

8-27-2018

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, August 27, 2018

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

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](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, August 27, 2018" (2018). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 1224.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1224

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 Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
08/27/18 (3:31 – 5:01)
Mtg. #1809
SUMMARY MINUTES

Courtesy Announcements

No members of the Press were present.

Provost **Wohlpert** commented on the collaboration between faculty leadership and administration on faculty evaluation, the Handbook, and the General Education Revision process as well as reasons for the dip in UNI student enrollment. (See pages 6-9)

Faculty Chair Cutter reminded faculty of the gathering where there will be short speeches, awards, and introduction of new faculty, as well as discussion of voting rights for non-tenure track faculty will be discussed. (See pages 9-13)

United Faculty President Hawbaker expressed thanks for the collaborative work between faculty leadership and administration, and reminded faculty of the reasons and implications of this fall's vote for United Faculty recertification. (See pages 13-16)

Senate Chair Petersen thanked Senators for their participation and listed some of the big topics for Senate discussion: HLC, General Ed revisions, the work of the Faculty Handbook and Faculty Evaluation Committees. (See pages 16-17)

Minutes for Approval April 23, 2018 – Summary Minutes & Transcript

(Stafford/Choi) All aye. <https://senate.uni.edu/meetings/apr-23-2018-faculty-senate-meeting>

Calendar Items for Docketing

** (O’Kane/Zeitz) 1397, 1398, 1399 Emeritus Requests for Geraldine E.

Perreault, Ronnie **Bankston**, Barton **Bergquist**, bundled for individual discussion
Sept. 10, 2018.

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-geraldine-e-perreault-dept-communication>

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-ronnie-bankston-associate-professor-dept>

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-barton-bergquist-professor-dept-biology>

**** (Strauss/Skaar) 1400 Consideration of Policy 6.10 Academic Freedom Revisions** docketed for **Sept. 10, 2018**. <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/epc-recommended-revisions-policy-610-academic-freedom>

**** (Strauss/Zeitz) 1401 Consideration of Policy 13.13 Research Misconduct** docketed for **Sept. 10, 2018**. <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/epc-recommended-changes-policy-1313-policy-research>

**** (Neibert/Gould) 1402 Consultative Session on HLC Accreditation** docketed for **Oct. 22, 2018**. <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/consultative-session-hlc-reaccreditation>

Consideration of Docketed Items

1376/1255 Eliminate Using Transfer Credit in Calculating Cumulative GPA

**** (Strauss/O’Kane)** Tabled for Sept. 10th meeting.

1379/1266 Overview of RSP Policy on Effort Certification

**** (Gould/Skaar)** Tabled and referred to special committee.

1386/1273 Reconsideration of Honor System for UNI

**** (O’Kane/Strauss)** <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/reconsideration-honor-system-university-northern-iowa>

Tabled and referred 2006 Policy to a special committee. **(See pages 21-29)**

1387/1274 Modification to the Criteria for Regents Award for Faculty Excellence (See transcript pages 29-51)

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/suggested-modifications-criteria-regents-award-faculty>

**** (Mattingly/Burnight)** To delete student evaluations as criteria and include teaching summations as an example of acceptable artifacts. **Passed.**

**** (Skaar/Strauss)** To add philosophy of education statement to criteria. **Passed.**

**** (Zeitz/Stafford)** To add philosophy of service & research statement to criteria. **Failed.**

**** (Zeitz/Skaar)** To add requirement of full professorship. **Failed.**

Adjournment (Strauss/Zeitz) 5:01 p.m. by acclamation.

Next Meeting: 3:30 p.m. Monday, Sept.10, 2018

301 Rod Library (Scholar Space) University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa

A complete transcript of 51 pages and 0 addendum follows.

