

9-14-2009

## University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 14, 2009

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

*Let us know how access to this document benefits you*

Copyright ©2009 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents](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, September 14, 2009" (2009). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 85.

[https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents/85](https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/85)

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](mailto: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.

## **SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**9/14/09**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

### **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Motion to table the minutes of the 8/24/09 meeting until all senators have had time to read them by Senator Hotek; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

### **CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

No press present.

### **COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON**

Provost Gibson had no comments.

### **COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN**

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

### **COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ**

Chair Wurtz had no comments.

### **CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING**

987 Emeritus Status Request, Mary Bozik, Department of Communication Studies, effective 6/09

Motion to docket as item # 893 out of regular order at the head of the docket by Senator Hotek; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate has been asked to review UNI's procedures for students missing exams. There was an unfortunate incident last year and the parents were unhappy with the way this was handled with their son and asked that we review that policy, reviewing how other institutions handle that and make sure that such an incident never happens again.

Associate Provost Kopper outlined the situation for the senate, noting that this involved a student whose grandfather passed away and the student, who was to be a pallbearer at the funeral, made a request to the faculty member to be allowed to take an exam early prior to leaving for the funeral out of town. That request was denied. That faculty member had on their syllabus spelled out that if a student missed an exam that exam would be dropped and their grade would be computed accordingly. This student really wanted to be able to take that exam and was ultimately not allowed to do so.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Senator Soneson to forward this concern to UNI's EPC, asking them to come up with a proposal; second by Senator East.

Discussion continued.

Motion passed.

## **ONGOING BUSINESS**

Elect Faculty Senate representative for May 2010 visit of His Holiness the 14<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama

Senator Soneson reported that Dr. James Robinson, Philosophy and World Religions, is serving on that planning committee and will be happy to serve as the Faculty Senate representative. Dr. Robinson understands that his task will be to report to the Senate occasionally with updates on the planning.

Motion by Senator Soneson to accept Dr. James Robinson as the Faculty Senate's representative on the planning committee for the May 2010 visit of His Holiness the 14<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

## **CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

893 Emeritus Status Request, Mary Bozik, Department of Communication Studies, effective 6/09

Motion to accept by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Breitbach.

Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Soneson to move Docket Items # 891 and 892 to the head of the docket; second by Senator Devlin. Motion passed.

892 Emeritus Status Request, Thomas L. Little, Department of Special Education, effective 12/03

Motion to approve by Senator East; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Motion passed.

892 Emeritus Status Request, Robert Krueger, Department of Special Education, effective 8/09

Motion to approve by Senator Basom; second by Senator Bruess.

Motion passed.

890 Guidelines and Schedule for Departmental Reports on Tenure and Promotion Standards

Motion by Senator Soneson to remove Item #890 Guidelines and Schedule for Departmental Reports on Tenure and Promotion Standards off the table for discussion; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

A lengthy discussion followed, ultimately on the specific changes and revisions of the recommendations, incorporating Provost Gibson's and Associate Provost Kopper's suggestions.

Motion by Senator Breitbach to call the question; second by Senator Devlin. Motion passed.

Chair Wurtz reviewed suggested changes for the Senate.

Motion to approve the changes passed.

#### **OTHER DISCUSSION**

Associate Provost Kopper noted that the Undergraduate Appeals Board and other representatives from the graduates and students are in the process of revising the Student Ethics and Discipline Policy as well as our grievance policies and invited Senators to join them. This will all be brought forward to the Senate once it has been finalized.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

---

***DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW***

### **MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING 9/14/09 1666**

**PRESENT:** Megan Balong, Maria Basom, Karen Breitbach, Gregory Bruess, Michele Devlin, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Gloria Gibson, Doug Hotek, Bev Kopper, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Phil Patton, Chuck Quirk, Michael Roth, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Joe Gorton was attending for Julie Lowell.

**Absent:** Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Jerry Smith

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion to table the minutes of the 8/24/09 meeting until all senators have had time to read them by Senator Hotek; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

No press present.

**COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON**

Provost Gibson had no comments.

**COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN**

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

**COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ**

Chair Wurtz had no comments.

**CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING**

987 Emeritus Status Request, Mary Bozik, Department of  
Communication Studies, effective 6/09

Chair Wurtz stated that she would like this to be approved for docketing out of regular order and placed at the head of the docket as Dr. Bozik's paper work got delayed in the process and she cannot obtain library, parking and other privileges that go with Emeritus Status until this is approved.

