

12-12-2011

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, December 12, 2011

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2011 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, December 12, 2011" (2011). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 52.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/52

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
12/12/11 (3:15 p.m. – 4:17 p.m.)
Mtg. #1704

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

No press present.

Provost **Gibson** read a statement describing the charge of the committee she created to recommend changes to the policy for defining “active scholar” in determining teaching loads.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** offered a Merry Christmas and wishes for a good Break to all.

Vice-Chair **Breitbach** had no comments.

Chair **Funderburk**'s comments included many thanks to everyone for their hard work this semester and a wish for good luck with completing the semester.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for November 28, 2011, were approved by acclamation with no corrections offered.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1107 1005 Resolution regarding UNI Museums. Motion to docket (**DeBerg/Boody**). Passed

1108 1006 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Business Administration. Motion to docket (**Smith/Wurtz**). Passed.

1109 1007 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Education. Motion to docket (**Boody/Roberts-Dobie**). Passed.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

- 1106 1004 Recommended changes to Faculty Senate Bylaws, **(Peters/Neuhaus)**. Motion to accept changes **(DeBerg/Bruess)**. Passed.
- 1102 1000 Consultation regarding Faculty Activity Reporting, **(Bruess/Smith)**. Discussion completed.
- 1103 1001 Emeritus Status Request, Sue Joseph **Mattison**, HPELS, effective August 1, 2011, **(Roberts-Dobie/Boody)**. Motion to endorse request **(Bruess/Kirmani)**. Passed.
- 1104 1002 Emeritus Status Request, Beverly **Riess**, Student Field Experience, effective, June 30, 2011, **(Neuhaus/Boody)**. Motion to endorse request **(Neuhaus/Boody)**. Passed.
- 1105 1003 Assigned Student Participation in Co-Curricular Activities, **(Smith/DeBerg)**. Motion to refer petition to Educational Policies Commission (EPC) **(Smith/DeBerg)**. Passed.

5. New Business/Old Business

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 4:17 p.m. **(Bruess/Boody)**. Passed.

Next meeting:

Date January 9, 2012

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m. **(Note new starting time)**

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
December 12, 2011
Mtg. 1704**

PRESENT: Robert **Boody** (alternate for Deborah **Gallagher**), Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Gloria **Gibson**, James **Jurgenson**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Susan **Roberts-Dobie** (alternate for Chris **Edginton**), Marilyn **Shaw**, Jerry **Smith**, Katherine **Van Wormer**, Susan **Wurtz**

Absent: Michael **Roth**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. and welcomed everyone.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Funderburk: Call for press identification. I don't believe we have any press today.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Funderburk: Comments from Provost Gibson?

Provost **Gibson:** I would just like to read, so that it would be in the Minutes, the charge that I gave to the committee—actually that I charged last week to look at the issue of the “active scholar.” So I'm just going to read the charge to you, and this is dated December 1, 2001 [sic, 2011].

(reading) “The Academic Affairs Council discussed and developed criteria in June 2011 to determine ‘active scholar.’ Implementation occurred this fall. The provost assured deans and department heads criteria would be further revised.

Faculty, and this is the previous criteria, are deemed ‘active scholars’ if, during the past five years, they have:

- Published two peer reviewed articles or book chapters
- Published one peer reviewed book
- Performed or developed two peer reviewed creative activities
- Won [two] grants or contracts, each worth at least \$50,000 or
- Achieved some combination of the above

Some faculty voiced concerns including: disagreement with criteria, unequal application of exceptions to criteria, and questions about returning to the 3/3 load. In order to better address these issues in a collaborative manner, a small committee has been identified composed of:

- The Chair of the Faculty Senate
- The Chair or designee of the College Faculty Senates
- The Chair of the Council of Department Heads
- The Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs

Specifically, the charge to the committee:

- 1) Examine current criteria developed to identify an ‘active scholar’
- 2) Make recommendations regarding changes to current criteria
- 3) Develop a procedure (or possibly a form) for requesting an exception, and
- 4) Develop criteria/process for returning to a 3/3 load

The committee should submit recommendations to the Provost by January 20, 2012. They will be vetted at Academic Affairs Council. Several iterations of the criteria may be necessary.

Thank you for your work on this most serious issue.” (ending reading)

So this was the charge that went to the committee, and their report recommendations are due back to me in mid-January. (pause) That’s all.

Funderburk: Very good. Chair **Jurgenson** is not with us.

DeBerg: Well, the “chair” is.

Funderburk: The “chair” is (laughter). And the “chair” for Vice-Chair **Breitbach**, who is also not yet here.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

(arriving later)

Funderburk: Chair **Jurgenson**, do you have any comments for us today?

Chair **Jurgenson:** No—Merry Christmas and have a good Break.

REPORT ON COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION FROM VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH

(arriving later)

Breitbach had no comments when asked.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Funderburk: My only comments today are thanks for all your work this year, and thanks for being here, and lots of luck with your exams, and I hope you have a wonderful Break, and I hope we start it as soon as possible today, so please keep that in mind as we go forward with the Agenda (light laughter).

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Funderburk: Motion—well, actually do we have any corrections to the November 28 Minutes? (**Nuss** shakes her head.) Had none coming in. Unless I hear some, I will assume those are approved by acclamation then? (Heads nod, and a few vocalize approval.) So those are approved by acclamation.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1107 for Docket #1005, Resolution regarding UNI Museums

Funderburk: Items for docketing. Calendar Item 1107, Resolution regarding UNI Museums. Is there a motion?

DeBerg: I move that we docket it in regular order.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**, regular order.

