

4-23-2018

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 23, 2018

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2018 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, April 23, 2018" (2018). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 1221.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1221

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.

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
04/23/18 (3:30 – 5:16)
Mtg. #1808
SUMMARY MINUTES

Courtesy Announcements

No members of the Press were present.

President **Nook** expressed appreciation for the positive response to the Tropical Celebration Day, provided an update on State financing, and thanked faculty for their hard work this semester.

Provost **Wohlpart** thanked and praised the work of the Faculty Evaluation and Faculty Handbook Committees which he termed “collaborative, inclusive, and really remarkable.”

Associate Provost **Pease** shared preliminary findings from the task force on Academic Probation and Suspension which shows that some groups of students are disproportionately suspended more frequently than others. **(See pages 7-9)**

Faculty Chair **Kidd** thanked those who have worked with him during the last six years in his role on Faculty Senate and as Faculty Chair and announced that Barbara **Cutter** will serve as Faculty Chair for the 2018-2019 year.

United Faculty Vice-President Becky **Hawbaker** named those who received awards at the recent Faculty Appreciation Dinner, announced that the United Faculty recertification vote will be held the last two weeks in October, mentioned the number of faculty assisted, and is “proud of the collaborative tone of problem solving” used by United Faculty. **(See pages 10-12)**

Conducting his final Faculty Senate meeting of the year, Chair **Walter** thanked those who supported him and presented certificates of appreciation to Senators whose terms are expiring.

Minutes for Approval Apr 9, 2018 – Summary Minutes & Transcript (Neibert/Mattingly)

Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

- ** (Strauss/Hakes)** Motion to docket for consideration today 1391, 1392, 1393, 1394, 1395 and 1396:
- 1391 Emeritus Request, **Wurtz** - M. Susan, Associate Professor – Management <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-wurtz-m-susan-associate-prof-management>
- 1392 Emeritus Request, Prof Jay **Lees** - Dept. History <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-prof-jay-lees-dept-history>
- 1393 Merger of departments of Educational Psychology & Foundations and Educational Leadership & Postsecondary Education) <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/merger-departments-educational-psychology-foundations-and>
- 1394 Emeritus Request for Victoria **Robinson**, Professor of Education & EdD. Graduate Coordinator <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-victoria-robinson-professor-education-edd>
- 1395 Emeritus Request for Leroy **Crist**, Instructor, Dept. of Accounting <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-leroy-crist-instructor-dept-accounting>
- 1396 Emeritus Request for Robert **Washut**, Professor, School of Music <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-robert-washut-professor-school-music>
- ** (Zeitz/Skaar)** Motion to docket emeritus requests 1390, 1391, 1392, 1394, 1395 and 1396 for consideration today at top of the docket. Passed.

New Business: Executive Session: (3:54-4:02)

Election of Faculty Senate Vice-Chair: James **Mattingly**.

Consideration of Docketed Items:

1277/1390 Emeritus Request for Melissa L. **Beale**, Professor, Communication Studies <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-melissa-l-beale-professor-communication> **(See page 20)**

**** (Skaar/Stafford)** Passed.

Emeritus Requests as follows: Wurtz, Lees, Robinson, Crist, Washut:

**** (Smith/Varzavand)** Passed.

1279/ 1391 Emeritus Request, **Wurtz** - M. Susan, Associate Prof – Management <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-wurtz-m-susan-associate-prof-management> **(See pages 20-21)**

1280/1392 Emeritus Request, Prof Jay **Lees** - Dept. History (See page 22)
<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-prof-jay-lees-dept-history>

1282/1394 Emeritus Request for Victoria **Robinson**, Professor of Education & EdD. Graduate Coordinator <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-victoria-robinson-professor-education-edd> (See pages 22-24)

1283/1395 Emeritus Request for Leroy **Crist**, Instructor, Dept. of Accounting <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-leroy-crist-instructor-dept-accounting> (See page 24)

1284/1396 Emeritus Request for Robert **Washut**, Professor, School of Music <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-robert-washut-professor-school-music> (See pages 24-25)

1250/1361 **Faculty Handbook Committee Consultation** (See pages 32-45)
<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/faculty-handbook-committee-consultation>

1273/1386 **Reconsideration of Honor System for University of Northern Iowa**
** (Strauss/O’Kane) Motion to suspend discussion for top of docket, first meeting of 2018-2019 school year. Passed. <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/reconsideration-honor-system-university-northern-iowa>

1274/1387 **Suggested Modifications to the Criteria for Regents Award for Faculty Excellence**

** (Skaar/Mattingly) Motion to move discussion to first meeting of 2018-2019 school year. Passed. <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/suggested-modifications-criteria-regents-award-faculty>

** (Stafford/Strauss) Motion to extend meeting until 5:15 p.m. Passed.

1275/1388 **Modifications to Policy 4.21, Emeritus/a Status** (See pages 49-58)

** (Schraffenberger/Burnight) Motion to table for Fall 2018 meeting. Passed.
<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/modifications-policy-421-emeritusa-status>

Adjournment (Skaar/Smith) 5:16 p.m. by acclamation.

Next Meeting: 3:30 p.m. Monday, August 27, 2018
301 Rod Library (Scholar Space) University of Northern Iowa,
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Complete transcript of 59 pages and nine addenda follows.

Regular Meeting
FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING

April 9th, 2018

Present: Senators Ann **Bradfield**, John **Burnight**, Seong-in **Choi**, David **Hakes**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, James **Mattingly**, Amanda **McCandless**, Peter **Neibert**, Steve **O’Kane**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Angela **Pratesi**, Jeremy **Schraffenberger**, Nicole **Skaar**, Sara **Smith**, Gloria **Stafford**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Shahram **Varzavand**, Faculty Senate Chair Michael **Walter**, and Senator Leigh **Zeitz**. Also: NISG Representative Kristin **Ahart**, United Faculty Vice-President Becky **Hawbaker**, Faculty Chair Tim **Kidd**, U.N.I. President Mark **Nook**, Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**, Provost Jim **Wohlpert**, Associate Provost John **Vallentine**.

Not present: Senator Lou **Fenech**.

Guests: Brenda **Bass**, Lyn **Countryman**, Susan **Etscheidt**, Benjamin **Forsyth**, Carissa **Froyum**, Gaetane **Jean-Marie**, Kate **Martin**, Paul **Shand**.

CALL TO ORDER

Walter: I will call this final meeting of the fiscal year 2018 of the UNI Faculty Senate to order, and we will begin as usual by thanking the President for invoking spring with a really silly proclamation. That’s why we’re dressed like this.

Wohlpert: I want to point out that not all of us are dressed this way. I want to point out there are some ties in the room.

Walter: Gelato. There's no down-side to this really. It's wonderful. President **Nook**, please.

Schraffenberger: I never had to apologize for wearing a tie. [Laughter]

COMMENTS FROM PRESIDENT NOOK

Nook: There is also Italian Ice. If you want some, do not hesitate to get one. I don't even know what flavors are left, but if you want one, hold your hand up and we'll make sure the box comes over to you. They are pretty good. We've gotten rid of about 700 of them over at the office this afternoon, so it's been pretty good. First of all, just thank you. I've been around campus a little bit today. It's been a pretty good day. Attitudes changed a little bit. That has more to do with the weather than any silly proclamation. But it has been kind of fun. As we were handing out treats, we had one impromptu musician set. Doug **Shaw** showed up with his ukulele and sang "5,000 Miles." And then the flute choir showed up. That was not impromptu, but no one planned it, except for them. And what an amazing job. It's such a great pleasure and a great treasure to work at an institution where you've got musicians of that caliber that will just drop by and serenade the office. It was a lot of fun. I tried to convince my wife that I arranged it for her birthday, but that's still two months away. [Laughter] The one sort of real University update: We've been working on the budget. We still don't know where we're at with the State legislature. They are now nearly a week past at least the day when they stop getting payments for per diem and things like that. I

am expecting that they'll finish up—come to an agreement—between the House and the Senate on their budget targets probably this week. We don't really know yet. There's a real philosophical divide. They are within \$5 million, which to you and me sounds like a lot. But we're talking about a \$7 billion-plus budget, so it's not all that much. That's just on the total number, and then there's some details under that. The House has started to move things anyway and the Senate I think is going to start to move some things as well. So, we'll keep you tuned in to that as much as possible. We do know that both the House and the Senate, as well as the Governor, the budget is bigger next year than it is this year in total for the State. There's going to be some expanded spending, whether or not we get any of that isn't known. Higher Ed's always been under a little bit of a target, at least in the last couple of sessions, so we don't know where that's going. We've heard friendly news that we might get something. We heard other news that Higher Ed isn't going to get much. So right now, we really don't know anything until the final bills start to come out. Even the House bill that came out didn't say how they were going to divide it up—just what the total number was. What we would get wasn't in there. So we're just sort of sitting back and relaxing. I've heard it's been a big day at the Capitol. Mary **Braun**, our legislative liaison has been running around the Capitol throwing leis on people and taking their pictures, so UNI's Tropical Celebration Day has even hit Des Moines. She said it's been kind of fun and they're reacting and responding well. I haven't seen her with the Governor yet, or the Speaker of the House or Senate yet, but we're keying in on those three as well. As we get near the end here, again thank you for this semester. It has seemed longer than most because the winter dragged on quite a little bit. That always makes attitudes a little harder to keep in line. It makes it a little easier for

students to continue to study, but not when they get as down as what we saw with some of this weather. The work that you do helps us get those students the education that they really need to go out and do wonderful things, and more than anything else, it helps them keep their heads on straight as we work through the end of the semester. So thank you for everything you've done for these students and for this University and continue to do. It's greatly appreciated. Thank you.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST WOHLPART

Wohlpert: I want to keep my comments brief. I want to thank the Faculty Evaluation Committee and Faculty Handbook Committee. They've done an enormous amount of work this year that I think is really remarkable and phenomenal. As I've read final drafts that have been approved by the Evaluation Committee, the Handbook Committee, I've had no changes at all. I find this work to be collaborative, inclusive, and really remarkable. So we need to find ways to thank them down the road as this unfolds. I do want to turn this over to Patrick (**Pease**) for a couple of comments if I might, on some of the work he's doing that faculty should be aware of.