Motion to docket as item # 893 out of regular order at the head of the docket by Senator Hotek; second by Senator Bruess.  
Motion passed.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate has been asked to review UNI's procedures for students missing exams. There was an unfortunate incident last year and the parents were unhappy with the way this was handled with their son and asked that we review that policy, reviewing how other institutions handled that and make sure that such an incident never happens again.

Associate Provost Kopper outlined the situation for the senate, noting that this involved a student whose grandfather passed

away and the student, who was to be a pallbearer at the funeral, made a request to the faculty member to be allowed to take an exam early prior to leaving for the funeral out of town. That request was denied. That faculty member had on their syllabus had spelled out that if a student missed an exam that exam would be dropped and their grade would be computed accordingly. This student really wanted to be able to take that exam and was ultimately not allowed to do so. The father did call to verify that the grandfather had indeed passed away and that his son was a pallbearer. The student volunteered to make different arrangements to take that exam but the faculty member would not allow that.

Senator Hotek asked what the Senate being asked to do about this?

Chair Wurtz responded that former Interim Provost Lubker had brought this to the Senate last spring and asked the Senate to take a look at UNI's current policy and discuss whether we needed to bring it more in line with the other state Regent institutions, who have situations such as this covered. She noted that copies of the policies from Iowa State and the University of Iowa were sent to senators.

Senator East asked if this would be something the Educational Policies Commission (EPC) should look at before the Senate acts?

Chair Wurtz noted that the reason it is being brought to the Senate is because she received a letter from the family that they be notified as we take action, and she does need to honor their request. If the Senate decides to forward it to another committee, she will write the family a letter outlining the process so they will know they are not being ignored. This is being brought to the Senate under new business so we have flexibility as to how we handle this.

Chair Wurtz noted that UNI does have an EPC, and we can certainly give them the charge to review this and report back to the Senate with their recommendation. If they come back to the Senate with a recommendation we will then have a green docketing sheet.

Motion by Senator Soneson by forward this concern to UNI's EPC, asking them to come up with a proposal; second by Senator East.

Senator East noted that he hoped Chair Wurtz would phrase the letter to these parents so that it was conveyed that this is our

standard operating procedure and we are not shoving on a committee or shirking our responsibility, that this is the standard way we do this.

Chair Wurtz replied that she would.

Senator Van Wormer asked if there was a chance for the student's grade to be changed, or is that over and done with?

Chair Wurtz noted that it is her understanding that all the parents are asking for is review of the retaking of an exam policy.

Senator Van Wormer stated that she was wondering if it would be possible for the student to retake that exam, in a case such as this where the Senate is reviewing the policy. Perhaps the student would work with the faculty member and be given a chance to take exam at some point.

Chair Wurtz responded that she would leave that to the Academic Appeals process if the student chooses.

Senator Devlin asked what the outcome was for this student.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that this went up the line through to Interim Provost Lubker and to President Allen. The faculty member's policy was to drop one exam but if a student were to miss an exam that was in an area that they were particularly strong in, they would lose those points. In this situation, the student wanted to take that particular exam and have the option of dropping another exam if he did not do well. Although the student was ultimately not allowed to take this particular exam, as this was the exam that was "dropped", he was not additionally penalized. However, the full opportunity as outlined by the faculty member was not available to this student.

Senator Breitbach noted she recently had a similar situation where a parent reported that their student was not allowed to take an exam because she had been told by the Health Center to stay in her room for 48 hours, until she had no fever. She referred this parent to the department head. However, it seems that when there's a medical emergency on campus, as we have now with the Health Clinic telling students they must self-quarantine, we need to expect professors to be a little more flexible.



Associate Provost Kopper commented that she has also had some advisors express concern to her because they have had students tell them that they will ignore the information and recommendations that went out about the H1N1 and what to do. Their concern is that they will get "docked" in their classes, and said they will not stay home; they will go to class.

Senator Hotek asked what is missing from our current policy? He believes the situation is covered with our current policy.

Chair Wurtz replied that what we will do, pending approval of this motion, will be to turn the facts of the situation over to the EPC and let them to advise us as to whether this situation is covered, or if we can do a better job with a revision of our policies. The Senate could debate it here but that is why we have that committee.

