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1. Chair Report Liz Brown

Good afternoon. We will be forgoing the Ex-Officio reports as we just had them Tuesday. We will be getting to work right away. I do want to thank everyone for all of the emails going back forth. I am making the assumption that everyone is operating with good will to help move this forward. I think that many of the suggestions are not major overhauls but tweaks. I am going work from Bob’s suggestions and delineate between the two. I think that he had some very good suggestions for making some changes to the language. I would like to get some consensus on what else everyone considers tweaks as opposed to major revisions so that we can separate those out. I would like to see the ones that are tweaks move forward this year. Next year’s officers are all here in the room. I think that we can get assurance that the ones that are not tweaks and should wait until next year after the Board of Trustees approved our new Strategic Plan. We can assure everyone that this will be heard first thing next year. The FAC sub-committee should continue on through next year. We need to figure out a way to make them permanent. I think that it should be a FAC subcommittee and operate within the governance structure. I think it needs to be an integral part and I think that is the best way to do that. I would like to see that continue for the next year so we can figure out that language in the section on committees and their responsibilities so it can be a legitimate and valued sub-committee of FAC.

I am going to ask everyone to please wait to be recognized today. There was a lot of talking over each other on Tuesday. I think that made it harder to discuss. I know that there were some people that wished to speak but were not able to. What I would like to do is talk briefly and go through these sections.

1. FAC item- discussion and possible vote

Motion to lay previous Tuesday’s document on the table T. Hawkins, K. Yousif: 9-0-0

Motion to move to R. Guell’s version V. Sheets, K. Yousif:

1. Changes to 305 from FAC Files #1 & 2

i) Motion to remove “or inclusion” from 305.2.1.2 T. Hawkins, L. Eberman: 1-8-0

L. Brown: I think 305.2.1.2, if we remove the “or inclusion” piece and the parts at the end are tweaks and not a wholesale revision then it should be placed back in after the Board of Trustees approves our Strategic Plan. I think that is tweak to the policy rather than a wholesale revision.

K. Yousif: Are you asking if it’s a tweak or revision and move on from there?

L. Brown: Yes, that is what I would like to do. Are there any objections.

R. Guell: I don’t object at all. I agree that there are things that we should have been doing all along. We should have always been recognizing the difficulty in evaluating the scholarship style of our colleagues when we are a campus of 400 tenure track faculty and not 2000. We should have already been formalizing the inclusion of relevant outside documentation whether scholarship or external letters. We should have been doing this all along and in fact many departments have.

T. Hawkins: I am unclear how we are proceeding here. Are we discussing the phrase “or inclusion” in 305.2.1.2?

R. Guell: Not at the moment. I believe what Liz has been doing is classifying minor revisions that are votable in Senate this year from those things that are significant to what it and what we have been doing. She considers “or inclusion” to be the latter.

T. Hawkins: That is going to be a messy discussion as I don’t know what “minor” means and I don’t know what “major” means. I think that we should discuss each proposed change and if we agree to it then we agree to it and it moves on. If not it disappears. Let’s actually have motions and discussions on specific motions and proposals.

C. MacDonald: I really take issue with the word disappears. I think what we need to do is divide this document more than disappear anything. With issue that can be dealt with at a later time as opposed to what can be dealt with now. I think that is what Liz is trying to do.

J. Gustafson: I think that we can easily do what Tim is asking for here just by maintaining a second document and hanging on to all of those changes as Chris suggested.

T. Hawkins: I first want to say that the addition of the scholarship engagement a couple years ago was controversial. It was supported by the advocates with significant information that showed people like me who were dubious about the value of including that section that there was, in fact, a discipline that existed for more than two decades. The advocates could build support to include that section in our Handbook and ultimately change minds like mine. For a scholarship of inclusion, I searched for comparable literature and could not find it. I was happy that Mike Chambers added to that search and found something. However, when I went through what he found it did not seem to me to be substantive. It seemed to me be a discipline in search of literature. That doesn’t mean that one will not emerge. In the future with more information we can add that language to that section. Currently I am not convinced we should to add this section, or argue that a scholarship ‘of inclusion’ is equivalent in weight as discipline of scholarship application engagement or anything previous in that section. Therefore I believe that until that time as evidence can be provided to encourage us to rethink, it should be stricken.

