

12-8-2008

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, December 08, 2008

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2008 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 08, 2008" (2008). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 88.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/88

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.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

12/08/08

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Wurtz at 3:15 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 11/10/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed with one abstention.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST, JAMES LUBKER

Associate Provost Kopper noted that Interim Provost Lubker is at a UNI Cabinet Budget meeting and will not be able to join the Senate today.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan stated that the subject of his comments today involve some of the activities of the Provost's Office, particularly regarding task forces and program cuts, noting that he has received several resolutions from college senates as well as the UNI Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, each detailing perceived problems.

He reminded the Senate that these task forces operating on campus are entirely and exclusively the result of an experimental exercise of the Provost's Office and the Provost's Office can operate by any means the Provost sees fit. They are not circumventing anything because they are the product of internal activity of the Provost's Office and they are only for the internal use of the Provost's Office.

No proposal regarding programs or curriculum has been made and proposals effecting curriculum can expect the standard review process of the university faculty, and any proposals effecting

working conditions of faculty can expect to receive the benefit of deliberate negotiations with the faculty bargaining unit.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz stated that she has received a copy of a letter sent from UNI Faculty Association to Interim Provost Lubker on the issues that Faculty Chair Swan just spoke about. She is giving it careful consideration and review. She will continue to address this and has nothing to say at this point.

Vice Chair Funderburk noted that the UNI Faculty Association is not United Faculty. The letter is from the AAUP Chapter.

Chair Wurtz stated that she will be addressing the exact nature of the relationship between United Faculty, AAUP and the UNI Faculty Senate and is gathering information on this. If the Senate chooses to address this she will ask for a motion to do so in Executive Session.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

976 Committee on Committees 2008 - 2009 Report

Motion to docket in regular order as item #881 by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Elect representative to UNI Facilities Planning Advisory Committee

Self-nomination by Senator Schumacher-Douglas. Senator Schumacher-Douglas was elected by acclamation.

879 Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities

Motion to accept the Committee on Scholarly/Creative Activity and Service Report on Service at the University of Northern Iowa as attached to docketed item #879 and to be discussed; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

Senator Soneson stated that he would like to bring an additional item forward to be docketed.

Motion by Senator Soneson for the UNI Faculty Senate to endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under two conditions; first, that monies from the academic budget that have been given to athletics and the Wellness/Recreation Center (WRC) be returned to the academic budget; and secondly, that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before said changes take place. Second by Senator Heidstad.

Senator Soneson stated that he made this motion because of discussions around campus and we, the Faculty Senate, represent the faculty and this is a faculty project, and it would be worth while to spend time discussing this so faculty representatives can actually have a say in this.

Senator Soneson continued, noting that there are two fundamental motivations for this project. One is to improve our academic programs across campus by comparative assessment, trying to identify who we are and what we would like to become in the future. A second motivation is for the purpose of allocating funds from so called weak programs to so-called stronger programs. It is the second motivation that has gotten a lot of faculty across campus feeling very uneasy and before we make any re-allocation changes we need to at least get our basic budget back intact.

A lengthy and lively discussion followed.

Senator Soneson revised his motion, that the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under two conditions; first, that monies from the academic budget that have been given to athletics and the Wellness/Recreation Center (WRC) be returned to the academic budget; and secondly, that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before said changes take place, and that it be placed at the head of the docket out of regular order. This was agreeable to Senator Heidstad who had originally seconded the motion.

Discussion continued.

Chair Wurtz reiterated what the Senate will be voting on is to docket out of regular order at the top of the docket the motion that the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program

Assessment Prioritization Project under two conditions; first, that monies from the academic budget that have been given to athletics and the Wellness/Recreation Center (WRC) be returned to the academic budget; and secondly, that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before said changes take place. Two-thirds majority is needed for this to pass.

A hand vote showed 12 yeas and 2 nays. Motion passed as Docket #882.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate has received and docketed the request to endorse the process as it is currently occurring, tied to two conditions: that any money that was originally in the academic fund that went to athletics and the WRC be returned to the academic fund, and that any proposed changes in academic programs that comes from this process be sent the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before those changes take place.

Discussion continued.

Senator Soneson moved to table his motion until the January 12, 2009 meeting at which time the Senate would like to have a Consultative Session with Interim Provost Lubker; second by Senator Smith. Motion passed unanimously.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

OTHER DISCUSSION

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING 12/08/08 1658

PRESENT: Gregory Bruess, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Deirdre Heidstad, Bev Kopper, Julie Lowell, David Marchesani, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Steve O'Kane, Phil Patton, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Katherine van Wormer, Susan Wurtz, Michele Yehieli

Absent: Megan Balong, Mary Guenther, James Lubker

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Wurtz at 3:15 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 11/10/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed with one abstention.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Motion to approve the minutes of the 11/10/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed with one abstention.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST, JAMES LUBKER

Associate Provost Kopper noted that Interim Provost Lubker is at a UNI Cabinet Budget meeting and will not be able to join the Senate today.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan stated that the subject of his comments today involve some of the activities of the Provost's Office, particularly regarding task forces and program cuts.

Faculty Chair Swan stated that he has received several resolutions from college senates and the UNI Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Each of these details many perceived problems, even as each expresses support for individual persons and for enhancing academic programs at UNI.

We are all reminded that these task forces operating on campus are entirely and exclusively the result of an experimental exercise of the Provost's Office. They are not of or by the

faculty. The Provost's Office can operate by any means the Provost sees fit.

These task forces and official sounding documents are not, in themselves, circumventing anything, because they are the product of internal activity of the Provost's Office, and because they are only for the internal use of the Provost's Office.

No proposal regarding programs or curriculum has been made. Any proposal effecting curriculum can expect to receive the benefit of the standard review process of the university faculty, and any proposal effecting working conditions of faculty can expect to receive the benefit of deliberate negotiations with the faculty bargaining unit.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz stated that she has received a copy of a letter sent from UNI Faculty Association to Interim Provost Lubker on the issues that Faculty Chair Swan just spoke about. She is in the process of giving it careful consideration and review, comparing the Master Agreement that is in effect, along with AAUP guidelines, which they included but without specific information as to what sections should be reviewed, in connection with the UNI Constitution and Bylaws. She will continue to address this and has nothing to say at this point.

Vice Chair Funderburk noted that the UNI Faculty Association is not United Faculty. The letter is from the AAUP Chapter.

Chair Wurtz stated that she will be addressing the exact nature of the relationship between United Faculty, AAUP and the UNI Faculty Senate. She has sent out a series of letters acknowledging service and asking for response, and has received a wide spectrum of responses. If the Senate chooses to address this she will ask for a motion to do so in Executive Session as this would be a discussion that carries significant concerns.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

976 Committee on Committees 2008 - 2009 Report

Motion to docket in regular order as item #881 by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Elect representative to UNI Facilities Planning Advisory Committee

Chair Wurtz announced that the Senate needs to elect a new representative to the UNI Facilities Planning Advisory Committee. The Senate needs to have two representatives and she has been serving as one of the two representatives.