COMMENTS FROM ASSOCIATE PROVOST PEASE

Pease: Thanks a lot. I mentioned to this body a few weeks ago that I put together a task force on Academic Probation and Suspension and Peter (**Neibert**) had agreed to be on that. I just wanted to give you a really quick update. The task force put together to look at a couple of things: One was how long our suspensions are, and the other is as to whether there's some alternative

pathways to suspension that might support student success a little bit better. We've met a couple of times, and where we left it as a committee the last time was for me to get together with institutional research, and begin to look at some data, and really try to determine first if suspensions are doing the kinds of things we want them to do, or whether they're creating their own issues. And I thought I'd just share really quickly without giving you a lot of details—I'll eventually have a report together and I'll share this with you, but not surprisingly, suspensions are disproportionately hitting certain types of students. For example, minority students are ten percentage points higher than they should be for suspensions. Males are 25% above their proportion for the total population in terms of suspensions. So they are dramatically over-represented. There are some variances in colleges, but maybe more interesting there is strong correlations between things like U-bills, Pell-eligible, and expected family contributions, which are all indicators of need, and across the board in every one of those, we're finding our students with higher amounts of needs are dramatically over-represented in the suspension-population. Perhaps the most significant one is that for students who go on suspension, we looked at the amount of time it takes for them to come back in terms of one semester, two semesters. And there are data in there, but the striking numbers: 77% of students never return to UNI. So, suspension is—seems to be driving students away. They're not coming back. They're not leaving, getting their act together, solving the problems and coming back. They're simply not coming back. And so I think that those numbers help to justify what we're going to be doing with this task force. So, in the fall we'll be coming back with some actual recommendations. So what we're going to do is set ourselves up the end of this semester to know where we're going forward. That

we'll have some actual recommendations in the fall. So, I thought those number were stark enough that I would share them with you.

Walter: I'm glad you did. 77%!

Zeitz: Is that the way it usually is? Is it usually 77%?

Pease: That is the...

Zeitz: ...at other schools?

Pease: I don't know about other schools. So that time frame is from 2012-2017. So it's not just a one-year blip, but I don't know and to be honest I don't know how we'd get at how other...what the rates are at other schools.

Zeitz: It seems if you're at a school and they rejected you, the chances are good that you wouldn't want to go back. I can see bringing support and things like that to help them succeed, how that could bring them back.

Pease: For lack of what we might call it, to have a "suspension in place," might be a better way. One of the things that we are going to do is bounce these numbers off the clearinghouse though, and see if the students are enrolling in other campuses. We just know they're not coming back but we don't know what happens to them after that. So that's the data piece we still need to put together.

Nook: We can get that information. They're asking about whether the 77% is unique here, or whether it's normal across other institutions like us. It's possible especially through AASC&U through their Provost of Provosts, to have him put out

a blip to the other institutions like us, and they can send back that information if they have it. It's not a scientific survey, but we don't really need that here. We need to know if we're in the right ballpark, right? So we can get some of that kind of information at the point we pull things together and decide if it would be really helpful for us to look at how we're doing.

Pease: That's great. We'll try to take a look at that.

Walter: Thanks. Chair **Kidd**, what do you have to say for yourself?

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR KIDD

Kidd: I'm almost done. How many of you were here six years ago? Was anybody here? So like six years ago Betty **DeBerg** invited me to come to the Senate for a little protest and that was fun. I got to sit down and look a couple of people in the eye--a President and the Provost who were trying to shut down my program, and I got to feed them numbers, and luckily it all worked out at the end. So, that's been six years, so I'm kind of looking forward to getting back into my research and worrying about my department, and letting you guys take over in the business of life. And we have an announcement of who is going to replace me?

Petersen: Yes, are we making it? [Laughter]

Kidd: I'm excited. Go forward!

Petersen: Barbara **Cutter** will be our next [Faculty Chair]. [Applause]

Walter: It doesn't require a Senate nod or anything.

Petersen: She won the election that closed last week. It was an at-large election.

Kidd: That's going to be great. She's wonderful and thank you all for putting up with me, and I hope I haven't been too much of a problem—just a little bit every once in a while.

Walter: It depends on who you ask. [Laughter]

Kidd: That's it, thanks.

Walter: Becky [**Hawbaker**] would you like to say a little something from United Faculty?

Hawbaker: I want to echo the thanks to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and Faculty Handbook Committee. I want to thank everyone who came to the United Faculty Appreciation Dinner and to let you know some of the awards we gave out that night. Our United Faculty Members of the Year included Jim **Mattingly** who is here today and Francis **Degnin** from Philosophy & World Religions. Our Department Liaison of the Year was Elizabeth **Sutton** from Art. Our Emerging Leader of the Year was Amandajean **Freking Nolte** from Communications. Our Administrator of the Year was Paul **Shand**. Legislator of the Year was Bill **Dotzler** and the Friend of United Faculty—we had two awards, one to the Iowa Labor Center, Jennifer **Sherer**, and the other to Kira **Schuman** from AAUP, who's been really instrumental in helping us with recertification and other efforts. Speaking of that, we've been doing some office visits and listening tours to meet with faculty. We're trying to get to everyone—we probably won't by the end of the year—we've hit about 200, and so we're just trying to spread the word about the

recertification vote and asking for you to commit to voting ‘yes,’ so here is one of the cards you might be seeing soon, and hopefully you’re seeing these cards around campus on people’s doors. Last time I was here I gave you some details about the recertification vote. It will be the last two weeks in October, but it won’t include the onerous pre-registration or four-part voting system, so it will be online, but it will be a little bit more streamlined than we had feared. Finally, as Carissa (**Froyum**) and I have wrapped up the end of the year, we were sort of comparing our notes about just how many faculty the two of us have worked with or helped throughout the year. And just between the two of us, this isn’t even including Joe (**Gorton**) we’ve assisted more than 50 faculty members with issues large and small, and what I guess I’m most proud of is that we only had to bring 15 to 20 of those forward for assistance with administration, and that when we did that we haven’t had to file a grievance or a formal petition since June, and so I’m really proud of that collaborative tone that we’ve been able to work together to solve problems and hopefully, that will continue. So, we’re looking forward to the start of the Benefits Committee and the Retirement Committee and the Budget Committee, and so that’s our UF update.

Walter: Thanks Becky (**Hawbaker**). From me personally, I want to thank you for the work that you’ve done with the Handbook Committee, and I think I got the impression from Tom (**Hesse**) that we actually have to button everything up in terms of the Handbook today—that’s not going to happen. We’re kind of rolling along, so even though the Handbook Committee Consultation is on the docket, it’s not completely finished. Would you venture a wild guess as to when this is going to be all done maybe? The wilder the better.

Vallentine: We're actually ready.

Walter: Are you? Okay. Alright. I was under the impression this was still a work in progress, but okay. Tom (**Hesse**) you were right. We're going to get to this at the top of the docket, but I may end up asking for a little adjustment. There's two things I don't want to do is run late, but that may happen, and I don't want to call another meeting. So as long as everybody knows.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR WALTER

Walter: So, my comments: I thank all of you for being so nice and friendly and informative and upfront with helping me run this sometimes a bit of a circus. This last week has been a little trying because a lot of stuff came in really late, so we kind of had to squiggle some things in under the calendar docket categories and we'll just do the best we can with those. We have a bunch of emeritus—four—five different emeritus requests, and a matter of some urgency that has to do with mergers of departments, and we'll try to pull a fast one and get that one on the docket. As I said to you in a couple of different notes I posted those way early, so I think you probably have had time to read all of these ahead of time. So, one thing, Jim (**Wohlpert**) would you like to—your signature's the last one on here, so why don't you just go ahead and do this right now?