L. Eberman: Can we hear from Donna or Virgil about how this was discussed in the sub-committee and FAC on the relativity of scholarship for ‘of inclusion’?

V. Sheets: I don’t remember specifically who put that in or how it got in there. There were multiple people working on this document. The discussion in the sub-committee was really about the idea that sometimes scholars are hired with the intention of them looking at particular aspects of minoritized elements within a discipline and it doesn’t get recognized because it goes into a specialty journals. That what’s framed the conversation around the changes in this section altogether. Where the individual words came from I don’t remember and I did hear anyone say that it was a sub-discipline. If that is the criterion then it’s not meeting that. It wasn’t intended as that, it was intended to be a broader statement.

R. Guell: I want to clear that my vote to strip it is only a vote to strip it for now. I couldn’t disagree with Tim any more vehemently, but I am going to vote for his motion. One of the things that I learned in my twenty month over in Social Work was to respect the scholarship of colleagues that went down a particular road that was different from what Virgil would describe as the typical scholarship and journals. When I came back to economics and Debra Israel got particularly invested in the committee of the American Economics Association of Female Economists I started to pay attention to that as well. What I will absolutely admit to dismissively calling that scholarship “navel gazing” and that was, in fact, wrong. It is a legitimate form of scholarship for Social Workers to examine what it is to be a Black Social Worker or a LGBTQ Social Worker or to examine those issues within that context. I have to believe that because I am outside the normal box as a textbook writer, I have to be in favor of “or inclusion” to ultimately be included in this policy.

T. Hawkins: It is important that we look at this at the national level whether we agree with it or not. There doesn’t seem to be a national consensus about scholarship of ‘inclusion’. Yes, it might emerge later but at this time there doesn’t seem to be any literature to support this. To have to ask Virgil whether his department would considered a particular journal as scholarship is not out of the question. We need peer reviewers to understand what that department is willing to accept. People who seem to be doing this kind of research and are in Psychology will be getting credit. We have process that we have to follow.

J. Gustafson: I did not see this as a significant change. I saw the word “or” and a lowercase “inclusion” to just be a modifier to it to help broaden out the definition of engagement. I can tell you personally, as an Environmentalist Historian that was trained in Economic History, that one of the things people came to find that there was a long substantial history that we can claim under the mantle of environmental history. I see this literature dealing with inclusion being very much the same. There are a lot people across many different disciplines dealing with things like in this Purdue document dealing with student success, stereotypes and violence, structural inequalities, and many more issue that could be claimed under (lowercase I) inclusion. I don’t see any particular problem using that definition and clarifying it. What I don’t see here is how this could harm anyone. If our Black faculty is telling us that this something that would clarify something that the view and would promote a fairer evaluation of their worker, we cannot object to that.

K. Yousif: I have a question for all of you, but especially for Virgil or Donna. From Virgil’s example I understand that the faculty member that publishes in the African American Journal of Psychology vs. whatever the national Psychology journal is would be the same. Would training help elevate this? What it sounds like to me is that departmental committees are taking their own biases. The work is still Psychology it might not be the scholarship of inclusion but it is in the Psychology field. It is really being implicated that there are biases in review committees and that would be at the department level. Is that the feeling that motived this?

V. Sheets: Training might take care of this but without that information from an outside source, I don’t know.

D. Selman: From the summary and justifications you can get some insight as to what is happening here. From the summary of justification you can get some insight: it says “additionally, faculty of color are not seen a legitimate scholars because of their interest and research agendas. Often times their research agendas, especially if minoritized, are devalued and considered non-essential.” So I think that gets to the point as to why this “or inclusion” needs to be specified. To the point of if training would fix this, I don’t want to say that it will fix this and I don’t want to kick the can down that road.