Self-nomination by Senator Schumacher-Douglas. Senator Schumacher-Douglas was elected by acclamation.

879 Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities

Senator Soneson stated that the second document, Committee on Scholarly/Creative Activity and Service Report on Service at the University of Northern Iowa was distributed to senators.

Motion to accept the Committee on Scholarly/Creative Activity and Service Report on Service at the University of Northern Iowa as attached to docketed item #879 and to be discussed; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

Senator Soneson stated that he would like to bring an additional item forward to be docketed.

Motion by Senator Soneson for the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under two conditions; first, that monies from the academic budget that have been given to athletics and the Wellness/Recreation Center (WRC) be returned to the academic budget; and secondly, that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before said changes take place. Second by Senator Heidstad.

Senator Soneson stated that he made this motion because of discussions around campus and we, the Faculty Senate, represent the faculty and this is a faculty project. It would be well worth our time to spend time talking about this whole project that's going to take place so faculty representatives can actually have a say in this.

Senator Soneson continued, noting that it has occurred to him that there are two fundamental motivations for this project. One very fine motivation is to improve our academic programs across campus by comparative assessment, trying to identify who we are and what we would like to become in the future. A second motivation is for the purpose of allocating funds from so called weak programs to so-called stronger programs. It is the second motivation that has gotten a lot of faculty across campus feeling very uneasy. Before we make any re-allocation changes we need to at least get our basic budget back intact. Last year, for example, \$5.5 million from the general academic fund was given to athletics so they could meet their budget, and something around \$1 million was given to the WRC.

Chair Wurtz reviewed procedural issues as to how matters may be brought to the Senate, noting that "any person may address a petition to the Senate on any matter by presenting the petition in writing to the chair-person and causing it to be entered on the calendar of the Senate." "Urgent business may be docketed for immediate consideration by a two-thirds vote of the senators present," docketing it out of order at the top of the docket. She has seen nothing that says the Senate cannot take up new business without it having been announced to the faculty through the Faculty Senate Agenda announcement. If someone is aware of something in the bylaws that she hasn't caught they should speak up.

Discussion followed on the procedure of addressing this item without it going through the docketing procedure. It was noted that there has to be a two-thirds vote for the Senate to address an item that has not been docketed in the regular procedure.

Senator Soneson stated that this appears to him to be urgent because faculty will spend a lot of time over the holiday break working on the reports for the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project. And as the Senate will not be meeting again until the beginning of spring semester it seems that this is something that could be discussed. This is an issue that we've all been discussing with faculty in our departments and we all have a pretty good idea of the will of the faculty. He is suggesting that, given the urgency of this matter, the Senate could go ahead to discuss it and vote on it.

Senator Smith remarked that he has no quarrel with voting to docket it but he does have a quarrel with treating this as an emergency issue. He doesn't believe that this motion, even if passed, will stop the procedure and he doesn't really see it as

being an emergency. He does agree that the Senate and faculty ought to discuss but doesn't agree with the notion that we all know how the faculty feel about this. You hear from selected groups of faculty but no one in this room is in the position to say they have a sense of how the full faculty feels about this. And you wouldn't be able to get a sense of how the full faculty feels about this unless you docket it appropriately and allow faculty to weigh in on it when they see it is on the Senate's calendar. He has no problem for putting it on the calendar for docketing in regular order but he has a real concern with treating it as an emergency.

Chair Wurtz commented that the Senate does need to remind themselves of their jurisdiction and charge. The Faculty Senate bylaws state, "That although elected from various faculty constituencies, senators shall consider themselves the representatives of the best in their profession rather than the representatives of factions of their larger constituency." That is our charge, we are not representing units, we are representing the best thinking of the campus.

Senator Van Wormer noted that she knows that items have to be announced in advance so people can come. She suggested holding an emergency meeting next Monday, December 15.

Chair Wurtz responded that the Senate could do a number of things to address this.

Senator Lowell remarked that she thinks Senator Van Wormer's suggestion is a very good one. She did try to get an emergency meeting going the week prior to Thanksgiving because faculty were not given a chance as a body, or various bodies within the university, to discuss this issue nor given enough time. The timing on this was really bad. It is her feeling that the Senate should vote to see if two-thirds of the Senate would like to see this issue discussed today. And it is her feeling that senators are not representing factions; that most of the senators have talked with enough people to have a really good sense of how they feel.

Senator Yehieli stated that she believes a number of senators have been approached by people within their colleges, as a number of colleges have sent letters on to the task force committee noting serious concerns. She has been approached by people asking why the Senate hasn't done the same thing.

Senator Smith pointed out that Interim Provost Lubker met with the Senate at the annual fall retreat at the beginning of the semester and said this was going to happen, sending a message out to the faculty in general about this. It isn't as though this has sprung out of nowhere. The specific procedures have finally been developed and laid out but as far as not knowing that this was going to happen he doesn't see justification for that.

Chair Wurtz, citing Section V, Article V, nothing precludes "service of members of the faculty on committees or other appropriate professional groups established by the university administration or other appropriate agencies." The provost can establish anything he wants, except that "no internal agency of university government not answerable to the University Faculty Senate may exercise any of it, the Faculty Senate's, functions." The question is, has there been an exercise of Faculty Senate functions up to this point, has there been a proposal for something that would take over the exercise of Faculty Senate functions. Unless we can say there has been a taking over of the functions delegated to the Faculty Senate, we have no reason to say, "You can't do that."

Faculty Chair Swan added except in the Faculty Senate's advisory capacity, to say the performance of your office now appears to much of the faculty to be one way or the other. He believes it is the will of the faculty to communicate that this body has been criticized by some of the faculty for not officially doing any thing.

Chair Wurtz continued, that if in fact the Senate has not acted as we should, that's another issue. If the Senate chooses to say, this is something you need to be concerned about, we can make that decision. As far as she's concern, what's stated in the bylaws and what's already happened, we cannot level charges that there have been any inappropriate actions taken to this point.

Senator Soneson reiterate the motion, to endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project, for the purposes of discussion, under two conditions; first, that monies from the academic budget that have been given to athletics and the Wellness/Recreation Center (WRC) be returned to the academic budget so that when they talk about changes in programs we're working with a fair field. He is trying to cast this in as a positive a light as we can, emphasizing what is positive about

this and trying to lessen what seems threatening to faculty by making this particular motion.

Senator East commented that there needs to be a motion to docket before there can be discussion.