Boody: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Boody**. Questions? Discussion? All those in favor of docketing in regular order, say “aye.” (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (1 heard). And abstentions? None. Docketed in regular order.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1108 for Docket #1006, Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Business Administration

Funderburk: Calendar Item 1108, Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Business Administration. Do we have a motion to docket? Senator **Smith** (who indicated) motion to docket in....?

Smith: Regular order.

Funderburk: Regular order.

Wurtz: Second that.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz** second. Discussion? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I have a simple question. As someone who's going through this for the first time, the UCC [University Curriculum Committee] rules that the Senate signed off on--was it in 2008, I think?—seem to specify that the Senate “shall” forward the UCC’s recommendations unless the UCC’s recommendations are challenged by certain entities or under certain circumstances. So I guess I’m just kind of looking for a sense of what our role is here in this? And, I mean, does it even need to be docketed, honestly, if it is not being challenged by anybody? I mean, I guess I get the impression that we are just serving as sort of an appeals body for the UCC, and if there’s no appeal being made, what’s the purpose in docketing it and discussing it?

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, again, I don’t know the rules, but I know the last curriculum cycle this Body took a serious look at it and did--during the course of looking at it, found things that we were concerned about, and I think that’s an appropriate role for this Body, and that’s what I would anticipate doing this time.

Funderburk: And just for clarification, there’s a link to the policy on our website (<http://www.uni.edu/senate/>), as part of that policy that Senator **Peters** is referring to, which states something to the effect that the Senate “shall” grant that final authority to the UCC except in cases of challenges. So that’s where this discussion is coming from, just as a point of information. Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Well, I—you know, as much as I enjoy going through those curricular packages (light laughter/wheezing around) and working on them one at a time, I do think that Senator **Peters** raises something of a point. Now, there have been a number of practices that over the past 10, 20 years since, you know, things were written in stone or on paper that we may have deviated a little bit from on this. I guess one of the questions—maybe we don't answer this right now, but one of the questions we may ask ourselves is, "What role do we play here? Are we sort of a 'super UCC,' or are we a 'super GCC,' or do we have these committees designated to do that sort of work which I sometimes wonder if we're going to repeat?" You know, certainly if there are concerns that are brought forward by other units, if we have two different Departments or two different Colleges that are concerned about something coming forward, this is a place for appeal. But sometimes I wonder if we're obligated or indeed whether we're messing things up by bringing forth concerns ourselves, unless we are doing so as part of a College looking at that. This is just kind of more of a question for me than anything else.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I don't know what would be the occasion where we as individuals, apart from our role on the Senate, could look at curriculum proposals submitted by other Colleges. We can look at that in our own, I suppose, but I don't know that we, as individuals—as individual faculty—have access to all the curriculum proposals, and yet I would think that it is perfectly legitimate for us as Senators to do that. And I felt certainly last time we raised some very good points. I think me and **Phil** did. (light laughter around). And I look forward to doing it again. I think some good points were raised about stuff coming out of my College. I think we should do that. I know this. We submitted a request to the UCC last time, 2 years ago, asking them to do stuff. They have yet to get back to us. What's with that? So, I mean, it's kind of like, if they are not going to respond on that kind of stuff, yeah, we should be doing things here, for sure.

Funderburk: Additional questions or comments? Hearing none. The motion is to docket in regular order, the curriculum package from the

College of Business Administration. All those in favor, “aye.” (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion carries. Docketed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1109 for Docket #1007, Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Education

Funderburk: 1109, Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Education. Motion?

Boody: I move we docket that in regular order.

Funderburk: Senator **Boody**.

Roberts-Dobie: Second.

Funderburk: Senator **Roberts-Dobie** second. Questions or comments? All those in favor? (ayes heard all around) Those opposed? (none heard) And abstentions? None. Docketed in regular order.

(Chair **Jurgenson** arrived and had a brief comment; see earlier.)

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1004, RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS (PETERS/NEUHAUS)

Chair **Funderburk:** All righty. Items for consideration today. 1106, Docket Item 1004, Recommended Changes to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, for a motion?

DeBerg: I’ll move adoption of the recommended changes.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**. Do we have a second.

Bruess: I'll second.

Funderburk: Senator **Bruess**. And comments? Questions? Senator **Roberts-Dobie**.

Roberts-Dobie: I had a question about the comments about the "Secretary," because I believe that it is referring to **Sherry** in the document, but isn't that what we're calling **Scott (Peters)**, too, that he has the role of the "Secretary"? And it's things like, "The secretary shall...." I just thought some clarification on that might be helpful.

Funderburk: Right, because Sherry **Nuss** is the Administrative Assistant, and the "Secretary" in this case is Scott **Peters**.

Roberts-Dobie: So then I would suggest that where it says "secretary" be changed to "administrative assistant," so those would be her roles that were enumerated?

Funderburk: I'm waiting—one of the members. Who actually.....?

DeBerg: It's 3.3, page 3. (pause while document with revisions was projected for the group to see) It looks like "administrative assistant" to me.

Peters: Right, so the idea was to indicate that the "Secretary" position now isn't actually responsible for taking the minutes but still is actually ultimately responsible for the production of the minutes, oversees it.

DeBerg: Oh, ok.

Roberts-Dobie: Ok, so these are your roles, **Scott**? These 4 things?

Peters: Those would be. Those would be the—yeah, those—it was an intent to clarify what the "secretary" is supposed to do now, given that the Senate hires an "administrative assistant" to actually take the minutes.

Funderburk: Chair **Jurgenson**.

Jurgenson: It was the duty of the Secretary at one time to do all this. We didn't have an administrative assistant to do this for us, so this language could—would properly be changed to reflect that change in practice.

Wurtz: Would it be understood that the Senate's Administrative Assistant would assist any administrative work as needed?

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Perhaps for the President or Vice President, as well as the Secretary.