K. Yousif: I am not naïve enough to think that training is going to fix this. I do think the lack of training is a big problem. I have a hard time identifying why something on inclusion or diversity would be counted and something not on it wouldn’t be counted. I am also sympathetic to Tim’s point that the standards of scholarship already exist. What it sounds like is that departmental committees are acting badly over and over again or maybe college committees too.

L. Eberman: I know, Bob, that you were using the phrase “navel gazers” as a euphemism and you were acknowledging a previous shortcoming and how you are more aware know about sociocultural issues within various fields. I think what that says to me, given that the phrase was used again, is that we have an implicit bias against this particular research and as a person that does this research, I am working really hard to pull back on my particular biases, because I do feel like there is substantial value in that. Beyond that I think that we have to acknowledge our privilege here. I am a cisgender white woman that studies transgender issues and people don’t question me because I am a cisgender white woman. If I was part of the LGBTQ community or a Black woman studying that particular issue that I would get the same legitimacy in that field, profession, or among those that appraise my work. I think that it is really important that we acknowledge our privilege. Tim was speaking to the evidence that it wasn’t being included. The worry that I have is that we may be looking through that lens on that view point. We don’t actually know whether people have experienced bias against that work since that hasn’t happened to us or ben able to see that in terms of somebodies overall matriculation through the tenure process. I think it is important that we try to be cognizant of our privilege is as we evaluate our culture at ISU. Many of us are not in minoritized populations and those are women have experienced some of these biases in the process. I can’t begin to imagine the magnitude of what that might feel like if that was happening to me for various other reasons.

C. MacDonald: I just want to add on to what James and Lindsey have said. It is beneficial that we do make this explicit that we do value this as it appropriate scholarship because otherwise it very easy for a department to or any other reviewer to be dismissive of this work or for the scholar themselves to look at what we value and not see themselves reflected in it. So being explicit about what count matters.

V. Sheets: A number of these items I didn’t see a substantial in part because I thought we were already doing them. I thought that what is being stated was already in there but as I thought more about it I realized that the problems is that some of my colleagues don’t see it. We need to make it explicit to keep institutional bias way.

T. Hawkins: I would ask that we return to the language as I feel that I am talking about one thing and my colleagues are talking about something else. The language in 305.2.1.2 talks about the scholarship of application engagement. When that was added it was added because our colleagues came to us and provided explicit evidence that it’s absents was hurting them. That there existed a literature of application/engagement for students of that particular discipline. That their study of that nationally recognized discipline was not being represented effectively because they found themselves in different departments across campus. That was significant literature that we could look at confirming the existence their work. The work that they were engaged in had other people across the country engaging in it as well. Now as far as I can tell what we are being asked to add is language that recognizes a scholarship of inclusion. You may interpret that differently. I read it as the scholarship of inclusion. Having looked at it this way I tried looked at comparable scholarship that could match that of application/engagement that we used to as a metric to determine whether or not to include that phrase in this section of 305 and I did not find it. If there are faculty working on a scholarship of inclusion, if there is a definition of inclusion that could be provided to us that is nationally recognized and we can see that people within these departments are being impacted then we can include it in here. From what I am hearing no one can show me it exists.

C. Olsen: It seems to me that there are couple of different things here in this section that might be helpful. One is the scholarship of inclusion that has been talked about. The other is the last part of the paragraph which seems to me like the discussion of something different. Scholarship can be different and people need to work hard sometimes to understand it but if it is peer reviewed then it is peer reviewed and to me that is the cardinal principle. The work that our costume designer does is different than what people see as peer reviewed, but it is still peer review, which the overarching measure in terms of scholarship no matter what it looks like and no matter where it is. Colleagues look to do the research and understand what our colleagues are doing. This changes over time and we need to respect that. Faculty can do that now. I don’t see why putting that in will make much of a difference. Katie wanted me to say that she hasn’t had a chance to look at anything here. She would like a chance to do that when it goes forward.