Chair Wurtz stated that the current discussion is whether or not to docket it.

Senator East continued, that Chair Wurtz is asking about discussion on the motion rather than discussion on docketing. It seems to him that Chair Wurtz and others have said that it needs to be docketed before the Senate can actually address the motion.

Chair Wurtz responded that she was repeating the request for docketing, to make sure we're absolutely clear on what the Senate is voting on. The motion has been that we docket a resolution that calls for endorsement of the current process tied to the condition of how money is handled.

Discussion followed as to whether Senator Soneson's motion was made as an emergency, or to be considered in regular order, which would be the next meeting.

Senator Soneson amended his motion that the this be docketed to be discussed in a special meeting of the Faculty Senate Monday, December 15 at 3:15 P.M. This amended motion was agreeable to Senator Heidstad, who made the second on the original motion.

Discussion followed and Chair Wurtz noted that she would be giving a final on Monday, December 15 at 3:15 P.M.

Senator Heidstad asked if it would be possible to docket the item out of order in an urgent fashion so it can be discussed today, and if it leads to needing some type of vote we can call a meeting for Monday?

Faculty Chair Swan replied that it could be docketed for discussion and action to be taken at the next regular meeting.

Faculty Senate Secretary Dena Snowden noted that there might be a problem in getting a meeting location at this short notice.

Senator Yehieli noted that there would probably be faculty that would want to attend that meeting so it would need to be a larger room.

Chair Wurtz stated that the issue can be docketed for immediate consideration and it will move to the head of the docket, but it will take a two-thirds vote from the Senate.

Senator Soneson revised his motion, that the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under two conditions; first, that monies from the academic budget that have been given to athletics and the Wellness/Recreation Center (WRC) be returned to the academic budget; and secondly, that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before said changes take place, and that it be placed at the head of the docket out of regular order. This was agreeable to Senator Heidstad.

Senator East stated that he would like to reiterate that this is not a new issue; that the Faculty Senate knew about it in September. Interim Provost Lubker has sent emails out to every faculty member on campus, probably a couple of times. The Senate has had numerous opportunities to weigh in on this or to consider it in regular deliberate discussion as opposed to something that seems as though it's at the last moment, and there is no difference between doing it today or January 12, when the Senate next meets.

Senator Smith reiterated that there is no evidence that what the Provost has done is in any way infringing on faculty prerogatives. In view of this, what the Provost is doing is entirely appropriate within the realm of the Provost, calling for faculty involvement, which has certainly happened before. As Senator East brought up, letting faculty know about this through the Senate as far back as August, he just doesn't see where this is an emergency. He doesn't see that whatever this body could do is something that has to be done on an emergency basis.

Senator Heidstad noted that this has been an evolving process and it has been evolving very quickly. The timing of senate meetings has not allowed us to have a thorough and meaningful discussion of what the process means to the faculty. And it hasn't allowed us to have a thorough and meaningful conversation as a body, and that is what is really important, as a body that represents the faculty. We're one of the only governing bodies on campus that hasn't met and come forth with some type of statement. It is really important for the Senate to go on record with a discussion, representing the faculty.

Senator Lowell stated that the urgency, which has been stated before, is the people are going to be spending lots of their very valuable time on this process immediately. If this process is going to be changed or dropped, which some of us hope it will be, we should get that known right now so people do not waste any more time on it. She was not a member of the Faculty Senate when the Senate was informed by the Provost about this process, and when the Senate was informed there was not a discussion. She also tried to bring up a discussion early on at her first meeting as a senator, suggesting that it might not be a good time to do this whole assessment, and the Provost was present and stopped her in her tracks, and that was it. She made an attempt to bring up a discussion that she had hoped would be discussed, which is what she thought we were suppose to do as representatives of the faculty, and it did not happen. She believes it should happen and it should happen now.

Senator Yehieli followed up on the timing issue, noting it's just been very, very recently that the various college senates have started to discuss this and submit letters of concern about the process. It's appropriate for us as the University Faculty Senate to also take a look at this issue in more detail.

Senator Smith he agrees and is sympathetic to the concerns about the timing in the sense that the time frame for the whole initiative has been very short. On the other hand, given what has been done so far and what it is intended to do, it is entirely within the Provost's responsibility. Given the fact that we haven't in any way challenged that, he doesn't see where our discussion is going to result in some significant change that would save some people some work that the Provost has a right to ask them to do. In that sense again, he's left unconvinced that there's some sort of emergency here. He agrees with the discussion, that we should have had it a long time ago but he just doesn't see the need to treat this on an emergency basis.

Chair Wurtz asked Senator Lowell if she feels there is a need to go back and review the tapes of the meetings, if she feels there was some matter of business brought forward that the Senate inadvertently ignored, and that she'd be happy to do that.

Senator Lowell replied that it's there in the minutes.

Chair Wurtz stated that Senator Lowell raised the question that the Senate overrode something that she brought to the Senate's attention.

Senator Lowell responded that it was the Provost that overrode it and everyone else was silent.

Chair Wurtz asked if Senator Lowell would like her to go back and find the words and review that conversation.

Senator Lowell responded that, yes, she would like Chair Wurtz to go back and review that.

Senator East stated that we don't just come to the Senate and discuss things; we come and act upon things that have been brought to the Senate. If you'd been cut off, the appropriate thing to do was to bring a motion, have it docketed for discussion and then the Senate would have discussed it. It's been raised repeatedly about just coming and discussing things; that's not what we do. We don't come and just discuss whatever a senator happens to have on their mind. We come and we behave in an orderly manner, addressing things that have been docketed and brought to the Senate in forms of motions that request some sort of action of the Senate.

Senator Lowell noted that what Senator East is saying contradicts this whole idea that we have discussed this because she hasn't seen that it has been discussed.

Senator East responded that he never said it had been discussed but the opportunity to discuss, which means you would have the opportunity to raise a motion about it, have it docketed in regular order and have it discussed by the full Faculty Senate.

Senator Funderburk noted that one of the issues on the time involved as it was originally proposed to the Senate was the Task Force of Phase I was to be reporting in October, which is obviously running late since the report finally went out this morning. The emergency part of it that we're operating on is the March 1 deadline, and some thought in October that we would have time to have a discussion. Obviously now, we're talking about it being half the time until the report is due before the next Senate meeting. This is where the emergency comes into play; if we have reservations this would be our one chance.

Senator Bruess brought up a matter of clarification in regards to what Senate East spoke of. When announcements are made it is

his feeling that that implies an opening for discussion. When the Provost comes to the Senate and makes comments, there's an implication that once comments are made they can be discussed. And it was in that context that Senator Lowell brought up her questions and her reservations. It wasn't just brought in without any notion of making it formal and trying to squeeze something in that wasn't in the docket. He remembers clearly that it was Interim Provost Lubker who brought up the issue and Senator Lowell who questioned it, and it was dropped.