Provost Gibson asked if it's an issue of some colleges or faculty having a different policy than the university?

Chair Wurtz responded that it is highly likely, however, in theory faculty cannot have a policy that contradicts university policy. It may simply be that faculty need to be reminded of the policy.

Senator Soneson noted that what needs to be discussed is the interpretation of the word "penalized." The policy reads, "faculty shall not penalize a student for missing a class or exam for an educationally-appropriate activity, including university sponsored or sanctioned events." It is his assumption that that would include illness, funeral, and so on. There are different interpretations of what it is to penalize a student. Some faculty do have such a policy of averaging the exams taken because they do not want to have large numbers of students coming to do make-up exams. This is what the EPC needs to talk about; is the current policy sufficient or do we need to add an interpretation?

Chair Wurtz commented that she knows of some professors who say any make-up exams are to be done on Friday morning of finals week. She also noted that the use of faculty time is an issue; we can't deliver customized one-to-one education.

Senator Devlin noted that she understands what Senator Soneson is saying and in having the EPC take an extra look at the phrasing of "educationally-appropriate activities" as there may

be room for a broader definition, especially with the current health concerns.

Chair Wurtz stated that she will talk with the EPC about the need to provide some interpretation of the policy, and will note the need to protect faculty time, specifically with the current broad health concerns.

Senator Devlin added family emergencies, as well as many other emergencies, also need to be looked at and included in the policy some way.

Senator Neuhaus asked if there are any senators currently serving on the EPC? If not, should the senate have someone talk personally with that committee so they have an understanding as to why this is coming to them?

Senator Balong is currently serving on that committee, as is Senator Patton and Associate Provost Kopper.

Motion passed.

## **ONGOING BUSINESS**

Elect Faculty Senate representative for May 2010 visit of His Holiness the 14<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama

Senator Soneson reported that Dr. James Robinson, Philosophy and World Religions, is serving on that planning committee and will be happy to serve as the Faculty Senate representative. Dr. Robinson understands that his task will be to report to the Senate occasionally with updates on the planning.

Vice Chair Mvuyekure asked why this visit is being planned when students will not be on campus?

Senator Soneson replied that that is the only time that he could accommodate a visit to UNI in his schedule.

Motion by Senator Soneson to accept Dr. James Robinson as the Faculty Senate's representative on the planning committee for the May 210 visit of His Holiness the 14<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

**CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

893 Emeritus Status Request, Mary Bozik, Department of Communication Studies, effective 6/09

Motion to accept by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Breitbach.

Senator Soneson noted that Dr. Bozik was a leading member of the Department of Communication Studies, taught Oral Communication most of her tenure at UNI, is a fine public speaker herself, and is someone he had the great fortune in working with for several years in teaching a cluster course. He was able to get to know her quite well is and is deeply appreciative of the quality of teaching she has brought to UNI.

Senator Patton stated that Dr. Bozik has served this institution by serving on many committees, including several inter-institutional committees, specifically the Regents Committee on Educational Relations. She has represented this institution very well.

Senator Van Wormer noted that Dr. Bozik also played a role with the Cedar Falls band and saw her doing a wonderful "hat dance" which she was very impressed with.

Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Soneson to move Docket Items #891 and #892 to the head of the docket; second by Senator Devlin. Motion passed.

892 Emeritus Status Request, Thomas L. Little, Department of Special Education, effective 12/03

Motion to approve by Senator East; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Senator Neuhaus asked why this is just coming to the Senate as the date is listed as 12/03.

It was noted that this was something that apparently got lost in the process.

Senator Soneson thanked Dr. Little for his patience and apologized for the Senate in taking so long to approve Emeritus Status.

Motion passed.

892 Emeritus Status Request, Robert Krueger, Department of Special Education, effective 8/09

Motion to approve by Senator Basom; second by Senator Bruess.