D. Selman: I think we all need to take a deep breath and really think about what it means to ask our colleagues to demonstrate or prove that they have suffered under institutionalized racism and/or sexism. That is abominable. It is not something that I would put my name on nor would I be affiliated with a group that would. That is all I have to say.

T. Hawkins: I was not asking people to demonstrate that they were being discriminated against. If I were doing my research on the type of rudders that the Spanish used on their merchant ships during the colonial period but my colleagues didn’t recognize its value and I was having trouble advancing myself then it would be up to me to a certain degree to show that the work I was doing was appropriate. It’s not about proving that you are being discriminated against. It’s about demonstrating the disciplinary value of your work. That goes both ways. I resent the implication that I am calling out our colleagues and asking them to show that they are being discriminated against.

ii) Motion to strike 305.2.2.5 due to not having a Board of Trustees endorsed Strategic Plan R. Guell, M. Chambers: 9-0-0

L. Brown: I want to be clear this doesn’t mean it is gone. This will be taking up once again once our Board of Trustees meets again and endorses the Strategic Plan in May presumably. It will go to the Senate first thing in August.

R. Guell: I have said in emails before and if the President wants to interrupt me she can. She has repeatedly on multiple issues that she did not want to get out ahead of the Board. If we are going to move this, I don’t think we should get out ahead of the Board. It’s perfectly anticipatable that we are not by any means but let’s not presume things. Ultimately when this comes back I do hope the language that I sent out in green with lines through it. It is the one thing that is not parallel to the language of other mission based activities.

J. Gustafson: Strategic Plans come and go every few years and this is something that is already in line with our University mission in the previous strategic to have inclusivity in our faculty work. Handbook language is forever while Strategic Plans come and go. If it would palatable to the president and other to wait, I have no objection.

L. Eberman: Can we read the motion back?

R. Guell: The motion is strike 305.2.2.5 only because we do not wish to get ahead of the Board of Trustees action with regard to the Strategic Plan.

L. Eberman: Is this in regard to the green section as well?

R. Guell: No. This is something for the next Executive Committee to cover.

 iii) 305.3.5

R. Guell: Creating 305 was for the purpose of moving bias in evaluation out of 310 and into 305 and to place the responsibility recognizing and dealing with this within the minds of the evaluators of the work of the evaluated. It does not parse out teaching evaluations the way with similar language in the draft that 310 does. It’s there in my mind because there are dismissive ways in speaking about other people’s scholarship and service that is parallel to biases. In teaching evaluations, I fully accept that there is bias in favor of younger white males. I do believe that teaching evaluations need to remain a required part of the university policy. It is on the evaluators to weigh the import of those student evaluations.

L. Brown: So this is actually intended to bring meant to bring what they had in 310 to 305 and apply it all aspects of faculty work and not just teaching?

R. Guell: Correct.

V. Sheets: I like what Bob did here. First I note that we skipped over the section on service so I don’t know if we are continuing on to find tweaks. With regard to Bob’s new section. I like that section but I like what we did in 310 better, which was not to remove teaching evaluations but to make it clearer distinction between the student and the instructional evaluations. I still thought that would be valuable. If we decide ultimately to parse out what isn’t passible today, I thought this was a little less controversial.

T. Hawkins: We are talking about 305.3.5, correct? I wanted to make that clear. It appears to me on a grammatical level that we are going to confuse people when we use both “shall be” and “may be” at the same time. I would think that it would be better to say “departments shall specify” or “department may specify”. I don’t know what we accomplish when we say shall and may.

R. Guell: The point was that department must specify things that have to be in a dossier and things that may be included in the dossier. I may have said it badly but that is what I meant to say.

T. Hawkins: Then I would encourage it to be rewritten that way. If I were a department reviewer, I am not clear whether a department will say this all and nothing more or more can be added besides what is on the list. Where is the flexibility there? I think that needs to be clarified.