Senator Soneson called the question.

Chair Wurtz reiterated what the Senate will be voting on is to docket out of regular order at the top of the docket the motion that the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under two conditions; first, that monies from the academic budget that have been given to athletics and the Wellness/Recreation Center (WRC) be returned to the academic budget; and secondly, that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before said changes take place. Two-thirds majority is needed for this to pass.

A hand vote showed 12 yeas and 2 nays. Motion passed as Docket #882.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate has received and docketed the request to endorse the process as it is currently occurring, tied to two conditions, that any money that was originally in the academic fund that went to athletics and the WRC be returned to the academic fund, and that any proposed changes in academic programs that comes from this process be sent the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before those changes take place. The Senate has a motion before it and needs a second before discussion can take place.

Second by Senator Heidstad.

Senator Smith asked for a point of clarification regarding the demarcation between administrative responsibilities and faculty responsibilities. It is his understanding that faculty is responsible for the curriculum, which means they design and determine what courses are in a program, they determine what contents are in a course, but do faculty have authority to decide whether a particular program will be offered? Isn't that ultimately an administrative decision?

Senator Soneson responded that no, that's a faculty decision.

Senator Smith reiterated that faculty can decide if they're going to have a program and if administrators say there's no money to offer it, faculty can say they're going to have it and the administration has to provide the funds to offer it.

Senator Patton commented that it would be appropriate to go through the administrative hierarchy. We're getting into curricular issues that are being created by the faculty and moved forward by the faculty to the administration and to the Board of Regents (BOR). The final authority is the BOR, not the faculty. Theoretically, and as has happened in the past, presidential action can negate action of the faculty.

Senator Smith commented so that while faculty say they have control of the curriculum, in essence it's more of an advisory, expertise to suggest and propose courses and curriculum.

Senator Patton responded that actually it's a step above that based on the faculty's expertise and knowledge.

Senator Wurtz cited Article IV of the Faculty Constitution, Item II, the general principles about jurisdiction and it is somewhat vague.

Faculty Chair Swan noted that in talking about program elimination there are processes to be followed that are governed by the Master Agreement.

Senator Smith asked if the Master Agreement relates to program elimination or to dropping faculty?

Faculty Chair Swan replied that it does have an effect on dropping faculty.

Senator Neuhaus stated that he heard Interim Provost Lubker, and that while he was envisioning changes he's quite sure he said that he was not envisioning reduction of the existing faculty as a result of this. He doesn't know what that means about future hiring but he thought the provost made that fairly clear when the Senate met, that he was envisioning changes and realignments but he was not envisioning reduction of faculty. There could be other things that could be significantly changed.

Senator Smith noted that on the first condition, monies being returned to the academic fund, the Senate discussed that a while

back when Hans Isakson presented a report on UNI's budget to the Senate. As he recalls, at that time the Senate basically said that while they weren't happy about that money going to athletics and the WRC they declined to pursue or do anything with it. He wouldn't have a quarrel with the Senate passing a resolution that encourages the administration to try to use our money for academics rather than giving it to athletics and the WRC. He has trouble conditioning support on getting money back from the Athletic Department because when it was discussed before we recognized that there wasn't much we could do about it. It seems to him that they are separate issues and putting them together doesn't really help.

Senator East stated that he doesn't understand where the notion of getting money back from athletics or the WRC comes into play; is our budget less than it was before? They have had budgets ever since they've existed and it's not clear to him that their budgets have anything to do with an increase or decrease in academic program budgets. He may be wrong but from his understanding of what the Senate was told last spring when the Athletic Department made a report to the Faculty Senate, the percentage of money paid to athletics is less now than it was, and the amount of money is also less. He doesn't understand where the notion of getting money back comes from.

Senator Funderburk replied that yes, the amounts that have gone to athletics have been increasing and it has been documented. The percentage of what's been spent has also been increased. The only argument made before the Senate last spring was that the percentage here at UNI has not increased as fast as it has at other schools.

Senator Yehieli asked how the WRC fits into that picture with the budget?

Senator Funderburk responded that there are three entities that had special lines coming from the general fund.

Faculty Chair Swan commented on the financing part of the motion, is it the motivation of the Provost's Office to move money from certain programs to "good, viable programs"? Is part of the motivation of talking about money to show that there are other ways to give money to those "good programs"?

Senator Soneson responded that a lot of faculty are worried that there's going to be restrictions put on their particular programs with money being taken away, or reorganized in a way

that makes them feel uncomfortable because there's not enough money. Resources are scarce as stated in the proposal from Task Force One. He's not opposed to reallocating resources, he just wants to make sure, and a number of faculty would like to be reassured, that the money that has already be allocated to academic programs remains in academic programs so that it's not taken away and then getting rid of academic programs is being suggested. That is his concern.

Positively stated, Senator Soneson continued, he believes that a lot more faculty are going to get behind this if they could see the real positive value of what this is about. By trying alleviate some of that financial worry it would be easier for them to see the positive aspects of this.

Senator Yehieli noted that she's also been hearing some of the comments that Senator Soneson's been hearing. Faculty are nervous as they hear about the national economy tumbling and we know it is affecting Iowa. The combination of this serious economic crisis coupled with an new provost coming in and being presented with written reports on programs that are not necessary and could be elimination, faculty are concerned that this might ultimately lead to lay offs or things like that.

Senator Heidstad commented that the initiative was presented as way to increase the quality of our programs. She understands what Senator Soneson is trying to do, which is to alleviate some of that fear. From what's she heard, it's gone from this idea of trying to do an honest assessment of programs to an act of trying to protect ourselves and our programs. That type of mentality, doing it in a fearful kind of way, is not really helpful with the fact that we do have an opportunity to assess our programs.

The second part of the proposal, that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before said changes take place, Senator Heidstad continued, is one of the things that the Senate needs to do that the college senates have already done, taking a position on the issue. Her concern is that by waiting and inserting the Senate's position at the end of the process we might not be able to do much. We might then been seen as connecting ourselves to a process, seeming as though we're part of the process, and we might want to disassociate ourselves from that process by making a statement that this is not our process.

Senator Funderburk noted that he's more or less a fan of academic program reviews but it's been unfortunate that the economic events that happened after this was announced gave it suddenly a more ominous feeling than it originally had. The concerns he has are pragmatic. If he had to collect the information just on himself for the past eight years, all of which he has been turning in to this administration every year, and apparently they have not been good stewards of this information since they're having to ask for it again, he would be hard pressed to get it done in a timely fashion and to give it reasonable consideration by March 1; it would be difficult to do. His question is if this is a realistic timeframe to be doing something that seems to be larger than a reaccreditation process, which takes two years in the School of Music. Can we honestly do a good job of this in this amount of time?