Senator Basom noted that Dr. Krueger served in her department. The words that describe Professor Krueger are passionate, tireless, and hardworking, but passionate above all. Bob taught Spanish, contributing extensively to UNI's Spanish Master's programs both on campus, in Spain and in Mexico. He also taught numerous courses in the Liberal Arts Core, several of which, for example, Arts in the Americas, he was instrumental in designing and well as others currently in the Liberal Arts Core. However, above all he will be remembered for his passion for Portuguese, and all things connected with Portuguese and Brazil. He will also be remembered for all the opportunities he provided students to study in Brazil or to experience Brazil right here in Iowa by organizing conferences, capoeira demonstrations, carnivals, and much, much more. He also made significant scholarly contributions in his study of Brazilian slave narratives, translating texts and adapting them for use in theatre, performing some of them here at UNI's Interpreter's Theatre. We wish him well in retirement and look forward to his continuing contributions in all these areas.

Motion passed.

890 Guidelines and Schedule for Departmental Reports on Tenure and Promotion Standards

Motion by Senator Soneson to remove Item #890 Guidelines and Schedule for Departmental Reports on Tenure and Promotion Standards off the table for discussion; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

Senator Soneson asked Provost Gibson about the possibility of her support on this item now that she has had time to review it and reflect on it.

Provost Gibson stated that she certainly supports the principles outlined in the document, including transparency, having objectives and stated guidelines regarding teaching, scholarship and creative service. She has a couple of things that she would like the Senate to think about. Last week there was a retreat with the Deans and Provost to discuss recommendations for academic programs. They also reviewed these guidelines and had a good discussion, and the Deans are supportive in principle.

Provost Gibson noted that there are four issues that she would like the Senate to consider. The first is, the timeline. It is pretty tight the way it is. Is there any flexibility or does the Senate feel they can get everything accomplished as it is stated?

Secondly, she noted a concern that the Provost is nowhere in this document. There is a statement about the Deans' involvement but it is her feeling that there should stronger statement about the Deans and Provost's involvement in tenure and promotion. In looking at Phase II, the second paragraph notes, "A copy of the final document should be submitted to their respective Deans for his/her information by April 15, 2010." The Deans and the Provost should be more intimately involved in the process.

The third point is in Phase II, third paragraph, "The committee suggests that department faculty review their tenure and promotion criteria periodically..." It's her feeling that if it's left vague it may or may not happen. She is urging the Senate to make that more specific, saying it's reviewed annually or bi-annually. That way it will definitely get done. If it's left "periodically" it may not get done on a regular basis. She believes everyone should do it at the same time.

Associate Provost Kopper stated that the other concern is clarifying who would be on the committee. There was discussion about Phase I, second paragraph, "The PAC and Head should not be designated with this task" and it was noted that "should not be" should be changed to "should not be solely designated". There is need for clarification whether the spirit was to bring together the junior faculty, senior faculty, and the department head in working together on this, or whether it was the idea that it would be faculty only and not the head. Also the rationale of including junior faculty did arise and felt that that was a very good idea, however, some junior faculty noted that they may be inhibited because here are people that they are sitting around a committee with who are in fact making

determinations about their tenure and promotions. While it's a good idea to bring everyone together, how might we help junior faculty feel more comfortable in that process?

Senator Bruess noted that in the History Department they have already started this discussion, at least Phase I. He communicated to his department the amendments that were made and they understood and appreciated that. They put together a committee of two junior faculty, two associates, and two full professors. This is something that has been done in History periodically as well as getting the junior faculty together with the PAC chairs to go over what the language means in their PAC procedures. It can be done.

Senator Soneson suggested that the Senate take up Provost Gibson's issues one at a time and if we'd like changes to the document based on these concerns we could vote on them.

Senator East stated that he believes that the Master Agreement speaks to PAC procedures, that the Deans must approve them, any changes must be made prior to a specific date in the fall and communicated to all those who might be assessed. It's either university policy or the Master Agreement that already says that so the notion of periodic reviewing and the Deans not necessarily having to approve already exists. He's in favor of doing this but it feels to him like we're doing this in an ad hoc basis as a committee of the whole and it's very frustrating that we don't have a motion that's considered these things and we're going to try to develop a motion that might deal with them but we're all responding in real time and he's a very poor real time responder. He is much better with a document that says here's what we're considering and then give him time to think about it and time to communicate with his constituents to give them a chance to review the motion and get back to him.

Provost Gibson noted that part of this is because there is a new Provost.