Wurtz: Exactly.

DeBerg: And deserving Senators. (light laughter around)

Smith: Well, some deserve it.....(joking)

Funderburk: Questions or comments before I recognize Sherry to comment on that? Are there no additional—I mean, I'm fine for us to vote these in very quickly, and it gets us out of here that much sooner. Senator **Boody**.

Boody: I've got a question on "representation." I don't understand what it means "When a number of voting faculty..."—this is page 1, 2.1 "When a number of voting faculty in a college falls exactly between 2 multiples of 30, Senate representation will be based on the larger multiple." So, if you have 45.5 people, then you get 3?

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus** is our designated mathematician.

Neuhaus: Yeah, this was actually a moment of non-mathematical grace when this first came up. If you—if we had gone with "odd multiples," it would have nicely resolved itself. And we were originally thinking of

representation based on groupings of 25. Somewhere along that Summer, in a couple of discussions, folks landed on the concept of 30, and somehow I neglected to remember that, you know, half of 30—you get this problem (light laughter around) where it's like you want to go up or down with that number, and so we had—as we approached this question, which was approved for the Constitution, we realized we were going to need that 1 in a 30 chance taken into account, because over time sooner or later someone would fall later smack between the upper or lower.

Boody: Well, I guess what I really mean, though, is not so much because no one would be 45.5. It either would be above or below, but it suggests that you have—you only get an extra one if you are exactly in the middle. I assume what you mean is “if you're above half.” (several voices attempting to explain whether “exactly half” or “half or above”)

East: If you are exactly half. Forty-five would be half way between 30 and 60.

Boody: Or above.

East: Forty-five would be half, exactly half-way between 30 and 60. Do you round up or down? And they just said, “always round up.”

Boody: Ok, yes. But the way it sounds like, the way it reads is if you have 47, you don't round up. It says only if you are exactly half-way.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I think in the sentence above that it does say that, and I'm looking at the third line in any color. “One senator per 30 voting faculty members rounded to the nearest multiple of 30.” So that takes care of everything, except for right in exactly in the middle.

Neuhaus: One clause. That's right.

DeBerg: And I want to speak for the rounding up principle because it will tend to give us a larger Senate, and I think that's a really good thing, so I like the strategy of rounding up.

Neuhaus: Should have done multiples of 31, I think. (laughter around)
Rightfully, so people'd say "Now, that's odd, mathematically speaking."

DeBerg: Someone would've looked for a Department with 31 members and assumed there was horrible lobbying going on.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: I notice that we talk about what happens if we somehow get an increase or there's—what happens when you decrease the number of faculty below, i.e., lose a Senator? Is that specified anywhere?

Funderburk: Does any member wish to speak to that? Senator **Breitbach**.

Breitbach: We did discuss that and people would be allowed to serve out an elected term, and then it would decrease at that time.

East: But that's not addressed in the Constitution, right?

Peters: Well, I think

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Sorry. I think we have left that up to the Committee on Committees. For the most part the only thing that we didn't leave up to the Committee on Committees was the opportunity to challenge if the Committee on Committees failed to adjust. Or am I missing a section?

Neuhaus: Well, I wonder if the other

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Barges in. (light laughter around) Part of the—part of the thinking on this is that the Constitution is a—and **Scott** probably would be more eloquent on that—but is a--something of a spare document. It's—it gets at some of the essences of what we're after and in some cases spells things out very specifically. But a lot of the mechanics of how these things will be taken care of, much as our own government I think tries to work in a similar fashion, is spelled out more specifically so that the Bylaws would tend to cover all of these rather than make a very long Constitution.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: Yeah, but that's not accurate because in 2.3 says, ""Petition to Increase Representation." When you find out you have more faculty, you get to petition to increase. What happens when you have a decrease in faculty? If it's worth talking about an increase, it's worth talking about a decrease.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Never mind.

Funderburk: Pass. Senator **East**.

East: Could we change "increase" to "change"? Does that—"If there is a 'change' that would result in a difference in representation, that could be considered by whatever process?"

Funderburk: Do I hear that as a motion to change the word on 2.3 to read "Petition to Change Representation"?

Boody: Why would a College want to petition to lose representation?
(light laughter around)

Funderburk: Senator **East**. Followed by Senator **DeBerg**.

East: It was suggested that the Committee on Committees could handle this. Why not do that? Say, should there be a change, the Committee on Committees will recommend a-- something different.

DeBerg: Recommend action.

East: Recommend an appropriate action.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**. And then Senator **Peters**.

DeBerg: Well, I don't—I don't remember this part of the Subcommittee's conversation, but I'm wondering why there would be any petitioning at all. The Roster is read by someone every Fall, and that Body simply indicates that someone's goes up, someone's might go down. This petitioning is going to get lost in the shuffle. I don't know why it isn't automatic that the elections are then recast or whatever.

Peters: Right. So the idea was that 2.2 in the Committee's view, I think, formalizes what the custom has been, just that the Committee on Committees handles this. 2.3 we thought there should be an avenue in case the Committee on Committees

DeBerg: Drops

Peters: did not act.

DeBerg: Ok, ok.

Peters: That there might really need to be an avenue to the Senate in case the Committee on Committees did not make the adjustment. So that's the idea of those two sections kind of acting together.

DeBerg: Thank you.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: I suppose, kind of going along with the Senator **East** thinking there that putting in something “Petition to Change,” I suppose if folks were feeling less charitable towards other Colleges, some persons from one College might wish to come forward and say, “Those folks have too many people, darn it. I want them to....” So maybe the word “change” rather than “increase” would make some sense in that regard.

Funderburk: The Chair repeats the question: “Is there a motion to do that?”

DeBerg: Motion to do what?