Wohlpert: You want me to hand these out?

Walter: Do you mind? These are certificates of thanks for any and all of you and certain people in particular for serving on Faculty Senate. Can you announce the names?

Petersen: We have some individuals who sought re-election for a second term, and so there's a few individuals who will return.

Wohlpert: Do we know those names or if those elections have happened?

Petersen: They have happened.

Wohlpert: David **Hakes**. Dave is coming back whether he got re-elected or not—he's coming back.

Walter: Jeremy **Schraffenberger**.

Petersen: Not all of the college elections are complete. Two-thirds.

Walter: Bill **Koch**. Nikki **Skaar**. Lou (**Fenech**) is not here today.

Wohlpert: And then Michael **Walter**—did you get re-elected?

Walter: I can't be re-elected. This is the end of my second three-year term. I'm a free man. So, as usual, I'd like our guests to please stand and introduce yourselves briefly, and then tell us what you came here to attend to; if there's a particular item on the docket or the calendar that people are paying attention to, let us know what that is.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Shand: My name is Paul **Shand** and I'm from the Department of Physics; Head of the Department of Physics. I'm a member of the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Countryman: Lyn **Countryman**. I'm here to answer any questions on the merger.

Etscheidt: Susan **Etscheidt**, Department Head for Special Education, also here on the COE restructuring.

Forsyth: Department Head, Educational Psychology and Foundations. I'm here for Restructuring as well.

Bass: Brenda Bass. I'm Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and I'm here as a member of the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Froyum: Carissa **Froyum**. I am the Co-Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and I'm also on the Handbook Committee.

Martin: I'm Kate **Martin** from the Rod Library. I'm a member of the Faculty Handbook Committee.

Jean-Marie: Gaetane **Jean-Marie**, Dean of College of Education, and I may have to slip out at 4:00, but my colleagues are here.

Walter: Okay. Thank you for showing up and showing some concern for these topics. The next item up would be the approval of the minutes for April 9th over which Amy (**Petersen**) bravely shepherded this group. Thank you very much. I was in Chicago at the HLC meeting. You did a great job. Do I have a motion for approval of the minutes from April 9th? Moved by Senator **Neibert**, seconded by James **Mattingly**. All in favor of approving these minutes as written or discussing them—are there any discussion points we need to cover here first? All in favor of approving these minutes, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, same sign. Abstentions? The motion passes.

Considerations of Calendar Items for Docketing

Walter: Okay, so now what I referred to as “pulling a fast one,” we have a list of items here, items A-F, five of which are emeritus requests. Those in particular I want to move to the docket for discussion and voting. It’s going to be up to you. This is irregular because normally, two weeks pass between moving these from calendar to docket. We have a chance to examine the documents that support them, et cetera. So, I want to move those to the docket for quick execution today. We also have Calendar Item 1393, the Merger of Departments of Educational Psychology & Foundations and Educational Leadership & Postsecondary Education. That is a consultation, so we can move that to the docket and consult on that. So, I would like to hear a motion to move Items 1391, 1392, 1393, 1394 and 1395 and 1396 to the docket for discussion and vote. So moved by Senator **Zeitz**. Seconded by Senator **Skaar**. All in favor of moving those items to docket, please indicate by saying, ‘aye.’

Strauss: Could we have discussion first? What’s the purpose of bending these long-standing rules? Why are we doing this?

Walter: I think amongst the emeritus requests, all these people in terms of the documentation have served honorably and they deserve the recognition. One’s own personal opinion about the value of emeritus varies in this room quite a little bit, but from my standpoint, recognizing them as they retire is very important.

Strauss: But were these last-minute decisions on their part to seek emeritus?

Walter: You know, they kind of were. Some of them had them turned in on time, but some of them did not, and we have...I won't make a big fuss about it right now, but...

Strauss: No, I'm the one making a big fuss about it right now.

Wohlpert: It is a process and it goes through dean, department head and sometimes it takes a while to bubble up. Not always on the part of the faculty.

Strauss: Understood. Thank you.

Walter: I feel like we would be justified in bending our own habits a little bit to get this done. Further discussion?

Mattingly: 1393, the Merger of Departments, we're not going to vote on that today, right?

Walter: It's not a voteable matter. It's a consultation. We can still move it to the docket, and it will be up to you to decide whether you want to talk about it. It is a matter of some urgency, and some people have shown up to talk about that today, so I'd like to be able to discuss that today, if it's okay with everyone. Is everyone okay with that?

Wohlpert: If I could say, it also must go through the Board of Regents, and so it can't go to the Board of Regents until it comes here.

Walter: Yeah. There's a deadline on this that has to do with the June Board of Regents meeting.

Pease: We're hoping to get it in June. Otherwise, it's going to be fall before it's on the agenda and that delays the whole process and the programs.

Strauss: Is it my imagination, or is this the second time we've had a consultation with a major department decision? I think it was Technology that was dropping the Ph.D.

Walter: About three meetings ago.

Strauss: ... that got railroaded through at the last moment. Is that a trend that's going on in the Senate?

Skaar: This is not a change of major. It's just a merger of departments. No programs are being dropped at this moment.

Strauss: Okay.

Schraffenberger: And the technology, I think was part of the larger curriculum package.

Strauss: Fine. Thank you.

Walter: Further discussion points on this? So, all in favor of moving the five emeritus and the other item, 1393, to the docket for discussion and potentially for voting, please indicate by saying, 'aye.' Opposed, same sign. Abstentions? The motion passes. Done. So, we've got the certificates passed out. Thank you, Provost **Wohlpert**, so now we have to elect the next Vice-Chair. This calls for an

Executive Session. So if our administrators would be so kind as to vacate for a couple of minutes...

4:02: Senate Rises from Executive Session

Walter: Congratulations Senator **Mattingly**. You're our new Vice-Chair [Applause] Thanks to both of you for stepping up. That's excellent. So now, on to the Consideration of Docketed Items. I didn't stipulate necessarily when we voted about these calendar items whether they should be at the top of the docket or not. Were we to put them there, that would certainly help us get to things very quickly. I hope that's convincing, and that's actually what I would like to hear a motion about. Can I get a motion to move those items that we have just freshly moved from Calendar into Docket to the top of the Docket? Moved by Senator **Zeitz**. Seconded by Senator **Mattingly**. Any discussion on the point?

Considerations of Docketed Items

Burnight: As we do emeritus and emerita requests, should we move the item that is already on the docket up, too?

Walter: Right. Very good point. The emeritus request for Melissa **Beale** will also be bundled, so to speak, with the rest of those. So we'll have a chance to say what we like about these people, and there are some comments to be made about some of them obviously. So, I heard a motion. We had a second. Is there any further discussion on this? So, all in favor of moving those items, along with Melissa **Beale's** emeritus request all together to the top of the docket to be dealt with first, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstentions? The

motion passes. Let us dive right into this. I think we should probably deal with Professor Melissa **Beale**'s emeritus request first. Does anyone have any particular comments on this? Comments on the emeritus request by Professor **Beale**?

Wohlpart: She's a great faculty member and has done a lot of hard work.

Walter: And she gets to retire. Okay. So are there any further discussion points on the emeritus request by Professor Melissa **Beale**? So I would like to entertain a motion to vote on this emeritus request. Moved by Senator **Skaar**, seconded by Senator **Stafford**. All in favor of approving the emeritus request for Melissa **Beale**, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstentions? The motion passes.

Walter: I would bundle the rest, but some of them have generated some really interesting comments. Let's start off in order. Calendar Item 1391, the five emeritus requests that we just moved to the docket and then to the head of the docket, I would like to seek a motion to approve all of those. Moved by Senator **Strauss**, seconded by Senator **Hakes**. Discussion points? Shall we start off with Susan **Wurtz**, Associate Professor of Management.

Zeitz: I have something I'd like to contribute. I'd like to thank Dr. Susan **Wurtz** for her hard work in research involving Second Life Online Virtual World. She's done it from 2008 until present. She actually had a virtual island that was a UNI island, and I started working with her early on. I showed interest in it, so she built a building for me and we called it Dr. Z's. We felt that Dr. Z's Bar and Grill wasn't going to be appropriate. I taught classes in this virtual classroom and I engaged my students to explore the opportunities of Second Life in a virtual world. Beyond her assisting me, Susan worked with a number of UNI educators to create

interactive learning environments, where learning was not limited by the physical world, but rather enhanced through vision and opportunity. She did a lot.

Walter: I also have a short comment from Dr. **Iyer** in Marketing: Dr. Susan **Wurtz** in the Department of Management, College of Business has provided over 30 years of meritorious service. I highly recommend that she be given faculty emeritus status.” And then there’s several complimentary remarks. “Dr. **Wurtz** has provided important service roles most recently in the area of assessment and assurance of learning. Dr. **Wurtz** has also published in the areas of curricular implications of virtual worlds, and designing and delivering training.” Further?