C. MacDonald: How about “What documents are required and what additional documentation may be provided?”

D. Selman: Does that mean then if something doesn’t appear under the “may” that it cannot be included.

L. Brown: That is a good question.

K. Yousif: This links to my question. I am not saying that this doesn’t need to be but some of this suggests that if you have a flexible document will have rewrite their P and T document. This more a question of intent. So when you say “departments must also specify how they will be considered in the candidate’s evaluation” is something like the department takes the holistic approach on teaching or are you think about some weighted system? I don’t want anything to be too complicated and I agree with Tim and don’t want to take away flexibility.

 C. MacDonald: May be just "what documents are required and may suggest additional documentation".

R. Guell: That seemed to be a question directed towards me. What I did out of deference to FAC and the sub-committee was to try to preserve as much of the original language as possible. You are asking a question of language that I didn’t really write in terms of my intent. I would suggest that you direct that towards Virgil or Donna.

V. Sheets: I think the issue was specifically departments not telling people what would not be considered more than what would be. It's not so much to take away the flexibility in the department, but allowing more. “It's trying to stop people from letting you submit your dossier, but then saying we aren't going to take those documents." Maybe we worded it poorly.

R. Guell: I personally believe that the most important part of the phrase is to provide largest context for evaluation. It was their language, so it was good.

R. Guell: The preposition should be “from” the candidate.

D. Selman: I worry about having lists of allowed items.

C. MacDonald: Our department has a list. It has all of the required documents but also contains a part that are suggestions of items they might not have thought about.

L. Brown: We have those too.

T. Hawkins: I appreciate Bob’s effort to revise the original proposal and I appreciate everyone’s work now. I am simply asking my colleagues if this is an example of something we want to write now or if it is better to step back and figure exactly what we want to say before we fumble through more language.

R. Guell: There is no motion on the floor so we can leave it as is and make elements like this part of Tuesday’s meeting.

T. Hawkins: Aren’t we in the middle of a motion to consider your language?

R. Guell: No. This is part of the underlying motion. I was just explaining what 305.3.5 was and move past it. We have no other motion on the floor.

T. Hawkins: Then let’s put a check by this section and move on.

L. Brown: We can than come back to decide if that should go to next year’s committee.

R. Guell: We can work on that as officers Monday and have something for Tuesday. Virgil noted that skipped over the service discussion. I did see where anybody was going to object to that.

iv) Section 305.2.1.3

C. Olsen: I was going to ask if we could change should to may. Instead of “should be recognized” it should read “may be recognized.” I think that was in there when it was related to course reductions. I think “may” is more parallel to what we do in other situations when there is an extraordinary request. “Should” implies something different to me.

R. Guell: I am going to defend “should” simply because the University should in fact recognize that whether it has any ability to compensate for or adjust for when we have important committees that need to be filled. Those committees that our minoritized faculty are tasks with a more frequent level than the rest of us.

C. Olsen: Maybe can say “should be recognized for their efforts” and put it at a period right there. I am just worried about the manner in which we recognize them. I think that everyone should be recognized for all service whether it’s extraordinary or not.

V. Sheets: So I think the committee would be in favor of that. I am okay with the taking out of the “e.g., Course reductions.” The real concern as I heard it from the group is that they are asked to get on all of these committees but then they are still held to the same standard in everything else. If we are going to ask them to take on all of this work in one area we need to make an allocation even if it is just adjusting consideration or weighting of the other areas."

T. Hawkins: I think that “may” is better than should. The use of the word “should” is empty unless we are explicit about what happens if you are not recognized according to how you think you should be recognized. This is Handbook language. If our faculty see language that says “I should be recognized” but the Handbook doesn’t say what that recognition is explicitly or it doesn’t say what happens if in my opinion I don’t feel I am being recognized, that is problematic in a practical sense.

C. MacDonald: At least it doesn’t say “shall.” Shall implies that the institution will do it every single time. “Should” say’s this the right way of doing things. I think that if we leave should in that the piece that comes after efforts with the adjust workload for their efforts. This is reasonable and we should be able to do these things. I don’t think we can just say that faculty should be recognized for their efforts because that may say “give me a high five”. Is that good recognition for doing a lot of extra work. I am okay with it as it is.