Funderburk: To amend that? I never got an answer to my question. (pause) Ok, I’ll assume not yet. Senator **East**.

East: I am reluctant to vote in favor of this when we’ve identified—to me a Constitution is a reasonably important document, even of the UNI Faculty Senate, and that we shouldn’t just kind of pass it because we’re going to pass it. I would rather—and I would rather not amend it ad hoc, in an ad hoc fashion. The wording currently doesn’t say “refer to”—doesn’t say “the Senate will be a Body of last resort.” It doesn’t say, “Refer to the Committee on Committees.” I think any attempt to wordsmith that less useful—less than useful.

Funderburk: Senator **Boody** and Senator **DeBerg**.

Boody: I would recommend instead that we simply remove 2.3 because the Committee on Committees should be doing this on a regular basis, and if they don’t, we have a regular petition system in the Senate. I mean, it’s right on line. So I don’t see a need to have an additional

Funderburk: I hear that as a motion to amend by deleting 2.3.

DeBerg: I second that amendment.

Funderburk: Second by Senator **DeBerg**. As we were discussing about this earlier, that will require a majority vote of this Body. Discussion on the merits of deleting 2.3?

Peters: I have no objections, but I don't know about other Committee members.

Breitbach: I have no objections either.

Funderburk: Ok, hearing no discussion, no objections, a vote—all those in favor of deleting 2.3 from the Amendments to the Bylaws as proposed, say “aye.” (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Ok, the Chair judges that that was half or more. Very good. Now back to our discussion. I think Senator **DeBerg** you still have

DeBerg: Pass.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Does the Body trust that the Committee can go back and renumber? Do we need separate motions to renumber each now, if we delete 2.3? Or can we get some sense that because of

Funderburk: It is now understood that all the numbering in the 2 section will be adjusted appropriately. Other issues with the Bylaws corrections? And just as a note, if--I can't remember if this was public or not. This was seen as the first time these are coming for just more or less clerical errors, clerical corrections. There may be another series of amendments coming forward with suggested changes as well, so if you see this document again, that's the why. Right now we are adjusting things like names and duties and things. I see no other comments. Are we ready to vote? All those in favor of accepting the Bylaws changes at present as amended, say “aye.” (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions. None. Passed. Excellent. We might get out of here early after all.

Wurtz: Major thanks to those

DeBerg: Not really. Thanks to the Subcommittee.

Wurtz: Major thanks to those who did the work. Mr. Pres—

Funderburk: Yes, Senator **Wurtz**.

Wurtz: Major thanks to those who did the work. A job that really needed doing.

Funderburk: Yes, absolutely. Major thanks to this Committee who has been working all semester on this and committee restructuring and the fact that they are still not finished. So, thank you, but don't slow down just yet. (light laughter around)

DOCKET #1000, CONSULTATION REGARDING FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORTING

Funderburk: Associate Provost **Arthur** can now join us for our consulting session regarding the Faculty Activity Reporting. Hopefully you have had a chance to look at the many documents posted there on the website. (to **Arthur**) And I think probably you have something to say about this before we begin.

Arthur: Right. Thank you. Thank you, everyone, for allowing me the opportunity to come and get some feedback from you on our Faculty Activity Reporting. Maybe just to give you a little background context for this discussion, you may know that we need to report every 2 years to the Board of Regents on faculty activities. And I did post it to the website, so perhaps you have had a chance to look at it. All 3 Universities turn in their information. We have to prepare responses to the set of questions, and if **Sherry** opens the report. This is the form, the report. (**Nuss** points to **Peters**, noting that he is running the projection today.) Ok. So, **Scott**, could you open the report. This is the reporting form. (several voices adding directives as to where to find the document). Yeah, and maybe if you could scroll down just a little bit; oops, up just--on the page 1, I thought it might

be helpful to look at the kinds of questions that we have to answer. So basically it's, "What do faculty do? How many hours do they work? Who teaches the students?" And that's really sub-questions about, "Is it tenure and tenure-track faculty? Is it instructors? Or is it teaching assistants? What's the allocation of time that faculty make between teaching and research?" And then the sort of question where is the free-for-all, "How do we know the Universities are doing a good job?" And in this particular report, they added a sub-question to that, "How do we know faculty members are doing a good job?" So those are the kinds of things we have to think about and try to cull out of that data that we gather. In addition, in at least in the few years that I've been here, in Fall 2009 and Fall 2010, all three Universities got many questions from legislators and Board members just at the time that professional development assignments were being submitted for approval. One of the questions that always was coming up around the PDA's, and asking us to justify them, was, "Well, explain what do faculty members do? Why are PDA's important to them and their development?" So you may—if you've read any of these news reports that have come out over the past few years, I think it goes without saying that taxpayers, legislators, sometimes even members of our Board, and certainly our students, they don't fully understand what it is that faculty members do. All they ever see or think about is the number of hours that you are in a classroom, and they don't see the greater complexity to the workload.

In addition, all 3 Universities have had to use the same form, and that was the form that **Scott** had up there to start with and one that you all must have seen in the past, because we do send it out to every faculty member. In that form, it focuses on where people do their work. Not much about the details of what kind of work is being done or what the activities are, but whether you do it at home, in your office, and so on. While we all use the same form, all 3 of the Universities were using a different method to collect information. At UNI we sent the form out to everyone and asked them to respond, and we got a much lower response rate. At the University of Iowa and Iowa State, they used a sampling method, but they used different sampling methods, and so when we have to make the report to the Board, it's—they are always confused. "Well, how do we compare? Why is the

response rate at UNI, which looks a lot lower than the response rate at the other 2 Universities, why is it such a low response rate?" Well, of course, if you multiply our response rate by 100% distribution, we actually have the better response rate. But it's not easy to explain that in a few minutes.