Mattingly: I would like to add about Dr. **Wurtz**. She was in my department, just a couple of doors down from me. I served with her on some committees, several committees over the years. I knew her to be conscientious and engaged. She did a number of things around campus and in the community. She was Chair of this body as I understand it, and she also served on the Board of Directors with Exceptional Persons, Inc. in the local community. So I certainly believe that she deserves meritorious status.

Walter: Thank you. Other comments on Dr. **Wurtz**? Okay. Let’s move on to Professor Jay **Lees**, from the Department of History. I think there are a couple of people here that may have something to say about Professor **Lees**. From our guests, perhaps? I have a letter from Dr. Robert **Martin**. He says he is “delighted to support Jay **Lees**’ request for emeritus status after teaching for several years on a temporary basis at Tulane and Louisiana State University, Jay joined the Department of History and the University of Northern Iowa in August of ’87.

During his years at UNI, Professor **Lees'** career has demonstrated a commendable balance of scholarship, service, and teaching, which led in 2005 to his receipt of the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence. The breadth of his knowledge, his flair for the dramatic, and his commitment to students and to his ability to engage with them, has made him an exceptionally able and very popular teacher among those in his history courses, humanities classes, and honors seminars. His skill in the classroom was recognized in 2004 when he received the Class of 1943 award for Faculty Excellence in Teaching. He will be retired the end of June, 2018. He has admirably served the University of Northern Iowa for the last 31 years, and I trust you will honor his request for emeritus status." I only hope somebody writes something that nice for me when I decide to retire. Other comments on Dr. **Lees**? We have up next, an emeritus request for Victoria **Robinson**, Professor of Education and an E.D. coordinator. Comments about Dr. **Robinson**?

Skaar: Vickie (**Robinson**) is an excellent colleague in the College of Education. She was a faculty in Ed. Leadership, and when we lost our dean, she became Interim Dean, and did an amazing job of bringing back some morale in the College of Education after some less than ideal things had occurred in the College of Ed. And then when we were able to have an Educator Prep Chair and VP in the Provost's Office for Educator Prep, she took on that role as Gaetane (**Jean-Marie**) came on as dean and did excellent things in that role too. She is definitely UNI through and through and has been an amazing colleague.

Walter: Thank you.

Neibert: My first experience with Victoria (**Robinson**) was my first semester on campus. She reached out to me because she understood that I had some background in qualitative research and I served on my first Doc committee here on campus, and I was so impressed from that point because she was so kind. She did not know me that well, but she turned to me for all the qualitative stuff and it was really kind of cool. I also kind of echo that she did a phenomenal job as Interim Dean. She really did help with morale within the College of Ed, and she is very deserving of this.

Walter: Thank you very much.

Zeitz: I worked with Victoria **Robinson** since she was a social studies teacher and principal at Price Laboratory School. She has been a leader in preparing educational leaders who have made a significant difference in Iowa. She has been dedicated to the UNI Teacher Education Program throughout her career, and has made a significant impact on the program and on the educators of Iowa.

Walter: Other comments about Victoria **Robinson**'s request for emeritus status?

Wohlpert: Come join her celebration Monday at 2:30 in the Great Reading Room.

Walter: Great Reading Room Monday at 2:30. Excellent. No other comments? Shall we move to Leroy **Crist**, Instructor Department of Accounting. I have a short statement written by Professor **Iyer** in the Department of Marketing, "Leroy **Crist** has more than 20 years of meritorious service, including 11 years at UNI. During his time at UNI he taught courses in tax law and financing and accounting. He has published in numerous journals, including the top academic tax journal, *The Journal of American Taxation Association*," and several other nice comments

here. “Each spring, accounting students participating in the Vita Program,” (which we’re pretty successful, I understand) “meet with 250 or more clients from the Cedar Falls-Waterloo and surrounding communities, and prepare and submit federal and state tax returns.” Some concrete help there. That’s really excellent. Does anyone want to say anything about Leroy **Crist**? I did not know this person personally, but does anyone have comments about this?

Mattingly: Only that I didn’t work with him directly either, but he has been a constant presence around the college for some time and he will be missed.

Walter: Any other comments about Leroy **Crist**’s request for emeritus? Now this next one I’ll start off by reading this one. This is emeritus request for Robert **Washut**, School of Music. I’ll just read what Chris **Merz**, one of my favorite sax players has to say about him, “It hardly seems necessary to write in support of Bob **Washut**’s application for emeritus status. He is precisely the kind of person for whom this status was created. He has done more to enhance the reputation of our institution nationwide and even worldwide than any other single person I can think of. He is universally admired by all who come into contact with him—students, faculty, and members of the wider community. He routinely engages students throughout the country through his work as a clinician and guest composer-conductor. He maintains a high profile as a composer and performer across many idioms. Known primarily as a jazz composer, he has of late completed commissions that fall more into the contemporary/classical idiom, further widening his field. Within the musical community, Bob’s name is synonymous with UNI. On a personal note, Bob is entirely responsible for my being here. (This is Chris **Merz**.) He recruited me as a faculty member and

supported me as a mentor since my arrival in 2000. I can never repay that debt, but I hope that this letter in support of his application for emeritus status will be a small balance on that side of the ledger. Bob is a remarkable educator, artist, person, and friend. I cannot support him enthusiastically enough.” Wow.

Comments about Bob **Washut**’s request for emeritus status?

Strauss: I say we give it to him. [Laughter]

Walter: You know that he played as the lead keyboardist for Alto Maiz when they were still together. And he’s led Jazz Band I forever, and now Chris (**Merz**) is doing that. So he’s also a friend of mine, so I sort of favored that a little bit. Okay, so I think I will ask for motion now that that’s on the docket to approve all of the emeritus requests that we just did: **Wurtz, Lees, Robinson, Crist,** and **Washut**, all together. Moved by Senator **Smith**, seconded by Senator **Varzavand**. All in favor of those just named, please indicate by saying ‘aye,’ opposed, ‘nay.’ Abstentions? The motions pass. Okay. Great.

Walter: Amongst the items that were moved up to the top of the docket, this is the last one that will actually jump to the top of the docket, is this consultation on the merger of departments of Ed Psych et cetera. I want to open this up for discussion, and I think Patrick (**Pease**) you probably have something to say about this.

Pease: I can introduce it. There are other people here to answer questions.

Walter: That would be great. Thank you very much.

Pease: This is something coming out of the College of Education. The reason it’s coming out at this time of year is just the process that they engaged in, and the

amount of time it took to go through that process. The reason we're try to get it in this year was pointed out. We're trying to get it approved through the June meeting at the Board of Regents. Programs cannot make any sort of official changes until the Board of Regents has approved those, and so if this was approved in fall, this is pushes back the date that they can make some moves and make some progress in there, and so this is for the benefit of those programs to come back in the fall and actually make some kind of progress toward this plan.

Walter: Do you feel like this has received enough scrutiny?

Pease: Me? Sure. This is not my program, so I don't want to speak too much for folks back there, but this went through a process. It went through department processes. It's gone through a senate process (the college senate process) and now it's here. And so it's certainly gone through the various steps along the way, and so it's been vetted in that college and with those programs, and so it's just seeking confirmation here. Perhaps it's maybe better to turn over. Would you answer that question the same?

Walter: Would our guests want to address that?

Countryman: The senate hasn't ever voted on it. They just...

Walter: Which senate?

Countryman: facilitated—the College of Ed Senate, just facilitated a forum and there was a lot of discussion by faculty there, and then we did a vote for the College of Ed and it wasn't definitive. It was 37 plus 21 opposed so...

Pease: 47. It was 47 in favor.

Countryman: 47? Okay.

Etscheidt: Just a little bit on the timeline. This would have started on August, 2017 and then the inter-departmental discussion from September through November, 2017. And then the three departments that were engaged in the conversation met December the 8th. Again, the proposal went to the dean in December, 2017 and then in January is when we began to move this process forward. So that's just sort of a chronology of events.

Walter: Our guests, if you could just mention your last name briefly first to make Kathy's life a little bit simpler. Go ahead please.

Etscheidt: Susan **Etscheidt**, Department of Special Education.

Walter: Thank you.

Forsyth: Benjamin **Forsyth** in Ed Psych and Foundations. So, this actually happened even earlier than August of 2017. In the spring of 2017 we were approached about the possibility of merging. At least Ed Psych and Foundations began at that point starting to talk with others to see what their thoughts were. Not only internal discussions, but across the other two departments—Special Education and Ed Leadership, and Post-secondary Education. There's been multiple levels of discussion, not just within departments, but across. There was one College of Ed Senate forum that happened. Small conferences between the three department heads, and then going back out to the three departments to discuss what those discussions were. Ultimately, it's just two of the three

departments coming together, but that was the charge that somehow three needed to become two.

Walter: That was the initial charge since June of 2017?

Forsyth: It would have been still during the spring 2017 semester when Dean **Gaetane** came to speak to us in a department meeting.