Senator Gorton noting that he is substituting for Julie Lowell who is out with a medical emergency, stated that this was also presented in his department, Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology. Colleagues have noted concerns, one of which is one that he is also concerned about, and is the authority of the Senate to be pursuing this line at all. Who has the authority to tell us to tinker with PAC procedures and criteria, and telling PAC members to meet with junior faculty members? It does seem to bump directly to the Master Agreement. He sees the

potential for the situation to end up really creating a lot of confusion among faculty at a time when we're trying to deal with accreditation and other issues. He's wondering if the possible solution is worth whatever problem it is we're trying to resolve. He understands how frustrating it is for many people to look at departmental PAC procedures that are vague but why is it that those procedures are vague, and department heads and Deans have to approve and signed off on them? He sees this with a lot of ambiguity in it.

Senator Soneson noted that the confusion has to do with PAC (Professional Assessment Committee) as part of the union contract. All faculty with tenure are on the PAC and make judgments and so on on junior faculty. Part of the concern that he's hearing, which he's heard other faculty voice as well, is the concern that PAC is a union thing and doesn't really have anything to do with Faculty Senate, and he agrees. The Faculty Senate cannot tell the union or PAC what to do. This motion is not telling PAC that they have to do anything. What it is recommending is that faculty in departments talk about and clarify the criteria that are operative in their discussion and judgments on promotion and tenure as faculty members. That is a different matter. In theory what this means is that a department could come up with a document, as we're asking them to do, and then the PAC reject it. Again, we are not asking, nor can we ask, the PAC to do anything. But faculty representatives can ask faculty members to take responsibility for the criteria that are implicit in their own personal reflections on promotion and tenure. And that this be a faculty discussion, not a PAC discussion, not a union discussion, so that junior and senior faculty, and heads can all be clear and transparent in the assumptions and criteria that are already at work. The PAC can do what it wants at the end of the year when it reviews its own policies and procedures as far as appending it to be included. They could also say that they don't accept it, but it's not likely if all faculty are involved in the formulation of the document. The point that he is trying to make is that the Faculty Senate is not demanding that the PAC do anything at all.

Senator Gorton remarked that he wished the way Senator Soneson has just framed it was the way it had been presented to the faculty because there are so many "must", "should" and dates and deadlines in it that it reads as if there is some sort of authority involved that makes people uneasy. It may just be a matter of presentation in some respects.

Senator Soneson noted that it is clear that there is confusion about this and it is a problem in the presentation, taking part responsibility. If this document does goes forward out to departments we may need to clear up the confusion so it does not read that either the PAC must, or that the Head is in charge of this. That is not the case; this is a faculty motion from the Faculty Senate to faculty here in the university.

Senator Gorton asked if in this process there is a role for college senates?

Senator Soneson stated that what had not been considered, and which he would expect there to be some consideration of down the line is, is that once these documents are drafted is that they're shared on the college level. Sharing some of these documents will help us in the long run to bring our criteria more in line with each other.

Chair Wurtz explained that this was a committee that was asked to do a task, and it's always important to her that we don't take the product of the committee and re-do the work. The work was requested and the work was done.

Chair Wurtz continued, asking if we need a policy or can this be handled if the Faculty Senate says that one of the things we're going to take on as a senate is to collect, from each appropriate unit, these standards being used and we will look at them, comparing and contrasting, with a disseminated piece of information being putting out. Will this transparency take care of the problem for us?

Senator Soneson replied that that is what the committee did and he's not sure it will go anywhere if the Senate does it.

Chair Wurtz stated that it would be the publicity factor that would move departments to act.

Senator Neuhaus commented that it is possible that if departments knew that their guidelines were going to become public to the university some departments might like some lead-time to improve them because of the embarrassment. It's one thing to know that a committee will look at them but if they know everyone's going to look at them at least a few departments would consider looking them.

Senator Breitbach noted that she believes that the reports generated by that committee at the end of last academic year can



do that, to point out some of the deficiencies and highlight some of the common features. She thought those were very detailed and well-written reports, and if departments take the time to look through and read those reports and compare them to their own, etc. we won't need to go back and re-do anything.

Faculty Chair Swan noted that from the discussion and the Provost's comments, it sounds as if it would be beneficial to do one of two things. One would be to offer this as a pilot in certain departments, such as History as they've already started. To go through this year as a pilot using this report and to then perfect it. Secondly, to have this go back to the committee with these comments to elaborate upon the proposal and to then bring it back. Listening to the comments, he understands the desire to move forward, slowly and deliberatively and with good understanding.