Chair Wurtz reiterated that there are two things here, the first being the money issue and the second is the action taken. If the Senate were to follow this, are we not inserting another step in the curriculum process that's already there? It wouldn't be possible to make curriculum changes without going through the curriculum process, which does come to the Senate? In what way is that not already in place, and would it be muddying the waters by adding another piece to it that kind of undermines the system that's already there?

Senator East stated that motion to him is a "paper tiger", sounding officious and blustery, and if we don't approve it it's not going to happen. Does anyone really seriously believe that if the Faculty Senate says we don't really approve of you dismissing that program, or doing anything without cutting the athletic budget, that that's going to change anything? He doesn't necessarily disagree that the Senate ought not to take a stand but to have a motion that says if you don't do these two things we're not going to approve it seems kind of useless.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas noted that the idea is that we discuss the process, which has been lacking. Now that it's come to our table many of us are feeling the reality of what's being asked of us. That issue of the workload and what's being asked of us is significant. We do a program and we work many long hours putting much thought into that, and then the quick turnabout on this. There's a undo amount of work that she's working on, as well as her colleagues, in order to get these things taken care of, especially with the information that faculty have just recently been provided. She can see the point of the motion but part of what we need to say, as a faculty, is

the reasonableness of the timeline given what faculty have to do.

Chair Wurtz commented that she misspoke when she said that there were two things here, there are three. One is the endorsing of the current plan. Two is the first condition and three is the second condition.

Senator Heidstad noted, returning to the curriculum question, it brings up another point about the entire process, which will lead to potential curricular changes. Doing the normal curriculum process those curriculum changes are identified by the faculty through a type of prioritization, assessment type of way and they are sent through a process that we all know. This isn't exactly the same thing; this will be a different process.

Senator Patton suggested that what the Senate really wants to do is to be a part of the process. Clearly everybody has the understanding that actions could be taken very quickly if mandated by the governor, the BOR or the president. The Senate should be part of the discussion and tying things to unrealistic expectations probably does not benefit or advance our cause.

Senator Neuhaus noted that one of the things the Senate had mentioned early on in the process was that communication needed to happen from the Provost's Office concerning this because there are a lot of things going on at the same time and that can cause an awful lot of confusion. This was all before the economy went really far south, which adds yet another item in the mix. The Senate may have been a little remiss in not trying to discuss this along with other things just to simply bring it out in the open, and it would also have been nice if the Provost had talked about this more with the Senate. He agrees with Senator Patton that we do have to keep in mind that at any time administration above us can call the shots. The Provost has tried in good faith to get us involved in it but we've just fallen way short on communication, particularly at this juncture where there's a lot of worry and concern. However, it is reasonable to be worried at this time and place but in making this really adversarial by saying we're not going to "play ball" unless you do this, this and this, we might strengthen our position if we lighten up a little and ask for discussion and ask to have it soon.

Chair Wurtz stated that at this point, in order to make a decision, we need to know if it really is revision to curriculum in that it's a new process, or is it at most a slight change in

the point of initiation. It would still have to go through all the regularly set processes. She doesn't know that and would need to know before making a decision.

Senator Soneson replied that yes, it is different than the other assessment processes such as the Student Outcomes Assessments and Programs Reviews because those are internal assessments whereby faculty members within departments look at their particular program and try to make their program better, and it is done in isolation. This process is a comparative process. We are asking something much larger than in an academic program review; we're asking who are we as a university, what is our fundamental identity, where would we like to go, how do we conceive of the university in the 21st century. It's quite different than an internal assessment; it's comparative, which is something we want to keep in mind. Senator Patton is right that we as the Faculty Senate do want to be a part of the discussion. It would seem very odd if we were not a fundamental part of that discussion. Will this process follow the curriculum review? He would hope that it would. He's more than willing to modify his motion to indicate that the process should really follow the curriculum process.

One of our jobs as senators, Senator Soneson continued, is to protect the academic side of the university and to continue to insist under all circumstances that this is an academic institution above all, and everything else is here to support academics. What's been happening it seems to him, is that the academic budget that's been set over the past years has slowly been eaten by other important, but not nearly as important, parts of the university. Now we're being asked to reassess our programs and the fear is, which is why he's bringing it up, to weed out the weaker programs and enhance the stronger ones. And then we might have a little extra money to give over to athletics or whatever. In the interest of protecting the academic budget he believes it's well within our realm of responsibilities to take a stand on this and to say that if you're going to do this, fine but let's be fair about it. Let's make sure our academic institution stays academic by bringing the budget back to where it was.

Associate Provost Kopper clarified that this process, the way she understands it, does not parallel the curriculum process. The departments should be wrapping up their curriculum packages this semester with the college senates reviewing them in the spring, and then in the fall going on to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) and the Graduate Council Curriculum

Committee (GCCC) and then to the Faculty Senate. Her understanding of the timelines for the assessment does not match up with the curriculum timelines.

Senator Lowell stated that to her, the problem with this whole thing is the whole thing. We should not be doing this at all at this time prior to having a new provost in place. She hopes that our new provost will be someone absolutely wonderful with terrific ideas that is going to look at this university and get us behind him or her and making changes, identifying who we are and what we want to do. That person is not on board and here we are going through a process that's going to try to make changes before we even have a new provost.

The second thing that is coming up really soon, Senator Lowell continued, is the reaccreditation. That's another opportunity for us to look at all of our programs, see what ones are weak and make changes with the new provost in place. She believes it would not be out of line for the Senate to come out with a statement that this whole process is not appropriate at this time.

Senator Funderburk noted that he agrees with all the sentiment that Senator Soneson mention, that ultimately we make comments if it's going to affect the academics. He'd be more comfortable with the version that we were looking for similar or equal measures to be put in place to evaluate the administration of these extracurricular items as opposed to predetermining what the decision of that review process would be. He does think that it's important for us to state that we just can't do academics in a vacuum because the funding decisions we make do affect the academics as well.

It is his understanding that the Academic Program Review Committee, a standing committee of the Provost, has not been a part of the Academic Program Review that is taking place. That has struck him as a procedurally odd thing because he would have thought they would have had a lot of this information.

Senator Soneson asked for a clarification from Associate Provost Kopper, the fact that this process is not a parallel to the curriculum process implies that decisions can be made about programs that will not go through the regular curriculum process.

Associate Provost Kopper replied, yes, that's correct.

Senator Soneson continued, which would include that decisions could be made and instituted which would not go through the Faculty Senate.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that that is correct.

Faculty Chair Swan asked how that would happen.

Associate Provost Kopper responded that for example, if there were decisions made to eliminate programs.