Pease: I'll point out why it may seem it's coming through quickly here: This is really about trying to close the end of the loop with the Board of Regents as a last part of the process, but the process itself has been going on for almost a year.

Neibert: I'd just add too that it's a similar process of course that we went through when the School [Price Lab] disbanded and the Provost brought forward to the Senate at that time also, so they've done a lot of work getting to this point, similar to what we did, and I think it's going to be better for the entire college.

Etscheidt: I would echo what Dr. **Skaar** said too, this isn't a curricular issue. I wanted to highlight that.

Schraffenberger: With 21 votes against, was there a sense that all of those 21 votes were voting 'nay' for the same reason? In other words, was there a bloc of people who were against this for some specific reason?

Countryman: There's no way to know that.

Forsyth: I can add to that. She's right. There's no way to really know how that bloc was, but if you look---the three departments: Special Ed, Foundations, ELPE

(Educational Leadership Postsecondary Education), one of the three smallest departments was in the College of Ed. For those that were in attendance at that meeting where the vote was done, 21 is more than there were of those three departments, so there would have been votes elsewhere.

Countryman: Across the College.

Forsyth: Across the College, but how much—there's no way to know that.

Schraffenberger: There was no discussion about people who were against it—you can't give us just a sense of the conversations that were going on at the meeting?

Forsyth: So at that meeting, there wasn't discussion. It was a vote taken. But prior to that, probably the most influential meeting was maybe two months before that where the three departments came together and talked for over two hours.

Countryman: Yes. At the forum.

Forsyth: Actually, after the forum.

Countryman: Oh, okay.

Forsyth: There was the forum meeting and then maybe a month after that, the three departments came and discussed, and at one point there were six proposals made. Through that two-hour meeting, we got it down to two of them. A vote was made, and a third one was added at the end, and then when those votes happened, that third added option was the one most voted upon. So, there was some concern about the fact that you had lots of time to discuss, but then the

third thing that was added showed up late. But ultimately, it was voted on, and there was a majority vote for it.

Walter: Clear enough. So again, we're not voting on this. This is a consultation, so does anyone have anything else to add to this? Questions about it?

Strauss: [to Senator **Neibert**] This is going to make the college better. What did you mean by that?

Neibert: I think that it—it's just my opinion of course. The same things as with discussions and such, one of the things it did for us in our area was that we had two seats at the table now, instead of just one. But also I think it helps to streamline the rest of the College of Ed to make us a little bit leaner and more responsive; responsible in regards to those areas. That's not just my opinion, but one shared among many faculty throughout the College of Education.

Forsyth: Total number of departments is now exactly the same as it was pre-KOS split and pre-ELPE-EF merge. It has fostered a lot of discussion about who we are, what's our identity? What are our strengths? Who do we align with? How can we make this work? And even at one point it was discussed about at the Provost's level, do we really want to have small departments? And again, these are—were the three smallest departments in the College of Ed.

Petersen: I just wanted to add, I think some of the concerns—getting at your question Jeremy (**Schraffenberger**) included process-related concerns. I think there was a desire from a group of people to consider a merger that might include more than the three that we were tasked to consider. So I think people were

hoping to have a little more information, and a bigger opportunity in terms of looking across all of the departments in the College to maybe reconfigure more than the three that we were tasked with.

Schraffenberger: It was like a limited menu, in other words? Or a sense of a limited menu?

Petersen: Right.

Countryman: I think there's a difference between the process that KOS went through and this process. This process started at the top, and that process started at the bottom. Don't you think that's fair?

Forsyth: That is fair.

Etscheidt: And I do think as Amy (**Petersen**) suggested, it started out large and again with invitations to consider, a reorganization that might involve other departments, and this then throughout the discussions it was narrowed to...

Forsyth: The feedback, as we look to go beyond those three—the feedback that we would get would be—no, stay looking at just the three. But there was interest in looking beyond. And there still is. Yeah.

Walter: Further questions? Further points? So, this is a just a consultation. We don't vote. Patrick (**Pease**) have you heard enough of what you need to hear from us?

Pease: Yes, I have.

Walter: Okay, so I will draw this consultation to a close and just mark it as done. Is everyone okay with that? Okay, good. So, next up Docket #1250, this is the Faculty Handbook Committee Consultation.

Vallentine: Thank you Michael (**Walter**). I can give you a brief update. There are some others here who will speak to you as well. So we're announcing updates and items for consultation with the Senate. All these items are on the Provost's website. I know you've been sent these documents, but if you want to look on the Provost's website under 'Current Initiatives' and 'The Faculty Handbook Committee,' you will see all of these documents. The Faculty Evaluation Committee consists of six members: half administration; half faculty. And the Faculty Handbook Committee, that's twelve people: six administrators, six faculty members. And if the members are here, could you raise your hand. If you look around the room you'll see that these folks will speak up, depending on what you're asking. So that's the Evaluation Committee and the Handbook Committee. I'll go through the various updates. First, is the Modified Duties. This is something new in the Handbook that will help out if you're on some type of illness or if you're on a pregnancy leave. There's many different reasons you would be gone, and let's say you were gone for twelve weeks during the semester and you would come back for the last four. Are you really going to take over your class during those last four weeks? Probably not, in the best interests of the students nor you as the professor, if someone else has been teaching for twelve weeks. So, it allows you to work with the department head and the dean to come up with some modified duties. That you would perhaps do a lot of department service that lasts four weeks, or some type of research project. But that would be

worked out with the faculty member and the department head and dean. So, that's basically what's in the 'Modified Duties.'

Vallentine: Next, the 'Professional Development Assignments,' we just moved that section. It has not been changed. It was in the 'Leaves' section of the Handbook because it used to be called a Professional Development Leave, for those that were here during that time period, and the terminology has changed so it made sense to move that to Chapter 4 in 'Workload.' Summer Research Fellowships—that was moved to Chapter 4 as well, because that is not a leave. It has more to do with workload. 'Sick Leave'—there has been some clarification on the use of sick leave and 'Family Caregiving Leave.' Early in the year we had a lot of confusion on how that was being interpreted, and we worked with Becky (**Hawbaker**) and United Faculty to come to an understanding and we're basically putting that into language that's more understandable now. We did have a Leaves Committee. It was a very large working group that was charged by the Faculty Handbook to work on Sick Leave and that group did a great job. So, the Sick Leave Policy is going to be much larger, you'll see next year. But the University of Iowa is also—whether they have wind—received wind that we were working on this, but they started a group on this and now, the Board Office would like to look at both policies. Obviously to see if there's alignment. Typically, with those types of policies, the Board Office wants to make sure that the institutions are being fair, and somewhat equal, even though there are some differences between Iowa, Iowa State, and our own policies.

Vallentine: For adjuncts, we considered some of the proposals there and I did pass that one out because this is the one that just passed today, but felt it was

best to get you that information so that it was in your hand, so that you can see that and we can certainly take any comments. In the next several weeks, if you have comments if you review that, you can certainly do that. Chapter 4 'Workload' has been updated a bit from the last Senate meeting, and that's also on the site as well. Then the Faculty Evaluation Committee—we have some representatives here, and they want to walk you through the Guiding Standards and I think Carissa (**Froyum**) is going to start with that, and then we have Paul **Shand** talking about Post-Tenure Review. So Carissa, could you update everybody on that please?

Froyum: I'd be happy to. You have a piece of Chapter 3 which is the evaluation chapter of the Handbook. So you know the Evaluation Committee has been—we've basically tackled Chapter 4, and are in the middle of drafts of various pieces of Chapter 3 and have had several faculty forums where we dealt with different pieces of Chapter 3. One of the things that we've been tasked with is creating University-wide General Guiding Standards for Evaluation. And you have a second draft of that before you. To give you a sense of what that would mean for departments, these would be the expectations for faculty at various ranks, and depending on their portfolios as defined in the Workload chapter. You'll remember from the Workload chapter that there's an option to have an Extended Teaching Portfolio that Tenured Faculty could choose to apply for, which would be teaching four classes and doing less research. So you'll see that we have a table before you that has the columns that are arranged by those different faculty workloads portfolios. And you'll also notice in the middle column, that there is a Lecturers and a Senior Lecturers status. Those are Contingent Faculty—Term and

Renewable Term, or Temporary Faculty who have been promoted. We're in the middle of trying to create a promotion ladder for our Contingent Faculty. So you'll notice a new status in here that doesn't yet exist, but it is included in our table. So, each of the sections of our workload teaching, scholarship, librarianship as well, and service have three different categories: Expectations for Meeting Expectations, those for Exceeding Expectations, and then those for Failing to Meet Expectations. What departments would be tasked with is making sure that their standards and specific criteria at all stages of evaluation align with these, and for departments that don't actually have those criteria written down actually having those criteria. So, we would appreciate your feedback on the content of the specific standards. As I've said, we've gone through two different iterations. We'll be working on this over the summer as well, so we would appreciate your feedback. You'll notice that we haven't yet tasked the librarians, but working with us to figure out theirs, so you have just big blanks. But this is something we'll be working on over the summer too, so please give us feedback. We would really appreciate that.