M. Chambers: I am a little bit worried about specifying the how these things are recognized. For example if we are saying that faculty can have an adjust weighting on service. I think we put equal weight on all three areas when it comes to promotion and it’s not about biennual/triennual review where we do put weighting on service at least in the past we have. Does this mean if somebody in Arts and Sciences meets the criteria of extraordinary service that they don’t have to meet the four to six peer reviewed article because they had so much more service? Is that available in language already in 305 some place?

L. Brown: Some departments have weighting that are different for each being weighted differently. I think it is equally weighted unless there is something to the contrary.

K. Yousif: I have the same concern. I don’t want to write something into the Handbook that seems that protect a faculty member that over preforms in one area and less in another and then get in a committee that has a hard time coming up. I would argue that we have to change the culture. We have to stop demanding the minoritized faculty do all of the work. Just like all of us they have full professional lives.

T. Hawkins: I think we need to be careful about legislating what we want to see changed. I am concerned a phrase like “exceptional service responsibilities” means different things to different people. When you put it in the Handbook and you don’t clarify then what that means to me in a practical since is that you are going to have a lot more debate and conflict.

V. Sheets: With respect I think that the department already defines what is necessary, therefore would be the place that would define whether service was exceptional or not. I don’t have a problem with allowing departments to do that. The word “should” just tries to set a moral standard. It gives a base on what the faculty member might have a right too.

The point is that minoritized faculty that sit on a dozen committees can go and say I really should get some accommodation. Nobody else in this department is doing all of this so please accommodate my workload.

J. Gustafson: I think this is a good candidate to hold for next year. I think what happened when we struck that earlier sentence “service may include” which was the context. I understand why it was struck. Sitting on a committee to help increase diversity maybe should have stated as a collective of a university value. Combining those two ideas together in the clause was the meaning here. We do ask for a lot of service from minoritized faculty and it imbedded is some parts of our university. You can’t hire without a hiring committee that has at least one minioritized faculty. Which means every single time in the history department that we want to hire someone we have to have one of our minoritized faculty members or draw someone from another department. It always seem to be the same person. Which we can’t decide to stop doing since we are mandated to that by policy.

L. Brown: So are you suggesting putting that back and maybe putting it down with the other new language?

J. Gustafson: I am not suggesting either right now. I don’t know if this is something that we consider it for next year or something that should just be worked out. If we could just set it aside and figure out a way to combine those two. I think without the first clause there the second one loses its meaning.

L. Brown: Is this something that you are thinking for next year or the officers to work on?

J. Gustafson: I would prefer that the officers work on it now.

L. Brown: That’s fine.

T. Hawkins: I don’t disagree with what he said I would note though *305.2.1.3 Service. Service includes activities on behalf of the department/school, college, and University, as well as to the profession and the community. Community service includes discipline-related activities at the local, regional, national, and international levels. Each academic unit (normally the department) is responsible for determining the relative importance of service activities within the unit.*

C. MacDonald: We do say later in the document that "the quality of teaching will be given high priority in performance evaluations".

v) Peer Review Committees 305.4

R. Guell: The sub-committee and FAC suggested the chairperson be trained. I think borrowing from both Liz and Keri, I think Rana Johnson should create something that is available for everyone via the web and that everyone that does evaluation should understand explicit and implicit bias and the ways to adjust your brain in evaluating to avoid such behavior.

K. Yousif: I will just say that I have argued this before with Liz and Bob. I absolutely agree that everyone on the committee should get training. I think it is onerous the chair gets trained and that they would have some responsibility in teaching other members. Many department and college committees are two year terms anyway and in some departments they are long standing terms.

L. Brown: I concur with that.

T. Hawkins: Just to clarify that simply means there would be a standard across colleges and departments across campus,

R. Guell: My understanding is Rana Johnson is to produce this training as quickly as possible. One of suggestions as to delay this until next year is that this training is not yet completed and that Rana might not have it done in time. Others have suggested that this might light a fire under to get it completed.