So at any rate, the 3—well, coming around these issues of PDA's and the questions that come up about how we collect our data, the 3 Associate Provosts began talking with our Chief Academic Officer at the Board to talk about how we might do a better job with this report and how we might use the information we are going to gather from faculty to help educate the public and legislators and others who have an interest in this.

So, we have two goals in trying to improve the report, and one is to just paint a more rich picture of what it is that faculty members do so there's a better understanding of their work. And we hope the spillover would be that we wouldn't get so many questions every time about "why PDA's" or questions about tenure and why we tenure people and so on. You might notice if you actually look through our report this time that one of the things we did to try to help take a step in that direction is that each University identified two faculty members. We wrote a profile of them. And the point of that was, "Look at all the many things we do and how they have an impact on students in the State." And the other thing we want to do is standardize the process so that we can just reduce that confusion and all the questions that come up and people can focus more on the substance of the report.

So I did provide you with the old survey so that you could see the way that we have been collecting data and then a draft of the new survey. Now the new survey doesn't have all of the information on it—this point where we collect about what rank you are when you are responding and what your appointment status--that would be there, but with the major changes between the old and the new, I think you can see is that we try to capture more of the types of activities that we talk about when we talk about teaching, what we really see teaching including. Advising hasn't gotten any place in the current Faculty Activity Report, and yet we know that's a critical activity that faculty members carry out. Again, there's just a poor

understanding of what we mean when we talk about scholarly and research and creative work. And they're always asking us about grants and how many grants are generated, so we are trying to do that. Clinical work and extension activities really apply to the University of Iowa for clinical and Iowa State for extension. So again we want to stick with a common form. Some won't apply across all the Universities. More information about service and more about community engagement and outreach.

So it's sort of interesting. The faculty—the Federal Government actually does a Time-Use Survey of its citizens, and we've never borrowed any—never taken note of the fact that they actually have perfected a methodology for gathering information. So we also have been consulting with a couple of people in the Economics Departments across the Universities who do know how the time reporting survey from the Federal Government works. So we have talked to them about how we'll carry out the process. Probably what we're going to do is more of a sampling and do it throughout the semester so that we know that there's variations depending on the time of year. You know, early on may be more prep. Later in the semester you are doing more grading and meeting with students. So, basically what I would like to hear is if you have comments, first of all on the switch in general, but also, you know, on any of the categories on here. Our plan is to, in the Spring after we filter back in consultation with all of the Senates on the three campuses, is actually do a pilot data collection. It doesn't count for anything because we do the report every 2 years. We wouldn't have to collect our actual data until Spring of 2013, so we thought we'd try a pilot--see how people respond to it, what kind of data we get back. But for our first pass I'd like your input.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, first of all, this is so overdue. I'm so glad this is happening. I'm looking at the old form, and I'm horrified by it. The old form is mostly interested in where we work and not what we do. (voices agreeing)

Arthur: Exactly.

DeBerg: I mean, any form that has hours spent working at home that goes to the Board of Regents is trouble. I do have some comments on the new one. I would like to see under “Service to the Institution” two phrases used that the Board of Regents requires: “Student Outcomes Assessment” and “Academic Program Review.” They take inordinate amount of time, at least in my Department. And they are not very fun. And up above, in “Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work,” I would like to see someplace for “application for patents and copyrights” and maybe “trademarks,” too. I don’t know the diff.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: One other thing I might suggest, because, you know, this thing could get too big. You’d like for it to fit on 1 page, but if it were possible to have some of these maybe more broadly defined or possible differing examples. I’m thinking of a number of things that some of my colleagues do and, even within the Library, there’s a wide variety of ways that effort is being put forward. Some of these I think some of us can recognize within instruction, but there are certain things in here that I think are a little more unique, and I suspect that might be true even in some of the other units around campus. So, if it were possible to have—I don’t know—an asterisk or a couple of little “See note 1 or 2 or 3” and then where there’s more room, put some of that in there, because I’m probably going to show this to my colleagues and say, “Do you see yourself in this document?” Now, certainly, this is much better than what we had before. That other was just almost—well, a little ridiculous anyway. This, I think, is really starting to get at things; I really do.

Arthur: So, if you could have either them direct it to you and you send those to me, or they can send the comments to me directly, that would be great.

Neuhaus: Excellent. I’ll do that.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**. And then Senator **Peters**.

DeBerg: I'm sorry, I thought of one other thing, and then I'll shut up. For Community Engagement and Outreach, I do a lot of consulting with like campus ministers and stuff, so I think it should be "Technical Assistance and Consultation." Now, I'm out of it. Thank you for your patience.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I might just be missing it. Is there anything for "advising student organizations" on there? It probably fits into one of the existing categories. It's not quite "student advising." It's not quite "student instruction."

Arthur: Right. Yeah, I think you're right that we don't have something there. (several voices noting it's under "Service") Oh, right, ok, thanks.

Funderburk: Ok. Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I've always felt that kind of the issue with this thing or the potential trouble was the fact that you are doing self-report data. And faculty—it's very easy for people to kind of overstate the time they are spending on different things, and I'm wondering—and probably it isn't easy to do, but I'm wondering are you aware of any institutions that have more rigorous ways of determining these kinds of efforts and how much time is actually spent? Are there methodologies for doing that, or not?