Regular Meeting
FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING

August 27th, 2018

Present: Senators Imam **Alam**, John **Burnight**, Seong-in **Choi**, Faculty Senate Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Senators Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair James **Mattingly**, Senators Amanda **McCandless**, Peter **Neibert**, Steve **O’Kane**, Faculty Senate Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Mark **Sherrad**, Nicole **Skaar**, Sara **Smith**, Gloria **Stafford**, Andrew **Stollenwerk**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Shahram **Varzavand**, and Senator Leigh **Zeit**. Also: NISG Representative Kristin **Ahart**, Faculty Chair Barbara **Cutter**, United Faculty President Becky **Hawbaker**, Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**, Provost Jim **Wohlpert**, Associate Provost John **Vallentine**.

Not present: UNI President Mark **Nook**.

Guests: Lou **Fenech**, Tim **Kidd**, Joyce **Morrow**, Kira **Schuman**.

CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

Petersen: Let us go ahead and convene. Welcome everyone. Let’s get started this afternoon. I am Amy **Petersen**. I am your Chair of Faculty Senate this year. Welcome. What I’d first like to do is call for any press identification. And because we have many new senators, I thought it would be helpful if we would go around and introduce ourselves: Where you are from, what College you are representing,

and perhaps the year that you have been on the Senate. This is my third year, and I am from the College of Education.

Mattingly: I'm Jim **Mattingly**, College of Business. This is my second year on the Senate.

Hawbaker: I'm Becky **Hawbaker**. I'm President of United Faculty, and this is my first official year, although I got to sit in a few meetings last year.

Cutter: I'm Barbara **Cutter**. I'm the Faculty Chair. This is my first meeting in this incarnation in the Senate. I have been in the Senate in a previous life.

Gould: I'm Gretchen **Gould**, I'm from the Rod Library. I am also the Faculty Senate Secretary and this is my sixth year on Senate.

Alam: Imam **Alam**, College of Business. Day one. [Applause]

O'Kane: I'm Steve **O'Kane**. I'm from CHAS and I'm almost embarrassed to say how long I've been a Senator. I heard a moan a little bit ago. This is my sixth year. I don't know if you know this, but you're allowed three and then three, and then you have to go off. But this is my second set of six. [Ohs and ahs]

Neibert: Peter **Neibert** from the College of Education.

Koch: Bill **Koch**. I'm Adjunct Representative and beginning my second three-year term.

Ahart: Kristin **Ahart**, Vice-President of Northern Iowa Student Government (NISG).

Strauss: Hi, I'm Mitch **Strauss** and I am in CSBS, and this is my second term, non-consecutive.

Varzavand: Shahram **Varzavand**, Department of Technology, second year.

Skaar: Nikki **Skaar**, College of Education. This is my fourth year.

Smith: Sara **Smith**, Department of Technology, second semester.

McCandless: Amanda **McCandless**. I'm from CHAS, specifically the School of Music. This is my second year of my first term.

Stollenwerk: Andrew **Stollenwerk** from Physics Department in CHAS. My first day also.

Zeitz: Leigh **Zeitz**. I'm from the College of Education and Instructional Technology and I believe I'm beginning my fifth year.

Stafford: Gloria **Stafford**. This is my third year as CSBS, School of Applied Human Sciences.

Choi: Seong-In **Choi**, CSBS, third year.

Sherrad: Mark **Sherrad** from Department of Biology CHAS and this is my first day.

Burnight: John **Burnight**, Philosophy and Religion, in CHAS. And I've been sitting here trying to remember if this is my fourth or fifth year. I can't remember; terrible memory.

Hesse: Tom **Hesse**, Philosophy and Religion. I represent Adjunct and Term Faculty, and I think this is my third year.

Pease: I'm Patrick **Pease**, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs.

Vallentine: I'm John **Vallentine**, Associate Provost for Faculty.

Wohlpert: Jim **Wohlpert**, Provost.

Petersen: Excellent and thank you and all and welcome. We will begin with Courtesy Announcements and seeing that President **Nook** is not here, I will move to Provost **Wohlpert**.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST WOHLPART

Wohlpert: Welcome back to the 2018-2019 Academic Year and the last day of summer because I understand there's another front coming through and it's going to be in the 70's after that, so fall arrives. That's the best news the Provost can possibly provide. I can take no credit, except I can deliver the news, that's all. We have lots going on. You all know this. I ask for your continued participation in all the wonderful things: Great collaboration between United Faculty, faculty leadership and administration on faculty evaluation and the Handbook. Wonderful work going on in the General Education Revision. I think Steve (**O'Kane**) is the only member of this group that's also part of Gen Ed Revision, so Steve will be a really important conduit. So lots of really big, important things going on that will be important for faculty to be involved in. That's it.

