs and wants, as far as the ratio of tenure track to non-tenure track faculty. So, we would like to get that kind of information. And then the committee will make its report back to the Caucus and the Provost.

Senator Horst: Thank you, Senator Marx. Remember this is coming from last year's AABC recommendations. Is there discussion on either the membership or the functions?

Senator Hollywood: Will the non-tenure tracks have any visibility into this ad hoc committee? Since there's no non-tenure tracks assigned to it. I think we should have some representation.

Senator Marx: This is largely about how NTTs are used by departments and colleges and why. Not about what they actually do. So, in the previous ad hoc committee that we had, we had NTT representation on the committee and that committee was more interested in how NTTs are actually used and the duties of NTTs and things like that. From the perspective of the financial aspects, I don't know that NTT representation is going to be as useful on this committee. Is there a perspective that you think NTTs would bring to this?

Senator Hollywood: I think it goes along with, when you're talking about the financial aspects, the first thing that comes to our mind is is there going to be a general riff of NTTs across campus to get to the ratio that you want to get to of 75%. So, is that increasing the number of tenure track lines or is that decreasing the number of non-tenure track lines to get there? What I'm asking for is just visibility into it, even if it's just being informed of what's happening.

Senator Marx: I'm not opposed to including an NTT representative, it's just that...

Senator Horst: Senator Hollywood, are you asking for visibility or could this ad hoc committee report be presented in front of some NTT entity in some focus group or something like that?

Senator Hollywood: It could be done in a couple different ways. It could be done that way or even a non-voting member that sits there. Because it is a financial thing, like you said, and it is not our jobs that you're talking about or what our capacity is but how many of us there are, and that's a financial issue. I just think it would be beneficial to non-tenure tracks because there's going to be a lot of questions, so we need to be able to answer. So, if we were a non-voting member or even if there was just some information that's communicated to us or to a member then I think that that would be satisfactory for me.

Senator Horst: I do think it would be appropriate to be a voting member. They are faculty.

Senator Smudde: I agree with that. I like the idea of having NTT representation on this committee. I think it makes a lot of sense. I do wonder how we would obtain that if there is a similar body of non-tenure track faculty that assemble to discuss different issues then come in. How do we want to invite them in and then how many?

Senator Horst: We can run an election. We'll run a call for volunteers, the same as we are going to do for the tenure track faculty.

Senator Smudde: Very good. Again, I like the idea that there be representation of the NTTs in this.

Senator Beucher: I appreciate the consideration of NTTs and I also have that same question because my understanding is this would be on a voluntary basis, serving on this committee. This is not part of the regular job responsibility, correct? So, it would be volunteering their time with no monetary compensation. So, I just want to acknowledge that component of this. I'm wondering if there was this space to include a non-tenure track faculty, would it be necessary? So, if there wasn't anyone who had that capacity to volunteer their time or interest would that be okay to not have that seat be filled?

Senator Horst: This is an ad hoc committee, which isn't formal. We can have a seat and just not fill it.

Senator Marx: You're correct that NTTs are not required to do service, so they'd have to volunteer their time outside of their normal duties.

Senator Horst: I think that's really the concern. It's not that they don't want to include an NTT but it's that it's not part of your work assignment. So, sometimes we do calls for NTTs and we can't find anybody. Senator Marx, would you consider that a friendly amendment?

Senator Marx: Of course.

Senator Nikolaou: I have a couple of clarification questions for the functions. For example, #4 are we talking about all GA funding or are we talking specifically about graduate teaching assistants?

Senator Marx: Specifically teaching. It's all about instructional capacity, so it is about teaching.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. And then for #5, you did mention it when you were presenting the ad hoc committee, but then I was thinking is it ideal to actually look at it from the college level because if we look at the College of Arts and Sciences, we have too many different departments. So, Economics will be totally different than Biology.

Senator Marx: Yeah. The various divisions would have to be looked at.

Senator Nikolaou: Even in the Academic Planning Committee when we're talking about the call from last year, we were saying, for example, in the College of Business how in some departments they do benefit from having a greater ratio of non-tenure track.

Senator Marx: Right. That's true.

Senator Nikolaou: But then if we go to the college level, it doesn't mean that it's going... I'm worried that it might mess up what works for the department if we try to aggregate it at the college level. So, that was one comment. And the other one was about the last paragraph, is there a reason why we may send the recommendations one at a time? Because it seems that most of them are interrelated, so why would we send, say recommendations for item #2 but when we go

and talk about #3 and #4, we need to revise item #2, and then we'll be send one proposal, and then an updated proposal.

Senator Horst: It is giving permission in case they don't get something done. Like the 1.8 policy that's coming from your committee.

Senator Marx: It's not required to send one at a time. The committee could decide to have a single report.

Senator Nikolaou: Okay. And I agree with Senator Hollywood's comment. That was the first comment that I had, why isn't there a provision for NTT representation.