Arthur: We, among the 3 of us, we sort of divided up and looked at our peers, and what we found is you can go to AAU institutions, you know, regional comprehensive, pretty much it's all some variation of self-reporting by faculty members. And, you know, I think that that's true of the National Time-Use Survey. It may not have that same impact on things but it certainly does affect some Federal programs. And this seems to be it. Now there is some move I think now to doing something more electronic. Now we have people sort of fill this out, you know, by hand and send it back, and whether we could do something electronic, and if that leads people to be a little more precise in writing down times, you know, that's—we're not sure. But we didn't find any better method for doing this. And it—and the idea is that it maybe averages out across reporters. So, I have

seen, you know, data where you'll have somebody reporting 30 hours on the low end and 90 on the high end, and that does lead sometimes, if any Board member is digging into that data or we get an open records request, does lead to questions about—they don't believe either end really, or they believe the 30, and they believe that's, you know, nobody's—everybody's doing nothing, even though that's 1 person out of 500, and they totally discount the 90, that people must be lying about it. So, the interesting thing is that we looked at our—the systems, Faculty Activity Reporting over the past 16 years, and it's remarkably stable. Amount of hours doesn't change much, so that also tells us something.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: I'm curious about the input that you've received thus far. Have you asked across campus? Or are you starting here? Or

Arthur: Yeah, we thought that it was good to start with the Faculty Senate and get your input. And that's what my colleagues are doing on their campuses, and then we are going to try the pilot in the Spring, so that would bring other faculty who are actually trying to apply the system for a week--would give us some input. "Well, it doesn't work." Or "It's hard to remember to fill it out." Or "It's too many categories, or not enough."

East: So here you got half a dozen suggestions for revisions to the categories. Do you anticipate allowing that kind—I mean, that seems like input that might be useful before the pilot, or a pre-pilot—a smaller pilot to look specifically at that or something, rather than, "Oh, we're going to go for collecting the data and see if the collecting the data part of it, and, oh, by the way, maybe we'll see if we think this covers everything."

Arthur: Yeah, in that—in the pilot, it's not—we're not using the data for anything, so it doesn't count, but

East: Well, what is the focus of the pilot? And it sounds to me like the focus of the pilot is to see if the categories we've identified can be used, not to see if we've identified all the appropriate categories.

Arthur: Maybe I didn't make that clear, that we would ask for people's input on that as well, if anything's missing, and whatever. I guess if you are suggesting--if you want me to send it out to faculty, I certainly have no objection to doing that.

East: I never know what's more appropriate. I mean, if we get—we get requests all the time for input about various things and then we bitch when we don't get—or we ignore them because we get so many, and then we bitch because we don't get enough. I don't know. I'm not the one designing the instrument either.

Funderburk: Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: Yeah, I was wondering if—what are the expectations? How many hours is a faculty member supposed to work officially? (light laughter around) Because that 30 hours was definitely—maybe 40 hours?

Arthur: Well, see—I think it's because we're professionals, the answer to that always is "however many hours it takes you to get the job done."

Kirmani: No, no. But for how many hours are you paid? You are paid for 40 hours, isn't it?

Arthur: Well, I—you know, we're not hourly workers is the problem.

Kirmani: Yeah, I know, of course not. But the salary is based on a certain thing. For example, if you decide how much you are going to charge for, let us say, consulting, you calculate it according to a certain formula. So, what exactly is the expectation?

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Yeah, I suppose in part what's the expectation from those who are looking in from the outside. What does a legislator expect us to be doing here? And, "Forty hours—I can't believe you are only working 40

hours?” “What are other people working?” “Oh, 40 hours, but.....” You know, is it an expectation that we would work 60 hours on average because we are just having more fun than everyone else? Or is this—you know, so-- but not so much necessarily from our direction, but I guess part of this is we’re creating this to try and reflect what we’re doing. Does anybody have any sense of what folks on the outside imagine that we should be doing? Or imagine what—well, I think we know what they think we are or not doing.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**.

Wurtz: Well, connected to that, if I’m on a cruise in the middle of the summer, and I’m watching as their dining operations fall apart, and I’m making notes because I’m going to use it in my Organizational Management class next Fall, am I on the clock? (voices quietly offering opinions)

Funderburk: Senator **Roberts-Dobie**, then Senator **Boody**.

Roberts-Dobie: When I think about this, I think about this side of it as being the input side. What we’re evaluated on is the output side. And so to get back to Senator **Kirmani**’s question, “What are we expected to work?” I don’t think faculty, in general, are ever measured on what their input is. We’re always evaluated based on what our output is, and I think some people can get great output—I think 30 might be low, but that was the number that was put out there. But some people get great output at 40 and 50 and 60, and I think we are all evaluated on output. This is a question about input, and that’s a question for—back to what **Chris** said—that was a question about what the community wants to know. What are we putting in?

Funderburk: Senator **Boody**

Boody: Well, yes, I think **Chris** makes a good point, because what are people expecting? I know my brother’s a government lawyer, and he always says, “Why do you guys get all—so much vacation?” And I’m like, “Yeah, but I can’t take it anytime I want. You can tell your boss, ‘I’m leaving

for 3 weeks.' I can't. I can only take it at very specific times." And even then, I'm sure most of you work during holidays, don't you? And this doesn't count that.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**.

Wurtz: Whenever someone says, "Must be nice to be a teacher. You get your summers off." The answer is, "No. I'm unemployed in the summer, unless I have a summer contract." So, it's not "we get vacation."

Boody: No, but I get more than he does at Christmas.

Wurtz: It's not vacation. You are either on contract or not.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: I liked Susan's point very much that we should be looking at outcomes assessment rather than what we tell the students in class. We should be looking at—they want us to be looking at what we learn—what they learn, so they should be looking at what or whether we have any impact. And if the University really wants to—I mean, it might behoove us to, or not, I don't know, depends on whether or not we're doing our job—it might behoove us to work toward more of an outcomes-reporting mechanism rather than an input-reporting mechanism.