Petersen: Thank you.

Strauss: I have a question for the Provost. May I ask?

Petersen: Yes. [Laughter] Not even five minutes in!

Strauss: It's my understanding that our enrollment numbers are on the low side, and I've heard broad ranges of numbers, and I'm just wondering if you could speak to us about what's going on in that area?

Wohlpart: We anticipated that it would be down. It's a whole host of things. One of the things we heard back from the high school counselors last year was the delay in announcing tuition was something that really set a lot of families back. In a lot of states, the tuition is not announced until after the legislature gets done because you have to have a whole budget, and the tuition is then announcement and once you have the appropriation announced, you know your budget is going to stay. Iowa has done things very differently. The Regents are taking a different approach to that. So that was one of the things that had a big impact. Very low unemployment, very strong economy has a really big impact. We have not done a good job telling our story in marketing. We are searching for a new marketing director. If you have time to participate in that activity, that would be great as well. And then again, Financial Aid. We have simply struggled with being able to offer the financial aid that the other two institutions do. Over the last ten, fifteen years the financial aid at the other two institutions has tripled. Ours has gone up by 50%. When there was a conversation about performance-based funding, which you know what's happened nationally with performance-based funding, what's happened here in Iowa was not performance-based funding, it's enrollment-based funding, which is where all of the other institutions outside of Iowa have been since the 70's and 80's. Iowa and Iowa State got very serious about marketing in the State of Iowa to get more Iowa kids. That has had an enormous impact on us.

Strauss: What the number I hear is somewhere between 500-600 students shortfall from last year.

Wohlpert: It will be down. I don't know if I'd call it a shortfall, because that's what we have been budgeting, or what we have been thinking towards.

Strauss: So you have been planning around that?

Wohlpert: We have been planning around this, yes.

Strauss: Because my next question is, 'What are we going to do?'

Choi: Actually I'd like to piggyback on Senator **Strauss's** question. I know we have a full agenda today, but sometime I would like to have some discussions to hear from those people to learn what would be the impact of the declining enrollment on Academic Affairs and each program and each faculty, because I hear concerning voices around faculty about what's going on and what will happen to us, and what changes will happen in our teaching and teaching programs. I would like to hear some more details about this.

Wohlpert: So let me say I'd be happy to have that conversation at some point if that's something that Amy (**Petersen**) wants to schedule. I do know that there will be an announcement coming out from the President's Office about some of the initiatives that we have targeted for this coming year. We believe that we are at the bottom, but Mark (**Nook**) and I are both highly optimistic people. We do believe that this is the bottom, and that it will be going up. We have not gone in and reduced the number of faculty that we had decided would be searching for

this coming fall for next fall, so I'm not in panic mode. We haven't cut travel and supplies and services, and we haven't reduced the number of faculty that we agreed we would search for for next fall. So we have been managing the budget very tightly. This is something we have been expecting. There are no alarm bells going off. I will say this, and I've said this in several of the college meetings that I've gone to: We developed a portfolio of programs for 13,500 students. We now have 11,500 or something—that's 2,000 fewer students. That's about \$15 million. So the question that I would ask the faculty to be thinking about is: Can we sustain that portfolio of programs, because you all are spread thin? I'm very aware of that. Until we increase that enrollment back up, and get that \$10-\$15-\$20 million, it's hard for us to think about the way in which we can add the faculty back to be able to sustain those programs. So, that's a really important question for faculty and to be quite frank as Provost, I really want the faculty to be thinking about those questions.

Choi: Yes. So someday, I'd like to hear more details—what's the plan and what's going on, and how that will impact our teaching and recruitment.

Petersen: Thank you.

Strauss: And Amy (**Petersen**) you just learned that managing the Senate is like herding cats. [Laughter]

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR CUTTER

Petersen: Alright. Faculty Chair **Cutter**.