Senator Devlin commented, in following up on what Faculty Chair Swan noted, that by re-writing or re-wording the guidelines they becomes a set of strategic recommendations based on a university-wide review. There is a lot of terrific information in there.

Senator Van Wormer, who served on the committee, stated that they were very careful to get the "shoulds" and "musts" out of there because this is simply a recommendation, and she certainly doesn't want it to go back to the committee. All they are doing is recommending that departments have a discussion. The initiative should be coming from the faculty; it shouldn't come from administrators.

Senator East stated that he agrees whole-heartedly, and it seems to him that the thing to do is say here's a report from a committee that the Provost put together; we find the report highly useful, we are distributing it to every faculty member on campus and suggesting that they think about it and consider revising their PAC procedures. Also noting that this has to be done in a certain time frame, and that Deans have to approve it. It's his assumption that the Provost can speak with the Deans and come to some sort of agreement as to what they think is reasonable to make decisions on, and if the documents that they see that are changed don't meet those standards they will tell them so. The notion of a very detailed, two-stage process, seems to be superfluous and makes us lose sight of the very powerful report that the committee produced that says we're doing an inconsistent job of evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure, and we'd like you to do a better job. Whenever we

start doing motions we have words in front of us and the words have to mean what they say. Something simpler, saying we highly recommend faculty re-exam their PAC procedures based on this report would be a great thing.

Chair Wurtz reiterated what Senator East suggested, a thank you to the committee, that they discharged honorably the task that was given, the report is incredibly enlightening and that we certainly urge everyone to pay attention to that report, and to reconsider their PAC procedures in light of this report

Senator Bruess noted that because the Dean of his college has a vested interest in this, it's come up to the departments. He asked if other units have received any thing about this? It was on his faculty's agenda, History, the very first faculty meeting of the academic year.

Senator Funderburk commented that the School of Music has already addressed this and presented their first re-write to their advisory council. The documents and everything here have nothing to do with PAC procedures. His department has criteria for tenure and promotion, which is outside of the PAC. The PAC is the body that addresses whether or not people are meeting the criteria.

Senator Balong stated that she thought last year that was what we had decided to do, after receiving the report we'd all go back and initiate that conversation within our departments.

Senator Soneson reiterated that neither this document nor the Faculty Senate should be asking the PAC to do anything. We will get into a lot of trouble if we ask the PAC to do something. It is up to the PAC to decide whatever they want to decide. We can ask faculty and departments to re-consider the operative criteria, and make them as explicit as they possibly can for the purpose of fairness so there aren't mixed messages that come up.

Senator East noted that he doesn't understand how criteria for promotion and tenure are not part of the PAC procedures? He doesn't see how they can be separate and how you can therefore ask people to re-assess the criteria if they're not re-assessing the PAC procedures. This is where his confusion is coming from.

Senator Funderburk clarified that in his department the criteria that they have been working off of was decided on by the faculty and administrators involved. The PAC tries to figure out if individual candidates meet the criteria as they have been set

forth. The PAC is not necessarily in the position to set the criteria but they are studying the procedures for evaluation. Ultimately faculty have nothing but a recommendation on tenure. They try to ascertain what the administrative criteria that have been set forth are, and then help people get their measure whether or not they're meeting those criteria. Those criteria were never developed in the PAC; they were developed in the faculty with administrators involved.

Chair Wurtz commented that it does get confusing because it's the exact same people wearing different hats.

Senator Funderburk added that it does include the junior faculty, and administrators are not part of the PAC procedure.

Senator Gorton stated that he may be in discussion with junior faculty about the PAC but don't act like I'm not wearing a PAC hat for all intents and purposes in that discussion. We are in a sense asking PAC members to do something. Junior members cannot change procedures; only PAC can do that. It seems to him that the Senate would be asking the PAC to do something.

Senator Gorton continued that he's also confused about, at least in his department, evaluation on a certain set of criteria, with expectations from the PAC about decisions made on tenure and promotion. There are procedures that are intended to ensure that those criteria are consistent with rigor and scholarship and fairness, and all those things. The criteria are there. Part of his concern is that there is almost an effort afoot to try to create some standardize criteria, which might be detrimental to junior faculty. Part of the confusion is whose setting criteria, and what do we want out of this document? To try to standardize criteria, to try to standardize procedures? Can you have a conversation with junior and senior faculty without it being tantamount to not having or asking the PAC to do something?