O'Kane: Is this a yearly kind of thing?

Froyum: What we're looking at right now in terms of evaluation is that there would be an annual evaluation of faculty, just like we have now, but shifting so that we don't have dual evaluations in a single year of faculty. Right now if you're probationary faculty, you're evaluated in the fall and then again in the spring using the FAR [Faculty Annual Report], so we would have an annual evaluation. Your departments would need to come up with specific criteria that at least align with these. These are General Guiding Standards for Annual Review, as well as

promotion and tenure, and then Post-tenure would be—Paul (**Shand**) will talk about how we're thinking about in a minute.

O'Kane: Particularly for Post-tenure, it seems like a three-year sliding average would be better, because we all have spikes. You may publish three papers this year; next year you don't publish one at all.

Froyum: So the departments themselves would be figuring out how much of what for Post-tenure review. We certainly recognize that people's careers change over time, and that there should be flexibility around, especially in terms of people who've already been tenured—what their work lives look like, and their work products.

Wohlpart: So Steve (**O'Kane**) this document doesn't say, "Here's what a faculty member needs to do each year."

O'Kane: Right.

Wohlpart: That will happen in the departments, based on this.

O'Kane: Okay.

Wohlpart: This will provide guidance for meeting expectations in teaching, exceeding expectations—but then the departments will be tasked with saying for scholarship—three-year average. Your choice.

Froyum: If I could just say a note about that. Right now, there are a few small pockets of places around the University that have any kind of standards written down around teaching or service. So the primary difference is that we're defining

teaching and service, and creating some standards around those aspects of our work lives that don't exist at the moment.

McCandless: I'm looking at Page 4 where it talks about creative and scholarship—the activity, and I'm looking at 'Needs Improvement' under the Tenured Faculty, and it talks about no fewer than two peer-reviewed products. The problem is in some areas—I'm from the School of Music where peer review is thin. So, I'm wondering is there--could something be added here that would say I do 15 concerts in a year, but none of them were peer reviewed. I'm just concerned about that sort of thing. And the things that are peer reviewed, you talked about in the 'Exceeds Expectations,' publishing or performing in a very highly regarded venue. That is important. And conferences are one of our peer-reviewed sort of things, but any discussions addressing travel money for faculty members, because once you're tenured, the amount of money you get decreases quite a bit. I know that conferences, even if you're accepted, can be \$200-\$300 just to attend. We're not talking about flights. We're not talking about everything else, and so I wonder if we set up all these standards, are we supporting faculty financially so they can reach these goals?

Froyum: Thank you so much for that comment. You may remember from Chapter 4 that right—we've expanded the definition of discovery, integration, and application research. Elsewhere in this chapter we define peer review as well. So there's the traditional peer review, and we certainly recognize in discovery the performance or the creation of original works as a type of discovery-scholarship. But also have expanded our notion of what peer review is. We would really appreciate, if you feel like that's not expansive enough, to include the kind of

work you're doing. From our perspective, it fits in to that. If it doesn't, we want to know.

McCandless: I'll just need to review that part of the document.

Froyum: Thank you so much. You know we've got performers on our committee, so thank you. We will certainly look at that. I'm not sure if anyone else wants to talk about that.

Vallentine: Paul (**Shand**) has some remarks about post-tenure.

Shand: So last Monday, the Faculty Evaluation Committee held an open forum that dealt with post-tenure review and these University-wide standards that we've just been talking about. I'm pleased to report that all members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee still have all their limbs [Laughter] after that discussion. We did generate a lot of useful feedback, which of course the Committee will utilize to refine the document. Before I proceed into a discussion of the current proposal that we have, I will discuss some history which may be useful in terms of context for the Senate. The Committee did a lot of research on various types of post-tenure review processes. It turns out that the most common type of process involves post-tenure review taking place every five to seven years. It involves a faculty member preparing a large dossier and the faculty member undergoing a review by the department head, typically by an internal departmental committee, like a PAC, and then a college-wide committee or a university-wide post-tenure committee. That type of system seems to be a little bit burdensome when it comes to the amount of work that the faculty member has to put in, and also on PACs, right? Because there are several large

departments on this campus, and the additional burden on PAC reviews of these dossiers I think would be quite high. So, that was actually the initial proposal that we put forward in the first faculty forum that dealt with these issues, and suffice it to say, it wasn't very hospitably received because of the reasons I've just cited. So the Committee went back and looked at other models, including models from our sister Regents institutions: University of Iowa and Iowa State, and we set about the process of crafting a different model. And so the model we have right now, that you have in front of you, is based upon the system of annual reviews as its core. Its foundation is the system of annual reviews. The post-tenure review would take place in the sixth year after the last post-tenure review, or tenure or promotion. If a faculty member has achieved 'Meeting Expectations' or 'Exceeding Expectations' in each of the three categories that were teaching, research, and service, in all years leading up the next post-tenure review, then the post-tenure review process is what we call a summary review. And that summary review would be given by the department head--will be prepared by the department head—and so in that review, which would be relatively brief, the department head would essentially summarize the annual reviews that came before that particular post-tenure review, and provide any advice that the department head deems fit: opportunities for professional development, that sort of thing. I would anticipate that this kind of review would be one-page or a couple of pages at most, and so the burden on the department head would not be very great. Now, at the other extreme, if a faculty member has failed to meet expectations in one or more of the three categories of work, in three annual reviews leading up to the next post-tenure review, then a post-tenure review would automatically be triggered in the next academic year if one has not already

been scheduled. So in that particular instance, the review process would be dual. The department head would conduct a separate review from the PAC. So both the PAC and the department head would conduct a review under those circumstances. The department head's review of course would be informed by the PAC's review, and if the department head gives a satisfactory review under those circumstances, then the post-tenure review essentially starts over—the cycle starts over. If the department head gives a negative review, for the comprehensive review, then a Performance Improvement Plan will have to be produced, and so that would involve the department head. It would involve the PAC. It would involve mentorship of that faculty member. It would involve the CET panel. So all of these elements of course are geared towards insuring that the faculty member's performance is lifted. The performance improvement plan would then be utilized to guide successive annual reviews that take place after that post-tenure review. Now of course, there could be cases in between those two extremes. So let's say that the results of the annual review were such that it wasn't all perfect, and you didn't have three cases in which you were not meeting expectations in each one of the categories. Then the PAC and the department head could decide on either a comprehensive review or a summary review, depending on the level of performance of the faculty member in those annual reviews. Typically, in post-tenure review processes, there is a reward system that is attached to it. In the many systems that we looked at in developing the first post-tenure review process that we advanced in the first faculty forum, typically that reward process was a salary increment that was open just to full professors. We are also designing some kind of reward system that will probably take the form of a superior performance-type award that will also be only open to full

professors, but that system is still under development. We're still working with the other members of the Committee and the Provost in order to come up with a system that is fair and comprehensive to everyone. So let me stop there, since we don't really have that much time, and invite comments from the Senate.

Zeitz: Can you explain why it's only for professors?

Shand: Because it would be too much money if we had everybody participating.

Zeitz: Wasn't it also a matter of if you went through and did everything you were supposed to do over the six years, you'd be going up for professorship, anyway?

Shand: Right and so of course if you go up for professorship, then you would gain an additional salary bump because of that. So because there is that avenue that is available to Associate Professors, we think it is more important for this opportunity to be provided to full professors.

Zeitz: Thank you.

Walter: Other questions or comments?

Petersen: Angela had a comment about the previous proposal.

Walter: These seem like fairly important matters, and I'm pretty pleased that here we are in the Senate talking about this. It isn't Senate's traditional role. We are a curricular body, and now of course we've broadened our scope a little bit. I find that really refreshing.

Shand: This affects everyone.

Walter: Exactly. This is a really healthy thing for Senate to do. If you have opinions on this, we'll let them incubate for a minute. Angela, (**Pratesi**) I think you wanted to go back to one?

Wohlpert: Let me also suggest that you don't have to have comments today. They are going to work on this through the summer, so please, take this home and read it and send comments to the Committee.

Walter: So you want the standards? Okay, fire away.

Pratesi: I'd like to jump back to the standards because I didn't get my word in when I had the opportunity.

Walter: Sorry, I must have missed you.

Pratesi: I have a question—not the answer, just food for thought in the 'Service' section under 'Probationary Faculty' for 'Meets Expectations, there is a phrase that says 'service growth over the course of the probationary period.' For folks who are in departments that have naturally high service expectations from the get-go, does service really have to grow for those people, and what is the 'out' for those? Because being on two committees my first year here was the norm. That was like starting out slow. I have grown and have been on ten committees at the same time, but I don't think that should be the norm, and I think that we want to be really careful about saying that it has to grow specifically.