Cutter: Welcome back everyone, and I wanted to thank the faculty for electing me to serve as Faculty Chair this year—or at least I think so at this point.

[Laughter] The one thing I want to talk about briefly is that one of the big things the Faculty Chair does is they organize the Fall Faculty meeting and I wanted to give you a heads up. That is coming up on Monday, September 17th at 3:30 in the Lang Auditorium, and there's a reception at 3:00 beforehand. As usual, we're going to have short addresses from the three faculty leaders which would be me, Becky (**Hawbaker**), and Amy (**Petersen**), also the President and the Provost. And we always do awards and recognize new faculty. But I want to make sure that you all know because we have another really important thing we're going to do: We're going to have a discussion topic as well this year and sometimes it's just ceremonial, but this year we'll also have a discussion topic, and that's the issue of expanding voting rights to non-tenure track faculty. Which would mean in addition to voting, they would also be able to be voting members on University committees; to serve on University Committees as well. So at this point, we'd like to have a discussion because there's been a little work—there's been some work on this in the past, and the Senators who've been around may be well aware of this, but I'm not sure that a lot of other faculty on campus are. So I just want to give you a brief history. I promise I'll try to not be really long in my remarks in general for the rest of the year, but Scott **Peters** told me that when he was Faculty Chair he had appointed a couple of committees to look into this issue of expanding the voting. And one of the results of their work is a new policy that was just enacted that basically says that “the University shall strive to integrate all faculty members into shared governance of the University, consistent with the terms of their contract and shall protect their academic freedom to voice

dissenting opinions in these roles.” And this was designed specifically to protect non-tenure track, as well as tenure-track faculty from administrative pressure if they served on University committees. So that was sort of step one. So step two is to have the discussion of what exactly this would mean. Would this mean expanding to all non-tenure track faculty voting rights? Or, to full time non-tenure track? Or to non-tenure track faculty who have service commitments written into their appointments? So they’re expected to serve, but if they’re not voting members they can’t actually be fully serving. So, this is the discussion we want to have before we would actually have a vote, because changing any of this would require a change to the Faculty Constitution, which means a big vote. And we wouldn’t want to undertake this until the people have had a chance to learn more about this, express their ideas, give feedback on the possible options. So this is phase one, and so we really want as many faculty to come as possible, so that this isn’t something that when we actually have the vote, faculty think “Well what’s this? I haven’t heard about it.”

Zeit: Two questions. One of them is that does this mean that non-tenure track faculty should not be on committees at this point?

Cutter: Well actually it’s very confusing. The way it works now is that some departments allow it. Some departments don’t. Apparently I’ve been told that CHAS allows non tenure-track faculty to be serving on committees. And there have been situations Scott’s (**Peters**) told me about in the past, where some committees elect non-committee members, and other committees, like the UCC one was elected once and somebody complained, and they were taken off the committee because the Constitution doesn’t actually allow it and they had a

different election. So it's been very inconsistent and it's caused a lot of problems, and you know it's a terrible situation for somebody to be in. They're elected to something and then told, "Well you don't count."

Zeitz: The second question is if indeed it turns out that they will then be officially allowed into joining committees and such, does that mean that service will be part of their assessment?

Cutter: Well, these are the kinds of things we would have to discuss. If someone has a contract and it already says that service is part of their appointment...

Zeitz: If they're basically a four-class term employee, then at least at this point service would...The person I'm thinking about—she's on all these committees and does all these things—she works very hard, but I'm just looking at requirements.

Cutter: Yeah, and that would have to be part of the discussion. What do we think is the most reasonable, the most fair way of handling this kind of thing? Since we haven't in my memory—the faculty hasn't had an open discussion about this yet, this is just a committee came up with some possible options.

Zeitz: Thanks.

