

CAS Congress General Meeting Minutes

Start: 10:35am

A. Greetings, Thanks and Introduction of Leadership Council Members

New list of Congress Members and Committee Chairs distributed. We have no one assigned to update the CAS website; H. Johnson asked that members of the Leadership Council work together to keep it up to date. We don't have the time to keep up the CAS Blog, which will be eliminated.

B. Selection of Congress President and Nominations for President-Elect

The situation: no current president or president-elect. Normally, presidents are not elected (president-elects are elected, then automatically become president the following year), so there is no specific procedure for establish a president in the absence of a president-elect. Attempts were made in Spring 17 to garner interest in the position, but no one stepped forward. Because we've already had significant delay, we decided to collectively appoint a president to finish out the remainder of AY17-18. Debbie Mann graciously accepted the nomination by Heather Johnson, seconded by Eddie Ackad. All committee members present approved Debbie's appointment! Debbie Mann will be President of the CAS Congress for the remainder of the 17-18 academic year. Members of the Elections Committee will actively seek a candidate for president-elect in the coming weeks.

C. Brief Reports from Committee Chairs:

--Policies: Policies recently conducted a faculty survey. Concerns of the survey, including faculty perceptions of CAS structure, the need for further promotion of the liberal arts, and the desperate need for cost of living raises.

Dean Budzban, who happened to be present, answered questions about his view of CAS structure, and mentioned that the two associate deans now have specific titles; this should help with routing.

--Promotion and Tenure: Chair could not attend (but committee work is continuing)

--Curriculum: Curriculum committee is running smoothly, keeping to the practices instituted last year by Sorin Nastasia. Committee Reviewed approx. 135 forms last year. New sets of forms will generally be posted on the first of the months, so that subcommittee are processing 4 sets per semester.

--Elections: Elections will tackle the search for a new president-elect, in addition to fielding a request from faculty senate for a new CAS committee member.

--Sabbatical and Awards: Chair could not attend (but committee work is continuing)

--Review: Chair could not attend (but committee work is continuing)

D. Open Forum: Any other concerns? Comments from Congress Members!

Moved on to Business Meeting, 11:00am.

CAS Congress Business Meeting & Open Forum Minutes

CAS Congress Business Meeting and Open Forum (11:00-12:00am)

- A. Presentation by Dean Budzban
re: Changes to External Review and Peer Evaluation Guidelines

- B. Public-forum discussion of proposed changes and timeline for review and voting

Start: 11:00a.m.

Meeting was introduced as a review of proposed changes to policy within the College of Arts & Sciences for the External Evaluation Scholarship and Peer Evaluation guidelines.

The guidelines were clarified as being intended to becoming policy within CAS, with voting/approval procedures yet to be determined.

I. An in-depth review of the proposed External Evaluation Scholarship policy.

Primary points of concern raised by faculty:

1. The perceived power differential between non-tenured reviewer (from another university) of tenured professor (at SIUE). A real concern?
2. The “worst case scenario” of requesting multiple reviews from multiple reviewers and only receiving one or zero back: should the promotion candidate be held responsible? (Though this is a rare case, we may need a slight amendment to the policy to account for “extraordinary” circumstances.)

In the coming CAS Congress meetings, discussion will occur on how to structure the review request letter to the faculty.

II. A review of proposed Peer Evaluation in Teaching Guidelines. Guidelines require that peer evaluations of tenured professors be conducted by tenured professors—this is intended to protect assistant professors from pressure to produce a positive review. There was also a worry that junior faculty reviewing tenured colleagues would not feel free to give critical feedback of those who would ultimately be deciding on their tenure cases (thus making their reviews less valuable).

Primary points of concern raised by faculty:

1. Power differential could easily be damaging either way: a tenured professor reviewing an untenured professor could impose his or her pedagogical perspective on the untenured professor.
2. More pressingly, the policy (*intentionally or not*) implies that already-tenured faculty are better equipped to evaluate teaching and give pedagogical advice. In reality, the

opposite may be true, as newly-hired faculty may well have innovative ideas about pedagogy and are likely to be up-to-date on best practices. Limiting feedback opportunities to tenured faculty has the potential to stifle pedagogical creativity and collegial exchange.

[Related discussion: Peer Evaluations serve two main functions: 1. As records of teaching effectiveness to be used in the tenure and promotion process. 2. As modes of intellectual exchange and community building among faculty members. Where the Dean's office is necessarily focused on function #1, the faculty recognize both. These two functions may not always be compatible, but *need to be made so* as much as possible, since time constraints mean separating them into two separate procedures is untenable for many.]

Suggested Revisions: A mandated 1/3rd of the Evaluations come from Tenured Faculty (to ensure the presence of a critical review if such is necessary), with the remaining evaluations more open.

[Side discussion: Focus on Research and Teaching. Service frequently ignored or undervalued.]

In another CAS Congress meetings, revisions will be made and presented to the faculty as possible amendments to these policies by Dean Budzban.

Finally, CAS Policy: The Midpoint & Final Tenure process were explained and reviewed. Effective immediately, there will be no 1st semester retention review for new faculty, unless the specific department requires a 3 month review, in which case the department will adhere to those policies. Instead, an annual letter of evaluation for professors is required (this is already being done).

Adjournment: 12:00p.m.

Attendance:

Heather Johnson*

Debbie Mann*

Eddie Ackad*

Darron Luesse*

Sarah Luesse*

Min Liu*

Jayne Swanke*

Wai Hsien Cheah*

E. Duff Wrobbel*

Musonda Kapatamoyo*

Laura Hanson *

Abdullah Hamad*

Chris Pearson *

Brian Lallish

Tom Foster

Doug Simms

Jessica DeSpain

Joel Hardman

Jason Yu

Undra Baasanjav

*Also attended the General Meeting