Senator Soneson continued, saying for example if someone comes with the idea to merge three colleges into one. Does the Provost believe this is a recommendation he can institute it without the Faculty Senate voting on that?

Associate Provost Kopper responded that she doesn't know. For clarification, decisions related to programs and curriculum ultimately go to the BOR.

Senator Soneson added that they always go through the Faculty Senate.

Faculty Chair Swan noted that the understanding is that the Provost Office is doing this to come up with a proposal. He has to propose at some point and then go through the regular process of deliberation. This is why nothing has really happened at Washington State (the model used for this program evaluation). For the Provost to come up with his proposal, combining colleges, getting rid of PE from the Liberal Arts Core or enhancing more PE in the Liberal Arts Core, whatever, this is his process and he'll then present it. Then we would send it to whatever committees we would want. It sounds like we're complaining about other things, the process that the Provost is engaging is giving us work that we don't want to do so we come to our faculty body saying we don't want to do that work and there are other ways for the Provost to come up with his proposal. The real concern is that if it's going to change curriculum it would have to come to the Faculty Senate and then be presented to the BOR as having been endorsed by the authorities, the only people who have any authority to endorse the curriculum.

Senator Smith commented on the time issue, that there are many people who would think that there's never a good time to do this kind of thing. As far as doing it now when we're looking at a new provost coming on board, it's President Allen's call.

Interim Provost Lubker didn't do this without the support of the president. One argument is that if there's "bloodletting" let the old person do it and the new person have a clean slate. But there's never a nice time to do something like this. And as far as reaccreditation, there are a lot of reasons to do this in support of reaccreditation. It's going to help us a lot in showing the NCA we're serious about evaluating our programs, which is an argument in favor of doing it.

Senator Smith continued on the issue Senator Soneson raised about this being an academic institution, noting that that's a very academic perspective. We're all academics so we'd like to take that perspective. In talking with students and their parents, they see every institution of higher education in the state as much more than just about going to school. They take a lot of pride in their sports teams; they're concerned with the Wellness and Rec Center. You cannot review this as simply an academic institution, which is why we have a very substantial Students Affairs Department. In terms of the budget issue, he doesn't know how the budget is actually done by the state legislature. If they were to actually budget money for athletics, the WRC, and the Gallagher-Bluedorn Performing Arts Center, saying that they're prepared to fund those deficits, then on what grounds could we complain about that? If they, acting in behalf of the taxpayers, say that they want to put money into that, how could we say, no, that's money that should come to us?

One issue that was raised in talking about the normal curriculum, that it would result in dropping programs, Senator Smith asked for some examples of where through the normal curriculum process programs have been dropped and not replaced. Sometimes we drop courses and not replace them but as far as dropping programs there aren't many examples. What happens is that the curriculum continues to get bigger and bigger with faculty doing more things less and less well.

Senator Smith continued, some people on the committee, which he is a member, did look at these kinds of efforts by other institutions, not just Washington State, and they found in some that there was no faculty involvement whatsoever. The administration just said this is what we're going to do. Our administration has rightly called for faculty involvement. If faculty involvement automatically generates this kind of digging in of their heels and opposing it, what's being set up is a situation where the administration gets alienated from the faculty and questions why they should ask for the involvement of

faculty when they in a "knee jerk" way oppose almost any kind of change that's proposed. We should think very carefully. It's nice to say that we support this in principle but then come up with any number of objections to whatever is done. He agrees with the concerns about the timing. The time frame is tighter than it should be but the committee has made an effort to reduce the administrative load on this. Dr. Kaparthi has provided all sorts of data which will be online and he's doesn't believe faculty will find this as time consuming as it's being made out to be. One department thought it would take him about ten hours to complete, which is not a huge load. We need to be careful about presenting an image that we're automatically opposed to serious efforts to reconsider how resources are allocated within the academic side of this university.

Senator East commented on the curriculum process, presuming that if any programs were identified to be cut they would go through the curriculum process where there is a mechanism whereby programs are proposed for dropping and it takes two to three years to clear all the students out and all of that. The Provost has said, and presumes that any provost that comes after him would be bound with the idea that we are not firing faculty, faculty may somehow be reassigned, at their desire if they come up with organized ways to present it. In any case, this is not a mechanism whereby we're expecting to fire faculty.

Even as a junior high school teacher, Senator East stated, his contract for teaching in the district said that he would be assigned duties as determined by the superintendent. All of us have exactly the same thing in their contracts, that they can be assigned however they please. They can assign you to teach something else and if you don't, they won't pay you. That is his understanding of what can be done but he doesn't think any of that is going to be done. Those on the committee and on the Senate have talked with the Provost, and he has done everything in his power to lessen fears that this is going to mean drastic changes. It is within their power to do whatever they wish and we have this opportunity to make our case. Those on the committee have said that they want this to be an opportunity for programs to tell their story. If they can figure out a way to do even better than they have been doing this will be a very positive process and it may take some time but not the weeks of work as some people are saying.

Senator Van Wormer noted that a lot of the criticism that she's heard has to do with the process. She's gotten the impression that the Faculty Senate should have been involved in this from

the beginning to choose, elect, nominate people to serve on the committee.

Chair Wurtz responded that it's an entirely valid view and it could have been done that way but the decision to not do it that way in no way violates any of what was approved as the Faculty Constitution.

Senator East remarked that the Provost asked for nominations from the Senate. He also asked for nominations from every college senate.

Faculty Chair Swan noted that the Provost actually asked for recommendations.

Associate Provost Kopper responded to Senator Soneson's early point about combining colleges. If a program is eliminated, that obviously has to go through the curriculum process because there are a number of reports, etc. and that would go to the BOR. If combining colleges, for example, and there were no curriculum changes, then you might argue that if it's non-curricular you would then use Curriculum Form G, which is not reviewed by the UCC or the GCCC, and it goes directly to the Provost's Office. It would depend on the nature of the change in combining colleges. If it was not curriculum in nature and had no curricular changes then you might argue that it could go directly to the Provost's Office.

Senator Funderburk commented on the amount of time, noting that one of the things that's not reflected by the committee is how different we actually are. He himself has 55 concerts and rehearsals a year in Cedar Rapids plus everything else he's doing and a list for the entire faculty in Music for a year doesn't exist anywhere. That would take an awful lot of time to try to pull that all together. There is information that's being requested that is not anyplace and will take anecdotal digging around to get, such as what are your graduates doing, what is their success rate, where are they working? We don't keep records on that. The pragmatic side of this to do it in a three-month time cycle strikes him as being not realistic. It's the timing more than anything else.

Senator Heidstad asked Associate Provost Kopper what would prevent a provost from taking the information that would be collected, including proposed changes and directing this proposal to the BOR, directing it upward instead of back to the Senate and having changes implemented at the Regents level?