Wohlpart: If I could just add to that, and Barb (**Cutter**) I don't know, do you all have numbers by any chance? I can give you rough numbers off the top of my head. Please don't quote these. We will be developing these numbers. I think we have about 470 tenured-tenure track faculty, about 50 full time non-tenure track faculty, and about 120 adjuncts. That number could be off by 30 or 40. And here

at UNI, the tenured-tenure track teach about 70% of the student credit hours. I think the full time non-tenure track teach about 15%, and adjuncts teach about 15%, which is very high compared to national models. One of the things that United Faculty brought forward last year—a year and half ago, was the way in which non-full time, non-tenure track—so not term instructors or renewable term instructors, were given assignments beyond their teaching in the way in which they were credited. So we changed the form that they are paid on. Teaching is at the top and then there's another bucket for any kind of service obligations, and it's a very clear stipend for those service obligations. Instructors can be asked to do service as part of their load but it depends on the contract. Becky (**Hawbaker**) anything I'm missing?

Hawbaker: I was just going to refer to the new section of the Handbook on workload so if you are on a term or a renewable term, then 20% of your workload is expected to be service and that could be University-level service as well.

Wohlpart: There are also some instructors in the College of Business who are required to do research because they have to be qualified for ASCSB.

Petersen: United Faculty President **Hawbaker**, your comments?

COMMENTS FROM UNITED FACULTY PRESIDENT HAWBAKER

Hawbaker: I want to start by just thanking Barbara (**Cutter**) and Amy (**Petersen**) for being so collaborative. It's wonderful to have united faculty leadership and they've been great about meeting over the summer and having regular meeting times so that we can all stay in touch with our mutual areas of interest, because

there are some overlapping areas, and it's good to have open communication. I also want to thank the President, the Provost and John **Vallentine** for what I see as a new era of collaboration and mutual benefit. Jim (**Wohlpart**) just talked about a couple of areas that we've worked collaboratively on problem solving and that's been really great. So last year at about this time--I was trying to find another email—and reminded myself that at this time last year, United Faculty had just become aware that there would be major changes in our insurance that we hadn't been consulted with and were guessing that it was going to be big jumps in our premiums. And I'm comparing that to now where—and I want to thank President **Nook** for establishing University-wide consultative committees and for my faculty co-leaders for helping to insure that United Faculty is on that committee. I and Carissa **Froyum** have been meeting all summer with the insurance benefits committee to get up to speed on all the benefits and to prepare for the data that we're going to need to look at as well as look at setting new premiums and looking at alternatives to cost-save for the future. I also want to report that United Faculty especially I and Vice-President Carissa **Froyum** have been working hard all summer not only on committees, but also on working on individual faculty issues that have cropped up—yes, over the summer on all kinds of issues: travel reimbursements, and office relocations, and all sorts of other issues, and John (**Vallentine**) has been wonderful to help us solve a lot of problems together, and we've been very happy with the outcomes we've been able to get so far. So, we're moving into this as we're here at the table, we're here to solve problems, we're here to make UNI a better place for UNI faculty and our families. We're working through policy work in consultation where we need to, and advocacy and assertion and fierce argument where we must.

So, another important thing to bring up is the approaching recertification vote, and to make sure you know in case you hear questions about what this vote is about. This is because of a change in the Chapter 20 legislation or law about collective bargaining, so that the legislature now requires that we recertify prior to negotiating a new contract. So we are preparing to negotiate your new contract, and so you have to again confirm or certify that United Faculty can represent your interests and bargain the very best package that we can for you. We are going to fight very hard for a fair, equitable salary increase, and we're also—no secret—looking to take some key parts of the Faculty Handbook and return them to the contract. So oh my gosh, I just revealed some negotiation strategy, but it's kind of obvious. So, that's what the vote means. It doesn't mean "Yes I'm voting and I support everything the Union has ever done." It's not saying, "Yes I commit to joining the Union." Everyone who is part of the collective bargaining unit, and you may have seen the email that John (**Vallentine**) and I sent out a few weeks ago about that definition of the unit. We cleared up some really bizarre language about—we won't go into details there, but if any faculty that is full time this semester is part of the bargaining unit. In addition, anyone who is at least half-time is also part of the bargaining unit this semester. If you're at least $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ time, and you were $\frac{1}{4}$ time sometime last year, then you're also part of the bargaining unit, and then excluding people who are department heads or P&S and other classifications. So, everybody who meets those definitions will be entitled to vote. If you choose not to vote, that is counted as a "No" vote. So we need 100% participation and we would like 100% "Yes." Last fall there were a couple hundred unions that recertified, and the average "Yes" vote was like 87%.