Arthur: I think we do get a lot of output—you know, we do have to report all of this on student learning outcomes achievement and so on. And it may be from a public relations point of view, but whatever, the Board of Regents feels that it's part of their oversight of the Universities to find out how much people are working. I don't know that they have a set standard, other than they conceive of us as having full-time jobs, so, you know, that's where maybe they questioned the 30 because they think of a 40-hour week, but I don't—I think at some level they know that when you're a professional, your work hours are extended, and they just want to know what the data is.

Funderburk: Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: **Ginny**, is there a note somewhere to distinguish what is “sponsored” and “non-sponsored”?

Arthur: We would include, yes, the instruct—I don’t have the instructions page here. We’re actually still formulating that, but, yes, there will be definitions, and.....

Funderburk: Other comments? Questions? (pause) Ok. Thank you very much for bringing this to us. (others expressed thanks also)

DOCKET #1001, EMERITUS STATUS REQUEST, SUE JOSEPH MATTISON, HPELS, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 2011

Funderburk: All righty. Calendar Item 1103, Docket #1001, Emeritus Status Request for Sue Joseph Mattison. Do we have a motion?

Bruess: So.

Funderburk: Senator **Bruess**. Senator **Kirmani** second (who indicated non-verbally). I’m assuming that is to approve [sic, endorse]. Is there a discussion? Senator **DeBerg**

DeBerg: Well, I have—I guess I never imagined that I would vote against one of these motions, but I wanted to explain why I will be voting “no” on this one. It came to my attention, because I’m the Grievance Officer of the Faculty Union, that Sue Jo—Sue Mattison at the end of Fall semester 2010 changed a student grade as the Director of HPELS over against a written protest of the professor who outlined his reasons for giving that grade. She went ahead and changed the grade. The professor again protested the grade change. This is in spite of the very clear policies that I believe Department Heads and Directors are bound to that the stu—that the Academic Grievance Procedure is the only way that the institution can change a student’s grade, unless the fac—without a faculty member’s

consent. And she, I think maybe with support of—from on high—but she communicated a grade change to the Registrar that was actually changed without a faculty signature or anything. And I believe that this kind of unilateral action on the part of an administrator, contrary to the faculty expertise in grading this course and contrary to the explicit policies and procedures of the University, is unacceptable in an academic community. The AAUP makes it very, very clear that part of their understanding of academic freedom involves academic freedom in the classroom, that the professor in the classroom is the one who should have ultimate grading authority unless there is in place a very clearly defined review of peers where both sides get to speak, which we have in our policies and procedures, but no one bothered to follow them in this case. So, I, because of this action of Director Matteson—maybe then Joseph, I don't know when her name changed—find it impossible to vote for Emeritus Status. And I want to read our policy statement. Well, let's go back to our policies—4.21, what Emeritus Status implies: "Eligibility requirements include a minimum of 20 years of credible full-time or part-time service in higher education with the minimal accumulation of 10 years of meritorious service at the University of Northern Iowa." And I do not believe what she did was in any way meritorious, and I think it takes away from the other contributions that she may have made. So I never thought I'd be doing this, but I'm voting "no" on recommending Emeritus Status for her, and I encourage you all to give this a thought about whether or not we want our administrators behaving this way. Thank you.

Funderburk: Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: I also am against administrators changing grades, but I do know in this case that she was told that she should do that, higher up the chain. It wasn't her decision to do it.

DeBerg: She signed the form. So.....

Funderburk: Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: Yeah, I think that as far as I know **Sue** has received a certificate as distinguished scholar and all those kind of things here at UNI, and as Emeritus she will not have the opportunity to change the grade again.
(light laughter around)

DeBerg: Thank goodness.

Funderburk: No additional comments? Senator **Roberts-Dobie**.

Roberts-Dobie: Last meeting I got to comment on another colleague, and here is a person that I've served with for more than 10 years, and like many of you, I'm sure you've interacted with her in a variety of ways, but I also got to have an office next door to her, and she was our Division Director and our School Director among many other things, and so as a colleague I would just like to say that I didn't know about this, **Betty**, I'm not familiar with this situation. This is a black mark on her long and distinguished record here. This is one that I'm unaware of. But her meritorious contributions in terms of teaching and research and scholarship here, though, is a very long list. But I was lucky enough to be a student under her tutelage as I was an undergrad here at UNI, and back before she got sucked into administration where she was very talented, she was an amazing teacher that cast a spell in a classroom. I remember her courses like Human Diseases and Epidemiology, and in her I found a role model. She was the first person who ever said to me, "You need to think about grad. school." She was the first person who took me to professional conference and just let me kind of tag along with her, and so while I'm always concerned about administrative concerns, and I was unaware of this, I think this institution has lost a very talented person who is meritorious in many ways. And although I think UNI owes her a great debt. Personally, there are hundreds of former students who sat under her who owe a great debt of gratitude to her as a student.

Funderburk: No additional comments? All those in favor, "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (1 nay heard) Abstentions. That will make 2 abstentions. Motion carries.

DOCKET #1002, EMERITUS STATUS REQUEST FOR BEVERLY RIESS, STUDENT
FIELD EXPERIENCE, EFFECTIVE, JUNE 30, 2011

Funderburk: Calendar 1104, Docket 1002, Emeritus Status Request for Beverly Riess, Student Field Experience. Do we have a motion? Senator **Neuhaus** (who indicated nonverbally). Move to approve [sic, endorse]. Do we have a second? Senator **Boody** (who indicated nonverbally), quick on the pin. Comments? Questions? Speeches? All those in favor, “aye.” (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) And abstentions? This motion is passed. One abstention. Motion passes.