Chair Wurtz reiterated what the committee is asking is not that we are mandating procedures but that we're mandating transparency procedures; that people know what's going on.

Senator Soneson noted that in his department they have PAC policies and procedures with absolutely no criteria. Nor do they have criteria anywhere in their files. He has mentioned before that when he was a junior faculty member he asked senior faculty members what the criteria are and was told that they didn't want to be too specific about that because they didn't

want to be held accountable. That is very, very confusing to young faculty.

Senator Soneson continued, noting that faculty wear many hats; they don't wear just one hat. They are teachers, they're PAC members, they're department heads, they're faculty members in many ways. It is important to not reduce ourselves to just one role, and what they're doing is asking you in the role as faculty member to have conversations with other faculty in their departments and be as clear as you can be. Be as clear as you can be for everyone's sake.

Senator Soneson added that it is important to re-state that the intent here is to have faculty representatives, us, recommend as strongly as we can to other faculty that they do this kind of work. If we don't the administration will. It seems so much better to have faculty do it than administration. We're telling ourselves to take responsibility.

Senator Funderburk stated that another key thing in this is what junior faculty can bring to this because we have a fairly complicated tenure process the way it's evolved. What we've been finding is that sometimes our wording should be cleaned up because we understand it but they don't, and it's important that they understand it.

Senator Basom added that she believes the committee did an awful lot of excellent work, particularly on those two reports, which we keep referring to. It's important that that information be emailed now to all faculty. While we represent the university, there still could be someone who's missed that information, who hasn't read the minutes or talked with someone about it. We know that the criteria are inconsistent and it's important that the discussions begin now. All we're asking is that people have discussions and make recommendations. Recommendation one is tell us what you're doing now. Recommendation two is think about it. You then have a discussion with the Dean and it's then up to the Dean to decide to enforce this or not. She would really like to see this move forward and she doesn't think we need to argue the language again as we've already done that. She suggests moving the timeline back a bit and would like to see this move forward. She noted that this is a recommendation, and we strongly encourage faculty to do this.

Chair Wurtz noted that this brings us back to the issues that were presented to us at the beginning in which time was the first issue. It would be wise to see if we can review this

issue by issue, with the first being the time. Would we push the timeline back or not have specific dates with a more general "as soon you can" type of statement?

Discussion followed on the specific changes and revisions of the recommendations, incorporating Provost Gibson's and Associate Provost Kopper's suggestions.

Motion by Senator Breitbach to call the question; second by Senator Devlin. Motion passed.

Chair Wurtz reviewed suggested changes for the Senate.

Phase I, first paragraph, first sentence: Change date to November 1, 2009 and "must" changed to "are to".

Paragraph two: "The PAC and Head should not be designated with this task." is deleted.

Paragraph three, first sentence: Change date to December 1, 2009; "and Provost" should be added after "Deans."

Paragraph three, final sentence: Change to "...should be made no later than February 1, 2010."

Phase II, first paragraph, second sentence: Should read "...should not be retroactive except at individual faculty member preferences..."

Second paragraph, third sentence: Should read "...submitted to their respective Dean's and the Provost for their information..."

Third paragraph: Change "periodically" to "bi-annually."

Motion to approve the above changes passed.

## **OTHER DISCUSSION**

Associate Provost Kopper noted that she updated the Senate last year on the fact that the Undergraduate Appeals Board and other representatives from the Graduate College and students are in the process of revising our Student Ethics and Discipline Policy as well as our grievance policies. While they are being finalized the committee invited Senators that would like to join

them to please do so. This will all be brought forward to the Senate once it has been finalized.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Senator Breitbach to adjourn; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden  
Faculty Senate Secretary

---

### **Recommendations for Improving the Tenure and Promotion Process at the University of Northern**

**Developed by the Committee on Scholarly/Creative Activity & Service at the  
University of Northern Iowa**

**August, 2009**

#### **Background:**

Late in Spring semester, 2008, Professor and former Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs James Lubker put together a committee with the charge to review criteria for scholarship and creative activity used by departments for promotion and tenure, and to make recommendations that seem appropriate. The committee consisted of a faculty member from each college, a head of a department, a dean of a college, and a member of the faculty Union. Their approach was to collect PAC Policies and Procedures documents, to study the, to make observations about similarities and differences with respect to criteria, and then to make recommendations. They engaged in long and vigorous discussions, motivated by the ideal of faculty self-governance and the obligation of intellectuals to think critically for the sake of improvement.