Now those were smaller unions and so that may be tricky for us, but in some small Iowa school districts they had 100%. We can go for that, right?

Strauss: What's the mechanism?

Hawbaker: You will get an email from PERB (Public Employment Relations Board) is my understanding, and you will be able to vote online. You'll click the link. You'll enter your date of birth and the last four digits of your SSN and then you'll click 'Yes' or 'No.' It shouldn't take very long, and we've been working very collaboratively with administration to determine the list of eligible voters and to insure that that list is clean and ready to go.

Zeitz: Based on the numbers the Provost gave out, I know that those were ballpark, that means we've got about 640 people who are going to be voting on this—if you take tenure and term and full time?

Hawbaker: Right. Not all of those will meet those specifications, but a lot of them will.

Zeitz: Okay. Thanks.

Petersen: Thank you Becky (**Hawbaker**).

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR PETERSEN & INTRODUCTION of GUESTS

Petersen: Let me begin just by echoing both Becky's (**Hawbaker**) comments as well as Provost **Wohlpart**'s comments. I am incredibly thankful we have been working very collaboratively with all the administrators throughout the summer, and so I'm incredibly appreciative. I'm also very thankful to all of you. And I want

to echo how important your work is this year, particularly on the Senate. There are a number of what I'm calling a couple of 'big stones' if you will, that we will be taking on together that will be significant, and will matter in years and decades to come. I want to do the best job I can to prepare you: To provide you with all of the options, the context, the background—and so when you see my emails, my intent is not to overwhelm you, but rather to help take some of that heavy lifting off of you as you attempt to sort through what is important and what is not important, and to just prepare generally for our Senate meetings. Some of those big rocks that I'm thinking of include HLC, also our General Ed revisions. That committee will be coming to us and sharing their work; sharing their timeline with us and really preparing us to take a vote later in the spring. We also will hear again from the Faculty Handbook Committee, and the Faculty Evaluation Committee as they continue their work and we'll have opportunities to provide additional input there as well. So there is much to do this year and I thank you for your participation and engagement. I did forget to introduce our guests, so I'm going to look to the very back of the room. Tim, (**Kidd**) would you introduce yourself?

Kidd: Hi, Tim **Kidd**, Physics Department. I used to come here a lot.

Morrow: Joyce **Morrow**, University Registrar. This is my second year of being your permanent visitor. [Laughter]

Schuman: Kira **Schuman**, I work for the National AAUP, so I think I've seen a lot of you around campus last semester and this semester to prep for the vote.

Petersen: Thank you and welcome. The next item on our agenda are the minutes from April 23rd. They were distributed through email and so you have had an opportunity to take a look at those minutes. Is there a motion to approve them? Thank you Senator **Stafford**. Thank you Senator **Choi**. Is there any discussion needed on those minutes? Okay, all in favor of approving those minutes say 'aye,' and any opposed say 'nay' and any abstentions? Alright the minutes pass.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Petersen: We have a number of items for Calendar docketing. The first three items are emeritus requests and what we can do to save some time is to bundle those together if we have a motion to do so. So I am asking if there is a motion to bundle the three emeritus requests, which will be Calendar Items 1397, 1398 and 1399 to docket for our September 10th meeting. Thank you Senator **O'Kane**. Is there a second. Thank you Senator **Zeitz**. Any discussion needed to docket those? I want to remind you when we take a look at them on September 10th, we will individually look at those for consideration. All in favor of bundling and docketing those three emeritus requests, say 'aye'. Anyone opposed, say 'nay.' Any abstentions?