Senator Horst: The friendly amendments that we have are: we are going to add one NTT faculty elected by the Faculty Caucus, if possible. This faculty will add to the diversity of college representation. And then in #5, Determine a desired goal for the ratio of tenure track to non-tenure track faculty for each College (or divisions for CAS) and advise the Faculty Caucus and the Provost of the goals. And then we're leaving in the clause that if they don't get all their work done, they can still submit something.

Motion by Senator Blum, seconded by Senator Lahiri, to approve the ad hoc committee charge. The motion was unanimously approved, with friendly amendments.

***Information Item:***

***09.07.21.01 Proposed deletion of Policy 3.3.9 Proceedings in Faculty Academic Freedom, Dismissal, and Non-reappointment Cases***

Senator Horst: This policy was passed in the 1970s. The last time it was revised was 1999. It was an agenda item that I received as far back as 2012. In 2013-2014 when I chaired the Faculty Affairs Committee, we looked at this in our Issues Pending list and we decided to draft new dismissal procedures. We based that on the AAUP RIR. We worked with Sam Catanzaro. He then forwarded it to the URC. They deemed it to be part of the ASPT process, and then they worked on it. That turned into the disciplinary articles (XII, XIII, XIV, XV). That was debated by the Faculty Caucus and approved in the fall of 2018. It was effective January 2019. So, what was a policy from the 1970s, some shell of it remained in 1999, was completely replaced by elaborate disciplinary articles in the ASPT.

Since then, we've discussed it in the Faculty Caucus, again, what to do with this old policy. We discussed it on April 10, 2019. There were questions as to whether or not this applied to NTTs (union NTTs, non-union NTTs) as well as the ASPT tenure line faculty. Last year, I had a meeting with Lisa Huson, Susan Kalter, myself, and Sam Catanzaro. We, again, tried to figure out what to do about these various types of faculty. Then a few weeks ago, there was a meeting between myself, Lisa Huson, Roberta Trites, and Janice Bonneville. So, that's the history of the Senate discussion on this policy. I'm now going to ask Roberta Trites, our interim Associate

Vice President of Academic Administration, to come to the mic and give us a brief synopsis of the rationale for deleting this policy.

Dr. Trites: Effectively, what we have determined is that we have a policy (3.3.9) that is basically null and void. Academic Freedom, dismissal, and non-reappointment are covered various different places in other policies and/or the ASPT articles XII-XV that Martha mentioned. The Collective Bargaining Agreement covers the appointments and non-reappointments and issues of who are on status. Academic personnel are appointed with appointment letters that discuss how we're going to non-reappoint if, say for example, we've hired an academic advisor and career development PR person in the department of Oceanography. I know we've got a big one here. It's right next to the big ocean that we have. But let's say that that person has come in, the first three years has been terrific, and then we start noticing a decline in the behavior. We have in that person's appointment letter, original contract, a mechanism by which that person will be given notice and that person could be dismissed. So, what we've basically discovered is that 3.3.9 is mostly redundant, and in some place's contradictory. So, those are the concerns that we have, and why we're proposing to strike it from the record because it's confusing at best, and unnecessary as well.

Senator Horst: I dug up the policy today and the 1971 policy and then it goes into establishing a faculty academic freedom and tenure committee, and then it basically goes through the academic freedom, what we think of as AFEGC. The rest of the policy is about how they would deal with academic freedom issues, that we now call policy 3.3.8. So, there's a lot of old principles that we don't follow anymore.

Senator Pancrazio: You had us with the words "null and void." Would the chair entertain a motion to delete this policy?

Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Marx, to delete policy 3.3.9 Proceedings in Faculty Academic Freedom, Dismissal, and Non-reappointment Cases. The motion was unanimously approved.

### ***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Marx, seconded by Senator Blum, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.

**2021-22 FACULTY CAUCUS ROSTER**  
**Wednesday September 22, 2021**

	Caucus			
Name	Attendance			
Aldeman, Matt (rep Qaddour, Jihad) - EXCUSED	0			
Avogo, Winfred	1			
Beucher, Becky	1			
Blum, Craig	1			
Bonnell, Angela	1			
Cline, Lea	1			
Garrahy, Deb	1			
Harpel, Tammy	1			
Hollywood, Mary	1			
Horst, Martha	1			
Lahiri, Somnath	1			
Marx, David	1			
Meyers, Adena	1			
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			
Samhan, Bahae	1			
Schmeiser, Benjamin	1			
Seeman, Scott	1			
Smudde, Pete	1			
Stewart, Todd	1			
Torry, Mike	1			
Valentin, Rick	1			
Vogel, Laura	1			
Chung, Seon Yoon (chair rep)	1			
Vacant - 1 CAS SS Faculty	0			
Vacant - 1 Faculty Associate	0			
<b>QUORUM IS 17</b>	<b>29</b>			
(Provost Tarhule - NV)				