DOCKET #1003, ASSIGNED STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN CO-CURRICULAR
ACTIVITIES

Funderburk: Ok, 1105, Docket 1003, Assigned Student Participation in Co-Curricular Activities. Is there a motion? I’m expecting from Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, I’d like to move that we refer this matter to the Educational Policies Commission with the request that they review the matter and report back to us with a recommendation by the end of March in 2012.

Funderburk: Motion to refer to EPC for March.

DeBerg: Second.

Funderburk: Second by Senator **DeBerg**. Questions? Comments? Discussion? Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, I just want to say I drafted this motion [sic, petition] at the behest of a colleague of mine who was concerned by an apparent increase in the number of occasions on which he’s been asked to excuse students from classes so that they can participate in various activities sponsored by other courses. These activities are often scheduled during normal class hours. They often are, if not mandatory, they affect the student’s grade, so they put the student in the position of, “Do I go to my regular class? Or do I

do this other thing?” And then they put the instructor of the other class in the position of, “Do I be a bad guy and not exempt them from coming? Give them an excused absence? Or do I maintain the, you know, kind of legitimacy of my class by kind of insisting on attendance?” And so I’ve had some experience myself of this kind, and I thought it was important enough to bring to our attention. I think the EPC should act on it.

Funderburk: Additional comments? Questions? Senator **Roberts-Dobie**.

Roberts-Dobie: I had a comment. I wondered about the wording where it talked about “will not ask,” and to me there’s a difference between “will not ask,” and “cannot require,” and I just wanted to—because I believe the wording is, “They will not ask.”

DeBerg: “Shall not require.”

Roberts-Dobie: **Scott**, can you pull it up?

Peters: I’m sorry.....?

DeBerg: You’re right. You’re right. Here it is.

Roberts-Dobie: It says, “The UNI faculty and instructors will not ask students to attend or participate in any event....” And to me there’s a difference between not creating opportunity and not requiring that they engage in the opportunities.

Smith: Uh huh. I think the point—and maybe—I’d have to think this through a bit further, but the issue maybe comes through at the bottom where the participation affects student’s grade, and so if you ask them to do it, and you still leave it, but it affects their grade, that’s what I want to protect against. That—I don’t have a problem with them asking or even requiring stuff—well, asking stuff that doesn’t affect a student’s grade is fine. But the issue, to me, is does it affect the student’s grade, because that puts—that creates the conflict. So I—we can talk about this when it comes, I guess, but.....

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**. Then Senator **Wurtz**.

DeBerg: Well, in my Department, I had a—I've had someone in the School of Music cause an—call an “emergency practice” that wasn't on the schedule, the semester schedule, and students had to miss my exam to go to this “emergency practice.” So, it is egregious what's happening out there. So, this is unacceptable. It's unacceptable. But policy did not give me a reason—did not give me a way to say “no” to that, because it says I have to, if they have a letter saying this is a student activity.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**.

DeBerg: Thank you for letting me rant about that. (light laughter around)

Wurtz: I would like to see a little increased emphasis on the issue of the student organizations, because that's not a matter of a grade in a class. It's a student—and so “the participation in the event will affect the student's grade for the course.” There is no grade in a—oh, my student organization, SHRM, when they go on onsite visits, going on that visit doesn't affect their grade because there's no course for going on the visit. So this just needs that concept added to it.

Smith: Well, again, I think we could

Wurtz: But, I'd like that to go forward to the Commission to take that focus as well.

Smith: I—again, I'm not specific on the particular issue, but my concern would be that if, for instance, we do this—we have students go on trips with our class things, it may not affect their—as long as it's left optional to the student, that's fine. But if somebody in a course is doing something, and that—this is the concern raised by my colleague that apparently people in courses are having students as part of their coursework go. Now, if you are doing this as part of a student organization, I'm not sure that this even addresses it, because then it is kind of optional. It's not required by a course.

Wurtz: But the language is a little mushy. It needs to be cleaned up which it is.

Smith: Ok.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I thought of a new rant, and that came up, you know, when the Liberal Arts Core asked the EPC to look at Study Abroad policies, remember that? And they didn't. One of the things that we saw was that when people—people were trying to cram 3 hours into Spring Break. So students would leave a day or two before Spring Break and come back late to try to get 3 hours crammed into a Study Abroad experience. So, I mean, there's a lot of things to look at there. But, you know, screw your course, Jerry. They're going abroad to cram 3 hours into a week of Spring Break. So there's a lot of stuff going on.

Funderburk: Language. Language. Senators, please. (light laughter around)

DeBerg: I'm sorry?

Funderburk: I said, "Language. Language!" That's two of you today.

DeBerg: I'm sorry. I thought I was—I thought I was talking "clean" today.

Funderburk: We are going to line up for soap at the end of this meeting. (light laughter around) Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I call the question.

Funderburk: Question has been called. That actually does require a vote on call the question, doesn't it?

DeBerg: It's not debatable but have to vote.

Funderburk: Right. All those in favor of calling the question? (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) And abstentions? (none heard) Question has been called. All those in favor of referring this whatever number [Docket #1003] to the EPC, “aye.” (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Done.

NEW BUSINESS

Funderburk: New business from anyone? We skipped Vice Chair **Breitbach**’s comments. Do you have any comments...at the risk of extending the meeting? (loud laughter around)

DeBerg: She’ll only take 15 or 20 minutes.

Breitbach: No, I do not.

Funderburk: Excellent answer.

ADJOURNMENT

Funderburk: Motion to adjourn ready to be entertained [4:17]. Senator **Bruess**. (who indicated nonverbally) Seconded by Senator **Boody**. All those in favor? (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Good luck with exams. Happy holidays. Yes.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting: January 9, 2012
Oak Room, Maucker
3:30 p.m.
(Note new starting time)