Alright, the next item for docketing is consideration of Policy 6.10 on Academic Freedom. This is a policy that Barbara (**Cutter**) referenced just a moment ago that we took a look at last fall and approved revisions, and the Educational Policy Committee has continued to work on this policy all through last year and they are coming back to us with some additional revisions for us to consider, and so I am requesting a motion to docket this for our September 10th meeting. Thank you

Senator **Strauss** and seconded Senator **Skaar**. Any discussion needed? Alright, all in favor of docketing this item say 'aye,' anyone opposed say 'nay.' Any abstentions?

Alright the next item for docketing is the Consideration of the Research Misconduct Policy, 13.13. This is brought to us again by the Educational Policy Committee, and they're asking us to take a look at some revisions that they have been considering. Is there a motion to docket this item? Thank you Senator **Strauss**. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Zeitz**. All in favor of docketing this item for September 10th say 'aye.' Is there anyone opposed, say 'nay.' And any abstentions?

And our last item to docket is the HLC Accreditation Committee, and they would like to come and consult with us on October 22nd to share their timeline, the work that they have done over the summer, and their continued work this fall. Is there a motion to docket this item for October 22nd? Thank you Senator **Neibert**. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Gould**. All in favor of docketing this item, say 'aye.' Is there anyone opposed? Any abstentions?

Wohlpart: Can we note in the minutes that Faculty Senate Chair **Petersen** has mentioned HLC twice and the Provost hasn't said anything about HLC? [Laughter]

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Petersen: It's on my list. Alright we have a number of items to consider here today and I do have some updates that may potentially change how we consider these items. So our first item that was docketed from last spring is related to the

Elimination of Transfer Credit in Calculating Cumulative G.P.A. And Tim **Kidd** had petitioned the Senate last spring to consider this issue. Over the summer, the Transfer Council provided us with some additional information. However, when I invited the Transfer Council to attend this meeting I erred in extending the invitation too late, and so they were not able to join us today: That would be Kristin **Woods** and Kristin **Moser**, and so I'm suggesting that we make a motion to leave this item on the table until September 10th when Kristin and Kristin can join us, so we can have some additional conversation.

Strauss: Do we need a motion, or can we just leave it sitting on the table?

Petersen: We can leave it sit on the table.

Strauss: And just move on.

Petersen: Sure.

Strauss: Why not? I'm not an expert on Robert's Rules, but it's already on the table.

Petersen: I think as I read it, when it's on the table if it is not discussed within the next meeting that it is killed, and I didn't want to necessarily kill it until we have had some discussion.

Strauss: I understand. I move that we keep it on the table.

Petersen. Alright. Thank you and I have a second from Senator **O'Kane**. Any additional discussion needed? Alright. All in favor of leaving this item on the table until our next meeting, say 'aye.' Any opposed say 'nay,' and any abstentions?

Our next item for consideration is the overview of the RSP Policy of Effort Certification. This was also an item that we discussed extensively until last spring and it was tabled pending some additional information. I have met with Jennifer **Waldron**, our new Dean of Grad Studies and she is working on addressing this item by putting a committee together, and so I bring it to us to let you know that is occurring and to suggest we make a motion to officially refer it to committee so that a committee can explore and bring back recommendations to us.

Mattingly: And that would remain on the table?

Petersen: Yes. Again, my interest is not to kill it, but to keep it moving forward. Thank you Senator **Gould**. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Skaar**. All in favor of leaving this item, the Policy and Effort Certification, on the table and referring it to a special committee for exploration, say 'aye.' Is there anyone opposed, say 'nay.' Any abstentions? Excellent.

Our third item is the Reconsideration of Honor System for UNI and I just recently learned—this was an item that was tabled last spring as well. If you recall, we had discussion about the work of a previous committee from 2006 who had done some extensive work on developing an honor system but at that time it did not move forward and so there is an interest in looking at that 2006 policy and considering it again. I have just recently learned that I don't have a sponsor for this petition at the moment, and so what I am going to suggest we do is leave it on the table so that I can find some other interested individuals who might be willing to take a leadership role. We could refer it to special committee so they could review that 2006 policy and any new additional information and come back to us with a recommendation.

Strauss: I don't agree with that. I think that I can sponsor it up to a point so this group could listen to it and see if they want to move forward. Okay?