At the end of 2008, the Committee issued two reports, one dealing with tenure and promotion criteria and procedures involving scholarly/creative activities, found at:

<http://www.uni.edu/vpaa/documents/CommitteeOnScholarlyActivityandService.pdf>

and an additional report evaluating tenure and promotion criteria and procedures involving service, found at:

<http://www.uni.edu/vpaa/documents/CommitteeonScholarly-CreativeActivityandService.pdf>

Members of the committee were astonished to find an absence of clearly stated criteria for tenure/promotion and promotion to full professor in most documents. With few exceptions, faculty are not provided with transparent and objective guidelines in written form, in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activities and service. The committee strongly feels each department needs to develop a document clearly delineating the criteria used in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activities and service for tenure and promotion purposes, insofar as, 1. Such a document will provide clarity, transparency and fairness for those aspiring to tenure and promotion, or promotion to full professor, ensuring that they are being rewarded for work done in fulfillment of stated expectations, and not relying on vague, ad hoc, or personal statements and, 2. Written tenure and promotion documents will foster greater consistency across campus, promoting a culture where criteria based on rigor, transparency and fairness are common in the standards of all departments and colleges.

It is important to note that the committee is not asking Departmental PACs to rewrite their Policies and Procedures. This committee, and the Faculty Senate, cannot ask the PACs to do anything. The committee members, and the Faculty Senate that endorses the committee recommendations, are faculty members who are asking the faculty of each department to take responsibility for the implicit criteria that are already operative in all discussions and decision relative to promotion and tenure by making these criteria explicit. As the committee sees it, each department will have its own document as a departmental document. PACs may append this document onto their policies and procedures document, but that is entirely up to the members of the PAC. Once again, PACs are not being asked to take action as PACs.

#### Recommendation:

Recognizing the many obligations that faculty members have to fulfill throughout the academic year, the committee is recommending a two-phase approach during 2009-2010 for creating the departmental documents. To assist the departments, the committee includes several recommendations for consideration by departments in the two reports listed above, always recognizing the significant differences between disciplines and how teaching, scholarship/creative activities and service are carried out in each discipline. In addition, the committee provides a suggest format for the document (see attached).

#### **PHASE I: Moving From Custom to Written Rules, August-December 2009.**

By November 1, 2009 academic departments are asked to have a written document to present a written document to their respective Deans detailing the **operative criteria and current custom** used in the granting of tenure and promotion as well as promotion to full professor. The criteria should provide as much detail as possible about the current standards used in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activities and service.

The committee suggests that departments ensure input from both junior and senior faculty, given that there may be different interpretations and understandings about the current operative criteria for tenure and promotion from the two perspectives. All members of the faculty should have an opportunity to review and discuss the committee's report to ensure it accurately reflects existing criteria.

By December 1, 2009, Deans and the Provost should offer written feedback to departments on their draft document. Such feedback should be aimed at clarifying existing criteria and NOT the introduction of new criteria. Department faculty should discuss the Dean's feedback at an appropriate meeting and any necessary revisions to their document decided on by faculty should be made no later than February 1, 2010.

The results will be disseminated across campus to allow the different departments to compare and contrast their standards and, as needed, calibrate those standards to meet the objective of achieving rigor, transparency and fairness in the standards of all departments and colleges.

## **PHASE II: Reflection and New Directions, January-April 2010.**

In light of the recommendations of the Committee on Scholarly/Creative Activities and Service reports, departments should have an opportunity to reflect on and revise the criteria currently used in tenure and promotion. Any changes in the criteria or evaluation of teaching, scholarship/creative activities or service **should not be retroactive except at individual faculty member preferences**, and should apply to faculty beginning in a tenure track position starting in the fall of 2010.

As in the Phase I process, departments are urged to designate a committee representative of all faculty to reflect upon and propose changes in existing criteria. A draft proposal should be presented to the full department for discussion and adoption. A copy of the final document should be submitted to their respective Deans and Provost for their information by May 1, 2010.

The committee suggests that department faculty review their tenure and promotion criteria bi-annually, following the above procedure, in future years as well, so as to reflect changes in their respective disciplines and in university culture both here and across the country.