K. Yousif: I would hope that if this part goes through and passes that we could work with the President and Provost to charge University with finding training and organizing it ASAP. We are about to do the biannual and I think there is no reason to delay on this.

L. Brown: I agree.

R. Guell: I didn’t intend that there be any changes to 310 after I made the suggestion of moving the portion to 305. Since it is in my document I am going motion to strike all changes in regards to 310.

V. Sheets: Can you repeat that Bob. I lost you.

R. Guell: My motion is to strike all of the document changes associated with 310. T. Hawkins seconds. 9-0-0

V. Sheets: I know that you restored a lot of the changes in 310.1.3.1 and I didn’t find a real problem with that but I did find value in changing the label to student course evaluations instead of course evaluations because I felt that clarified without changing much there. The movement of the first sentence from there into 310.1.2 I thought help make the distinction a little clearer and they are such trivial changes that I would like to retain them.

R. Guell: You want to retain that which is in highlighted yellow in 310.1.3.1 and the highlighted yellow in 310.1.3.2 and that is an incretion. Is that correct?

V. Sheets: It is actually an insertion there and was pulled from 310.1.3.1 we forgot to track the change there. It is currently the first sentence of the prior section and we moved it the first sentence of this section.

R. Guell: Okay. Other than those two changes leave those two sections alone. Other than the moving of the quality of teaching sentence and the insertion of student in the label you are okay if we don’t change any of the existing language?

V. Sheets: Assuming that the other section that you added is included, I think so but to be clear what that means is the first section in your document in 310.1.3.1 that is sort of darker red stays because that is what is currently there and removed by the committee and not the next little section of red as that is the insertion that would not go in. The same thing in red would not go in the new document.

R. Guell: Yes. I ask unanimous consent to adjust my motion to leave the body of the text in 310.1.3.1 unchanged with the exception of moving of the first sentence to 310.1.3.2 and with the exception of adjusting the title of 310.1.3.1 that is my unanimous consent request. (It passes)

T. Hawkins: I simply want to know at this time if we are going to vote on this full proposal today.

L. Brown: No. We will bringing a clean document to Tuesday meeting.

vi) 305.4

L. Eberman: I note Katie’s comment in the chat about needing training but also decision makers. I feel like we have language in the faculty evaluation model that speaks to training at all levels and may want to consider that for that section versus just members of the review committees.

R. Guell: This is in the evaluation?

L. Eberman: 305.4 Peer Review Committees. Right now it reads members of review committee, but based on Katie’s suggestion any decision maker should receive training.

R. Guell: So it should be every reviewer?

L. Brown: Reading from chat: *I am in support of every member of the committee should participate in this specific professional development. And decision-makers*.

L. Eberman: Or those that evaluate personnel.

L. Brown: Let us mess with that and we will work it up so that we can present it on Tuesday.

vii) Question for President:

R. Guell: You had noted in a previous occasion that you didn’t want to get ahead of the Board.

D. Curtis: I will make sure that I get up to speed when I see your clean copy. Please make sure that I get copied on that.

L. Brown: Of course we will. We are thinking about doing this Monday so after that. If you could have that ready before the officers’ meeting with Chris. He will want to see that too.

R. Guell: I don’t know how much of the email that you read in the last 48 hours. I asserted some things that I thought you were probably thinking - and I don’t want to put words in your mouth - but that is why I added to the conversation that we are having. I didn’t want to put you in a position of having to get ahead of the Board of Trustees. Are we thinking the right way? That this is something that you want Board action on before we start inserting thing like mission based activities.

D. Curtis: Help me understand what you mean by Board action?

R. Guell: It meant that specifically we were talking about mission based activity in existential learning. Before us was the inclusion of diversity and inclusion in mission based activity. It was my thought that it would be better if the Strategic Plan was voted on by the Board first and that this would be a response those.