Froyum: Thank you. If you remember back to our workload document, we have a notation about protecting junior faculty from heavy service burdens, but recognizing there are pockets on campus where they are extremely high—so we

will take that figure out how to reword it, so it doesn't penalize people who are in that particular situation.

Pratesi: Thank you. I have another one. I am still unclear whether the workload percentages are they weight, or time, or effort? And I think it could be any of those, and any of those would be fine, but it needs to be clear and consistent across the entire Handbook. Last one: To my knowledge every department has faculty who teach, but to my knowledge, no department has faculty who—librarian—for lack of a better term. So if the purpose of this document is to be a set of guiding principles for things that could be universal to all faculty, I would find it odd that the librarian rubric would be in the University Faculty Handbook. I'm not saying it shouldn't be, but it's something to consider, because it is something that is very specific to one group of faculty that does not impact any other department. And, if other departments are developing their own specific criteria within their departments, I would think that we would want to extend that same privilege to all faculty in all departments.

Petersen: Angela (**Pratesi**) I'm just going to ask for a bit more clarification, because our Committee has struggled. So, are you suggesting that the library would prefer to operate within the teaching standards?

Pratesi: No. I'm saying that the librarianship rubric should exist in the Library Faculty Handbook as it has for decades.

Walter: Free standing and not considered with this?

Pratesi: Just as something to think about. I'm not saying that it should definitely be that way.

Petersen: But are you suggesting that this Handbook would not apply to the library whatsoever?

Pratesi: No. This piece. No, because research and service should absolutely be the same. But the rubric for how we are evaluating librarianship is specific to librarians, and the rubric by which we're evaluating teaching crosses departments.

Petersen: And so you wouldn't necessarily advocate for separate standards for librarianship in this Handbook, but a reference to the Library Handbook?

Pratesi: Yes.

Petersen: Okay.

Shand: What if it were in both places? I think we would have the librarians...

Pratesi: It could be.

Shand: We could have the librarians write their rubric, because we're not really qualified to write it. I think that's the...

Pratesi: Yes. Absolutely. I would agree with that.

Vallentine: That's why we left it blank; to allow you to do that.

Pratesi: I saw in this version for the first time that there was a librarianship rubric that was blank and as a librarian, I thought I would say something about that.

Froyum: Great. We appreciate that. Just so everybody knows, we consulted with the librarians. We had a focus group with the faculty and two separate focus groups with administrators, so we're not ignoring the input of the librarians. We will certainly seek some more input from the library as a body.

Walter: And we appreciate those comments. We have very little time left, so I'd kind of like to move on to our next docketed item. Unless someone vociferously disagrees, I think our consultation on this matter is satisfactory. I would accept a nod of head.

Schraffenberger: I have something I want to say. Should we email Carissa (**Froyum**)? Should we email Paul (**Shand**)?

Walter: Yeah. What's the feedback loop of it?

Schraffenberger: Could you give us some direction? I just didn't get a chance to get my hand raised.

Walter: To whom should the comments go?

Froyum: Please do. You can send an email to any of us. If you want to send something anonymously you can send it to Krista **Herrera** and she will take things up. You can meet with us individually. I'll be around. Whatever format works for you to give us feedback, we appreciate.

Walter: Okay. So let's move on to our next item, #1273: Reconsideration of Honor System for University of Northern Iowa.

Strauss: I have a comment while you're hunting around for it. Given the fact that this policy was approved in 2006 and then subsequently gatekeepers in upper administration at the time killed it, I'm reluctant to engage in this conversation five minutes till five on the last day of the Senate meeting. I think that this document deserves careful consideration, because it would have major impact on how we would function as a faculty, and how students would function within the concept of academic honesty, so I would recommend that we put this on the docket for the first meeting next year.

Walter: Effectively tabling it for now, basically. Okay.

Strauss: I hate to use the word 'table' because it has such a negative connotation.

Walter: I don't think so at all.

Strauss: Everything we've tabled for Tim (**Kidd**) this year has gone into a graveyard. [Laughter] I would say...whatever you want to call it, but let's put it on the top of the docket for the first meeting next fall. Start out fresh.

Walter: Tim's (**Kidd**) tabled remarks are right here. They're not going anywhere. They're going to be Amy's (**Petersen**) problem. They haven't disappeared.

Strauss: Sorry if I insulted you Michael (**Walter**), but that's what it feels like from this end of the table.

Walter: Thank you, Senator **Strauss**. So, you're making a motion that we suspend this for now, and put this as a high-ranking item; top of the docket actually for the first meeting.

Strauss: Yes, sir.

Walter: Second by Senator **O’Kane**.

Strauss: Senator **O’Kane** knows the depth to which this policy goes because he’s an architect of it.

Walter: So all in favor for docketing this as the top item, Reconsider the Honor System at the University of Northern Iowa, #1273—top of the docket for the first meeting in fall, please indicate by saying ‘aye,’ opposed, ‘nay.’ Abstentions? The motion passes.

Strauss: So Amy won’t shoehorn something in on top of it at the last minute.

Petersen: I’m making my list.

Walter: But she will ask your kind permission before doing so. So the next item up is the Suggested Modifications to the Criteria for the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence, but we are about to run out of time. I get the sense that the rest of the items on the docket can be suspended.

Walter: I get the sense that the rest of the items on the docket can be suspended.

Kidd: There’s no hurry at all. We could consider the emeritus issue.

Wohlpart: the emeritus should be faster, but these two are more meaty conversations.

Walter: The modification...

Wohlpert: The modification is pretty straightforward; The Modification of Policy 4.2 on the Emeritus Status.

Strauss: Is there an urgent need? Do we have something in play?

Kidd: Yes. I don't know if it's urgent, but yes we have something in play. It should have been taken care of a long time ago to be honest.

Wohlpert: You don't know when you will have to use this modification.

Strauss: But we might. I got the impression from reading it that there's somebody out there embarrassing the Institution.

Wohlpert: No.

Strauss: No? Okay.

Petersen: We need a motion to extend the meeting and or to...

Walter: Essentially we will run out of time. I will have to entertain a motion—much to my regret, to extend the meeting for 15 minutes. Moved by Senator **Stafford**. Do I have a second?

Strauss: I'll reluctantly second.

Walter: Reluctantly seconded by Senator **Strauss**. All in favor of extending the meeting till quarter after five, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, same...

Wohlpert: Somebody vote 'no.' [Laughter]

Walter: You have no vote here.

Wohlpart: I'm just saying.

Walter: Who is this guy? Okay. Opposed, 'nay.' None. The motion passes. I didn't ask for abstentions. Sue me.

Skaar: Do we need to vote on putting that other policy on whatever we were going to look at before? Tabling that until our first meeting?

Walter: We did. We moved it to the top of the docket.

Skaar: No, the second one. The Criteria for the Regents Award.

Walter: I'm sorry. Right. Suggested Modifications to the Criteria for Regents Award. So this is a non-hurry up item I take it. So I would entertain a motion to move that to the second top rank of the first meeting in fall. Moved by Senator **Skaar**, seconded by Senator **Mattingly**. All in favor, please indicate by saying, 'aye,' opposed, 'nay.' [One nay] Abstentions? [Laughter] Motion passes despite Senator **Zeitz**'s resistance. Now we are on Modifications to Policy 4.21. This is item 1275 on the docket. Who has something to say about this?

Kidd: I guess I do. Basically, it deals with if there would be an issue that the University or the Faculty would wish to revoke the emeritus status if somebody did something awful. Many universities have this in their emeritus policy. Typically, it's done at the whim of the president. So, if you go to the very bottom, this is the policy as is. Nothing has been changed. Keep on going down to the bottom part of the policy in red. So basically, this would establish a method by which emeritus could be revoked. I ran this by the President and Provost for non-

faculty, and they said it sounded good. For non-faculty, basically the president would choose to revoke the status. For faculty, it would be if there is egregious conduct, et cetera. Also that actions or conduct protecting academic freedom should not be used. So this should not be an opinion piece. It should be something of substance, which has been done. And if so, the Faculty Senate has the authority to vote to revoke the status by a two-thirds vote. Questions have come up: What is the appeals process for this? The appeals process would be that for any Faculty Senate resolution which is an appeal to the faculty as a whole. Any questions?

Walter: Comments?

Strauss: What are examples of cause?

Kidd: Gross behavior.

Walter: Illegal behavior, I suppose?

Kidd: It depends.

Strauss: That's kind of vague. Supporting Donald **Trump**—is that the kind of behavior?

Kidd: If the Faculty Senate thought that was the case, if the Faculty Senate were to take an open vote on that, go for it. I don't think that would go down very well.

Wohlpert: Mitchell (**Strauss**) some of the very serious sexual harassment that has been out there—many people have had their honorary status revoked from many institutions.

Strauss: That makes sense.

Kidd: That's what I mean by 'gross behavior.' I don't mean like, "I got a speeding ticket," or "I smoked pot." You've done something awful.