Associate Provost Kopper replied that the BOR requests certain information when we're eliminating a program. If all the information was included in the report and put in the correct forms, a program could be dropped that way if requested.

Faculty Chair Swan added that faculty would tell the BOR that the faculty has not looked at this, and that would prevent the Provost from doing so. The BOR would just know because faculty would tell them.

Senator Smith asked if faculty has a veto on those kinds of things?

Faculty Chair Swan responded that nobody does.

Senator Smith continued, when the committee worked on this there was a viewpoint to try to minimize the information and, recognizing that for most programs they will be pretty much "steady as she goes." He's not sure what pushed for the increase in the required information but a lot of that is not really required, it's just suggested. The argument is that if you feel that you want to make a case for your program to be viewed as in the top tier, or you want to make the argument, due to enrollment or other data, that it's vulnerable at the bottom then you make that case by bringing in this other data. He believes that for most programs people could write a five-page report and it would be just fine. Within the committee a number of people said this could be an opportunity and faculty should be encouraged. This is good but if you're spending all your time getting data you're not going to spend time thinking. He personally would encourage faculty to spend some time thinking and writing it up. Where there's required data his sense is that most of it is stuff that faculty can get off Dr. Kaparthi's database which has already been provided.

Senator Yehieli commented on Senator Soneson's motion of taking money from athletics and putting it in academics, she would be supportive of that general concept if it were even broader, not just athletics. There are a number of different elements, custodians, food service, facilities planning and if there was a broader statement saying that we are an academic organization first and that should be the final priority and not specify which line item money should come out of.

Chair Wurtz stated that we can certainly look at the total package, but it does acknowledge that there are all these pieces to the organization and they need to work together.

Chair Wurtz noted that the meeting deadline of 5:00 is fast approaching and questioned if anything would be accomplished if the Senate extends past that. There is a backlog of work in front of the Senate but that's ok because we do what's important. There are two items that have been docketed and which have both been tabled. Where does the Senate want to go?

Senator Soneson asked if it would be possible to get the minutes of this discussion out to the faculty before next Monday? It would be helpful for the faculty across campus to read what has been discussed and get back to senators to provide them with more information and insight.

Chair Wurtz reiterated that she is scheduled to give a final next Monday at 3:00 and would be very unhappy at a Faculty Senate meeting when her academic duties call.

Faculty Senate Secretary Dena Snowden suggested sending the minutes to the Senators for their review and email approval, and which can then be sent to the faculty. Faculty will have sufficient time to review those minutes and get their responses to senators prior to the next meeting, January 12, 2009. There just wouldn't be sufficient time for her to get the minutes transcribed and for faculty to review them before a meeting next Monday.

Senator Soneson asked the senate what their sentiment is on this.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas noted that she doesn't think this will stop the process but she does think it was good to get something on the table, to have this discussion. She also thinks its good to get this information out to the faculty as soon as possible but feels January is soon enough. The discussion today will not preclude us from writing these reports over Christmas.

Senator Heidstad commented that regardless of how the minutes are circulated, finalized form or draft form, expecting colleagues to read them yet this week given it's the last week of classes is asking a lot. Even scheduling a meeting for next Monday we might feel as though we didn't give people enough time to give us feedback.

Senator Funderburk stated that he also senses that what the Senate would really like is to have this kind of discussion with the Provost. It's unfortunate that he was not able to be here today and until that discussion happens there are a lot of people that aren't going to be satisfied.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate can ask for a Consultative Session.

Senator Soneson moved to table his motion until the January 12, 2009 meeting at which the Senate would like to have a Consultative Session with Interim Provost Lubker; second by Senator Smith. Motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Bruess to adjourn; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:52 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary

Committee on Scholarly/Creative Activity & Service Report on Service at the University of Northern Iowa

October 2, 2008

Philip Mauceri, Political Science & Committee Chair; Alan Asher, Library; Mark Bauman, Accounting; Jeffrey Elbert, Chemistry; Joel Haack, College of Natural Sciences; Sam Lankford, HPELS; Jerome Soneson, Philosophy & World Religions; Katherine Van Wormer, Social Work.

I. Areas of Concern: Criteria, Evaluation & Standards for Service

The committee strongly believes that service is an important responsibility of faculty at the University of Northern Iowa and an essential aspect of faculty development. The committee also views professional service as a key component of successful faculty governance and a major source of the cultural and intellectual life of the community. As a result, we believe that university citizenship and a culture of service need to be promoted across campus, for the well being of faculty, the university and the community. The committee recognizes that there are a wide range of activities that are considered under the rubric of service at UNI, and believes that faculty in each department are the best judges as to what is appropriate to their professional field. After a preliminary discussion, we reviewed the service sections of PAC procedures from all departments and the service sections of the Faculty Activity Reports used by colleges. In reviewing these documents and in our discussions, the committee identified several areas of concern:

1. Many departments either did not explicitly mention service as a requirement for tenure and/or promotion or provided vague general references.
2. Given the general "lore" that service does not count for much in tenure and promotion decisions, it is not surprising that most PAC procedures lack an explicit mention of how service contributes to professional development.
3. Many PAC documents and Faculty Activity Reports require a mere listing of committees/activities that "count" for service without an elaboration of the effort, time or outcome of such service.
4. The absence of specific benchmarks and definitions of the quantity and quality of service obligations required for tenure and/or promotion.
5. The lack of any mention as to how service activities should be documented for tenure and/or promotion.
6. The unequal burden that falls on women and minorities in the area of service. As the university strives to ensure diverse representation on committees, women and minorities are likely to be called upon more

frequently for service. For instance, with women making up 41 percent of tenured and tenure track faculty at UNI (fall 2007), there is clearly a greater likelihood they will be selected for committees more often than their male counterparts to ensure diversity. In our discussions with Phyllis Baker, Director of the Women's and Gender Studies Program on campus it was revealed that studies have found women generally spend more time on committee service than their male counterparts; with attitudes on gender roles playing a major role. Given that the current reward structure in tenure and/or promotion traditionally undervalues service, women and minorities are clearly disadvantaged for their service activities.

II. Recommendations on Criteria, Evaluation and Standards for Service

Based on the concerns expressed, members of the committee voiced a strong belief in the need for clearly stated criteria in the area of service with precise language on how service contributes to tenure and/or promotion. The committee also believes that service needs to be more explicitly part of the mix in the tenure and/promotion process. The object of PAC documents in this area should be to provide faculty with transparent and objective guidelines. To address these issues, the committee suggests the adoption of the following recommendations by all Deans and Heads, their inclusion in departmental PAC procedures and where relevant, in university documents pertaining to service:

- All department PACs are encouraged to explicitly state in their procedures that service is considered a requirement for tenure and/or promotion at the University of Northern Iowa.
- The committee strongly believes that service is an important part of the tenure and/or promotion process, and would urge PAC documents to make explicit that service is considered part of the mix when PACs and Heads consider the professional attainments of faculty. In this same vein, we suggest that

department, college, and university documents dealing with promotion and tenure provide a general statement regarding the importance of service in professional development and its centrality in maintaining and promoting faculty governance.