D. Curtis: Let me be clear that the Board is not approving the Strategic Plan or will they be voting on it. They will be endorsing it. They will be endorsing it because will be making annual modifications and not to have to come back to the Board every time we change what we are doing in the plan. Since this if a four-year document that will go by fast. We want to be nimble enough to make modifications. With that said they will not be making a vote, but the will probably be receiving the Strategic Plan sooner than the Board packet goes out, because you will be getting one more review before I share it them. It seems like everybody in this mix including the Trustees wants to be the first and last to see something before it goes forward. I would really prefer that we not make some presumptuous decisions that would signal to them that we are 100% expecting their endorsement.

viii)

T. Hawkins: Just for quick clarification I wanted to ask about the bottom of the report where it states it was approved by FAC on November 2021. I assume that is a typo.

D. Selman: Yes that is a typo. It was attached to another policy that we were working that we did approve back in November so it just got moved over.

T. Hawkins: Can I just encourage the officers to have language to endorse the creation of a permanent sub-committee for FAC? I can’t see any reason why that wouldn’t be supported.

D. Selman: We weren’t clear if we needed to have language for a sub-committee of FAC.

L. Brown: If we want it to be a permanent standing one I think we should put it in.

V. Sheets: So that is the language that is drafted there that FAC didn’t approve.

R. Guell: So either we have to say we want the sub-committees language not FAC rejection of it or we need the logic of why FAC rejected it. I imagine it would be similar to Graduate Councils (GC) logic. The sub-committees of GC aren’t in the Handbook.

L. Brown: They are in their by-laws.

V. Sheets: You are correct that doesn’t parallel GC. Exec can decide how it wants to approach that. The reason FAC rejected this language was that the sub-committee approved this language although the sub-committee was favoring having a standing committee. FAC felt that if we approved this language, that was sort of settling the issue and FAC preferred to the examination of creating a standing committee as opposed to keeping a sub-committee.

D. Selman: That is exactly right. We want to keep the sub-committee until it was worked out how it would be a standing committee.

K. Yousif: You just wanted a temporary solution for next like we did for this year to work on the language to have an official standing committee in the Handbook?

D. Selman: Yes. Independent of FAC. With charges and membership requirements. That is what we preferred and that is what the sub-committee wanted too.

J. Gustafson: I support that and I think as one of the incoming officers next year I think that I would like to talk with Keri and Liz more generally about the enormous load that is placed on FAC every year and the fact that we have committees that are significantly lighter. It should be part of a bigger conversation.

R. Guell: I don’t vote on Standing Committee’s imagined mission of this body would intersect with the permeant charges to FAC. I view that as likely setting up a turf war of who owns 305. I would caution against a vote on the approach of standing committees.

L. Eberman: A question and a comment. Changes to standing committees are in the by-laws, correct?Do they require a vote of the whole faculty?

R. Guell: A change to 146 either requires a super majority in Exec. If it doesn’t get a super majority only then does it require a vote of the whole faculty. Only the constitution 145 requires a faculty vote.

L. Eberman: The other thing to consider is to Bob’s point that 80% of this will align with FAC but the other 20% might align with SAC so we might want to consider sub-committee that address these issues with SAC as well.

R. Guell: To me that would be a cleaner approach would be to ask SAC to create a sub-committee on minoritized students rather than combine those minoritized issues into one.

V. Sheets: I tend to agree with Bob on this. This is a place that I disagree but colleagues of FAC say there are models out there and I don't believe we should forestall that.

R. Guell: I am making going to make a motion to table the current motion so we clear up the language. Seconded by M. Chambers: 9-0-0

C. MacDonald from chat : *145.9.2 Bylaws. Bylaws to this Constitution shall become effective when:145.9.2.1 Initiated by the University Faculty Senate; and either145.9.2.2 Approved by two-thirds of the voting members of the University Faculty Senate and accepted by the ISU Board of Trustees; or145.9.2.3 Approved by a majority of those present and voting in the University Faculty Senate and approved by the University Faculty in the manner provided in 145.1.5; and accepted by the ISU Board of Trustees.*

1. Adjournment: 5:20 pm