Skaar: I would assume that would come up in the discussion with the Faculty Senate. If two-thirds of the people feel that it is egregious enough to cause a revocation of emeritus status, then that's two-thirds of the people agreeing. So it wouldn't be likely to be a speeding ticket or something like that.

Kidd: Two-thirds is a reasonable vote. The Faculty Senate will not be using this for political agenda. It's a public matter, too. It's not something that's done in secret.

Strauss: I think the example of a history of hidden sexual misconduct is a good one that protects the Institution. That makes sense to me.

Zeitz: One of the issues is that this says, "violates the intent and spirit of the faculty emeritus." There's nothing in the text above that actually says what the intent and spirit are.

Kidd: Well, that was...I wrote this with Gretchen (**Gould**) and we might have just lifted lines from other university's policies because...

Zeitz: I understand, but what I'm saying is if you're going to put something like that in there, there's really nothing in that policy paragraph that says this is what is the intent and spirit of the emeritus. It simply talks process.

Kidd: Absolutely. My intent was to define the violation—not what the intent and spirit are, but the violation will be “engaging in egregious conduct that will diminish the reputation of the University of Northern Iowa,” so that would be how you violate the spirit. If you don’t want to have that in, that’s fine. I thought it read okay as it was.

Zeitz: I’m just saying a sentence or two up there would probably be better to identify what the intent and spirit are.

Kidd: I have no idea what the intent and spirit are.

Walter: To recognize meritorious service: It says it right in the application. So that’s the minimal. Of course, you have your Bob **Washut**’s, but anyway.

Zeitz: But if you’re talking about recognizing meritorious service, if somebody goes out and does something terrible, are they—did they no longer do the meritorious service? I think there also has to be something that has to do with value and things like the values of UNI. I’m not exactly sure how you’d put it, but do you see what I’m saying? If you’re going to have somebody that commits an egregious activity, it needs to be violating something that the emeritus is all about.

Walter: We might be more specific about what that means.

Choi: I just want to follow up. I support this idea, and also I want to say that I support this modification, because actually at the last Faculty Senate meeting I abstained when we voted for some emeritus request because there was no supporting narrative documents, because I was worried about—if I don’t know

about those members and what if they make...those kind of things. So that's why I'm glad that we had this proposal and modification because if we approve this modification, then I would also suggest to add on other modifications; adding something in this section but somewhere.

Strauss: Is there some form of due process that I'm missing here? Is there a hearing? Is there some committee that will deliberate first before it's brought to the Senate? How would this happen?

Mattingly: By petition.

Kidd: It would be by petition to the Faculty Senate. That is it.

Strauss: By petition. What does that mean?

Kidd: That means the fact that by normal processes of the Faculty Senate, that the Faculty Senate could choose to hear or not hear this request.

Strauss: So someone could bring this to the Senate?

Kidd: They would have to bring this to Senate?

Strauss: So, somebody could make an accusation. Bring it in. Then the due process—is this board considers the evidence?

Kidd: Yes. And the Faculty Senate could do as they wish. They could make an ad hoc committee to investigate. They could...

Strauss: Does the accused have an opportunity...

Kidd: The Senate could choose to let the accused... The Faculty Senate would make the guidelines.

Strauss: I'm sorry, I don't understand.

Walter: We really don't have anything set up to act as a court in here. We have various mechanisms set up so that we can vote on curricular items, principally, and consult on other items, and sometimes vote on those as well. But you're right, we have no such mechanism and you're right.

Strauss: This is a very big thing to remove emeritus status. We've reviewed all these people today, and the years of service that they've accumulated and granted, and then...I just think you want to enter this with caution. If somebody does petition something, how do you adjudicate it so that it's fair? I think that there's more work that needs to be done on this and to have some type of maybe a subcommittee to...I don't know. There needs to be due process for something like this.

Walter: Is that what you're suggesting—that we form a subcommittee to meet next semester and reword this a bit?

Strauss: God knows that I don't recommend more committees, but...[Laughter] but I don't feel comfortable approving this unless...

Walter: I'd say tabled, except that it has this really negative connotation...

Strauss: Somebody's going to come marching in here one day and we're going to be like, "Okay, now what do we do?"

Kidd: I'll give you my thought process for that. I did not have, and I do not have a really good understanding of how to set up a court system for this, right? I do know what's done at other universities. At other universities it just says the president can revoke emeritus status. And so my concern was that if there was an issue that arose, then that's how the University would have to go, and so I thought having something in place where faculty had some role would be an improvement over what is done at most other institutions. That's it. I'm not trying to say this is the greatest option ever.

Walter: I agree. Just handing it to the President is probably a little bit...

Kidd: So that's just what is done in most places. The president just decides yea or nay.

Strauss: I don't want to obfuscate with procedure. Don't get me wrong, but I think you put this body at some risk I think to have to consider that without a proper way of presenting the information. When you consider sexual misconduct right now I think that there are probably very true accusations coming out but then when you read the news they say, "Oh no, I had nothing. That's wrong." So you have people who are denying it.

Kidd: Absolutely.

Strauss: You have people who are denying it.

Kidd: Sure.

Strauss: So suppose you do have an emeritus that's accused by five students of doing something for years, and that emeritus says "No, that's nonsense. There's nothing going on here." We have to deal with that. How do we do that?

Kidd: I don't know.

Walter: I don't either. Much as I hate to do it, I would suggest that we table this until we form a committee—I can't believe I said that. We don't have any choice. What happened to the presumption of innocence? That's happening a lot right now. It's not terribly popular to bring up, but it's still there and it's still being beat up right now.

Schraffenberger: I should think though, that a body like this is meant to deliberate on difficult decisions. I mean, in that case, it would be up to us to decide whether there was enough evidence to decide 'yea' or 'nay.' And I think this actually protects the University. It gives us an option that if we granted Ted **Bundy** emeritus status, that we could remove our name from his name and not be attached to something that we don't want to be attached to. That's not to say every case would be a two-thirds vote. I actually don't know if we need a committee to discuss this. I feel like this is just another way to protect the University and that we must as Tim (**Kidd**) said, trust the wisdom of a body like this that can deliberate and not make rash decisions, and not just trust gossip or hearsay.

Walter: We also have a mechanism not to discuss it at all. It doesn't always move from calendar to docket. You know, you can vote against talking about it—and discussing or voting about it.

Schraffenberger: I see no downside so long as we believe that in the future smart people will be in this room.

Skaar: Is there a way to—because you said just a little bit ago, and I don't know all the procedures and bylaws that are written, but is there a way to have this the way it is, and then add to our procedures how we deal with this if it arises. So, some things were suggested like we might have a committee to look at the evidence. We might have you know, the accused come in. We might have the people who accuse that person come in. So, we don't have those procedures written down, but is there a way to add those procedures to what we already have as procedures, or like have some outline of that while keeping the policy the same?

Walter: Keeping this as it's written?

Skaar: This as it's written, but helping our—giving guidance to our body in order to deal with that policy.

Walter: I don't know how we'd vote on that today without adding something to it.

Skaar: I don't know, but we could.

Walter: I agree with you.

Skaar: That might be a way to keep the policy, but help our body to deal with the policy in the future.

Walter: Which we probably will have to do.

Wohlpart: You've got one minute and this is a policy that will go through other iterations. It has to go through a variety of other...I would encourage you all to not at the end of the semester, in the last minute vote on something. I would table it.

Walter: Yeah, definitely. Table? Isn't that the 'kiss of death'?

Varzavand: The Senate is already inundated by approving the emeritus status and then revoking the emeritus status? That's what the Senate's going to be doing?

Wohlpart: Hopefully not.

Varzavand: Because it looks like we are consistently dealing with in this body.
[Laughter]

Walter: I wouldn't call it 'inundated.' I don't mind giving people recognition, and it's not that burdensome. You're right, they do take up a little bit of time. I recognize that. But outside that, we do nothing when somebody retires. Well, except for things that have been departmentally arranged for recognition et cetera. I see your point. It does take a lot of time.

Varzavand: I'm surprised there is no gold watch.

Walter: Well, there's no gold. [Laughter]

Schraffenberger: I move we table this discussion until the fall semester when we can have a longer and more substantive discussion.

Walter: I recognize the motion by Senator **Schraffenberger**. Do I have a second?

Second by John **Burnight**. All in favor, please say 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.'

Abstentions? Motion to adjourn? So moved by Senator **Skaar**. Second by Senator **Smith**. We're done.

Respectfully submitted,
Kathy Sundstedt
Administrative Assistant and Transcriptionist
Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Next Meeting: 3:30 p.m. Monday, August 27, 2018
301 Rod Library (Scholar Space) University of Northern Iowa,
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Follows are nine addenda, supporting documents for emeritus requests for:

1. Susan Wurtz
2. Susan Wurtz
3. Jay Lees
4. Victoria Robinson
5. Victoria Robinson
6. Victoria Robinson
7. Leroy Crist
8. Robert Washut
9. Robert Washut