- The committee encourages PACs and Heads to focus on the quality of service done by faculty and to move beyond lists of committees and activities. Just as teaching and scholarship evaluations for tenure and/or promotion attempt to assess the contribution of faculty in these areas, we believe the focal point in assessing service should be the contributions of faculty in the area of service.
- The committee urges PACs and Heads provide specific benchmarks and definitions of the quantity and quality of service obligations that are considered important in tenure and/or promotion decisions.
- PAC procedures should clearly explain the evidence required to document service activities, just as teaching and scholarship files include evidence of accomplishments. Such documentation could include letters of evaluation from committee chairs on which faculty have served, certificates of participation, copies of final reports from the committee or the minutes of committee meetings, or copies of media reports about key off-campus events involving a faculty member's participation.
- To address the unequal burden of service that fall on women and minorities in the area of service, the committee urges PACS and Heads above all, to be sensitive to the often heavy burdens borne by minority and women faculty who disproportionately serve on committees, mentor students and engage in other service oriented activities. In practical terms however, the committee suggests that departments address this inequity by a) valuing service when figuring merit pay on an equal basis with teaching and scholarly/creative activity, b) make service activities a greater part of the mix in determining tenure and/or promotion, and c) adoption of the idea of Alternative Assignment Portfolios (AAPs), proposed in the committee's earlier report on scholarly and creative activities, to provide alternative portfolios

for tenured Associate Professors. This would allow those faculty with tenure to not be disadvantaged if they choose to focus more of their efforts in the area of service.

III. Impediments to Service at UNI and Recommendations for Change

In discussing the role of service at UNI, the committee explored the challenges and difficulties that faculty face that might explain the generally low ranking given to service obligations. What follows are some of the key impediments the committee focused on and recommendations on ways by which these impediments can be reduced.

1. **Downplaying service obligations by Heads, PAC and other faculty:** Many junior faculty members are told either explicitly or implicitly that service should not be a priority for tenure and promotion, and should therefore be minimized. The message is reinforced by the unclear expectations and criteria for service obligations in PAC procedures. The committee believes that if first year faculty engage in no service and service obligations are kept to a minimum during their probationary period, service will be viewed as a burden later on, making it more difficult to develop a "culture of service" that will remain with faculty throughout their careers.

Recommendation: All members of the faculty during their first year of probationary status should be expected to do service and be judged on this criteria by the PAC as a way to instill and maintain a sense of professionalism and community in the university. The committee believes this is essential if a culture of service is to be inculcated in faculty.

2. **Poorly organized committees and meetings without clear objectives:** Faculty often associate "service" with committees that have poorly defined goals with little impact on the running of the university. Time is seen as eaten up by a "black hole" of service commitments that produce either no impact on the university, or

else a miniscule result in comparison with the time dedicated to meetings.

Recommendations: Standing committees should produce annual reports of their accomplishments that are widely circulated throughout their respective colleges or the university. Ad-hoc committees should produce a final report that is made available to the university community. Committees should explore the usefulness of a web page link that provides updated information on committee activities. In addition, a review of college and university committee structures should take place on a regular basis, focused on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of committees on campus and phasing out committees whose tasks can be more effectively done through other means.

3. **No tangible rewards for service:** Aside from a bit more merit pay, there is no clear reward structure for doing service, let alone for developing a sustained commitment to service.

Recommendations: Departments should think creatively about incentives and rewards for faculty who excel in the area of service. Measures ranging from formal recognition and appreciation during department meetings or other events to departmental awards in recognition of service (perhaps involving special fund raising coordinated with the Foundation), should be considered. Moreover, the committee suggests that the distribution of merit should provide for an equal valuation of service with research and teaching, as a way to emphasize to faculty the importance of service. As was noted in the scholarly/creative activity report issued by this committee earlier, we recommend the idea of Alternative Assignment Portfolios (AAPs) to provide alternative portfolios for tenured Associate Professors. The committee believes this system will encourage greater service among faculty by leaving open the possibility of promotion to full professor based in part on exceptional performance in the area of service.

4. **The Competency Gap:** As with research and teaching, engaging in service requires a specific set of skills, particularly inter-personal skills and knowledge of

how a modern university functions. Faculty who are deficient in these skills are often sidelined in the service area, as Heads and Deans turn towards more "effective" faculty to engage in service tasks. This in turn results in an unequal distribution of the service load in units.

Recommendations: Just as the university offers support to improve scholarship/creative activity and teaching, the committee believes UNI should address the competency gap by offering greater support for faculty in the area of service. Faculty development in this area could be coordinated by the new Center for Teaching and Learning and involve workshops on such topics as how the university works, issues in higher education or managing committee meetings. The committee believes that since competency in the area of service depends upon inter-personal, communication and management skills, much like teaching effectiveness, the new Center might be the place where remedial efforts and mentoring of faculty in these areas would occur.

5. **Declining Community Identity:** Social scientists have noted for sometime now the decline of "social capital" in the US, and a concomitant growth in individualist orientations and atomistic behaviors. Among faculty this means a decline in institutional loyalty and a growing focus on their own agendas and career paths. The appeal to service as an obligation to the university community clearly has less resonance with such faculty.
6. **Burn Out:** Senior professors may justify avoiding service obligations by noting that a) they have already done their "fair share" b) issues are viewed as the same dealt with earlier in their careers and no improvements are possible c) a disconnection with the university in general takes hold as they move into an unofficial early phased retirement period.

Recommendations for points 5 & 6: The committee strongly believes that a commitment to service cannot be fostered without maintaining a strong sense of being part of a larger community working toward common goals. Greater efforts need to be undertaken here, both for junior and senior faculty, based on extending

networking opportunities, friendships and collaborative intellectual dialogues and projects. At the most basic level, more "space" needs to be created where faculty can interact freely. This can range from a common faculty lounge or dining space on campus (which was phased out a decade ago) where faculty can meet informally, network and socialize to more organized activities targeted for the professional development of faculty at all levels.

IV. Conclusion

With the completion of this report, the Committee on Scholarly/Creative Activity and Service has concluded its mission. We believe there are serious deficiencies in the way service is currently promoted and evaluated and urge serious consideration of our analysis and recommendations. Our purpose here is to present to administrators and faculty across campus with what we see as the main problems and challenges in the area of service as a starting point for serious discussions and changes that can enhance the academic life of the university and contribute to faculty development.