Petersen: So you want to continue to sponsor it?

Strauss: I will sponsor it up to a point, yes. I think we need to discuss it now. So call me sponsor, and I'm ready to go forward on it right now. I declare it's been sitting around on this table long enough. What with all those emeritus we had last year, I think it went months sitting on the table.

Petersen: So Mitch (**Strauss**) let me make sure I'm understanding you. So you would like to refer it to a special committee today?

Strauss: I'm going to present this to this group to consider and as you suggest, one of thoughts would be to move it to committee. What happens there is open to debate. But just as background this thing sat languishing since 2006 and then at the time Faculty Chair **Kidd** gave a presentation about different things going on around campus, and one of the things he brought up was the fact that he had anecdotal evidence in conversations with faculty who were uncomfortable and ruminative about the current way of treating academic misconduct. Is that correct Tim? (**Kidd**)

Kidd: That is correct.

Strauss: And I brought up the fact that we had taken a run at this over ten years ago. Just as a brief background, to give you some idea where this thing came from: First of all, in another lifetime I was a department head at Kansas State University and we had a major nationally-published cheating scandal. Ninety kids

in a biology class all caught cheating, and there was all kinds of floundering around and unhappiness on campus. And I'd come up through multiple institutions back in the east as both an administrator and a student where there were honor systems, and I saw some potential benefit in it, so I brought it to Jim **Coffman** who was the provost at the time. One thing led to another and we founded an honor system at Kansas State that continues to work and work well. I came here as a professor and I think I had been just promoted to full professor and I thought 'What can I do to make an impact at UNI?' And I thought an honor system might be interesting to do, and I had also heard anecdotal information from faculty here who were also uncomfortable with the academic misconduct system the way it existed. So, through the American Democracy Project—I used that as a platform, and quickly people became interested in it and we presented it to Ronnie **Bankston** who was the chair at the time, and he put together a committee and we worked on it for days and days and hours and hours and put together this package. So I spent a lot of time back in those days being an advocate of it and working with people who were skeptical about it and convincing people. I worked with the Student Senate. I worked with this group here and we finally got it all packaged up and approved by the Senate. Well, it died somewhere downstream. I was...I would say disenfranchised from that process. I don't know exactly what happened, but it died. So here we are.

Let me just give you a thumbnail of what this thing does: The biggest value of the system is that it puts the importance of academic honesty out front as a central part of the institutional sculpture. I think every student that comes here knows basically that it's wrong to cheat. But, the statistics—at least when we put

this thing together, suggest that at schools like ours, roughly 2/3 of students cheat at least once, and some students—I think the number was 16-20%, cheat repeatedly. So, there is a common culture at institutions like ours—larger State institutions, where cheating is considered how you do things and an acceptable behavior. And honor systems go after that by being upfront and having students sign pledges and keeping it as a better part of our culture. And so what this committee did twelve years ago is set put together an honor statement. Also put together a system for addressing academic misconduct. And that's one of the issues that we have here from an anecdotal standpoint: Holding a student accountable for cheating is difficult here. There's a lot of pressure placed on you if you do it and speaking personally, I've had administrators come back on me for doing it, and put pressure on me for holding a student accountable, and so what this system does is it does two things: It does not take away the opportunity for a faculty member who feels really strongly about a cheating event to take action on their own. However, another avenue exists, and that is to refer it to an external committee to do fact finding and review on an independent basis and find whether cheating has occurred. So it takes pressure off of the faculty. And at the same time, if a student is approached by a faculty member and says, "I have evidence that suggests that you cheated and I'm going to hold you accountable based on our current policy," that student also has the option to refer it to an objective external group for consideration. And then the system also codified penalties, too. Again, penalties in our current system are spelled out, but there's still a wide amount of latitude, and this thing is a little more focused in terms of how it addresses penalties. Finally, there is—and I think we have this now, too—there is an option for an accused student who has been found guilty to appeal. So,

there's an appeals procedure. And the last thing is there is a whole definition in case people are unaware of what cheating is, there is a major definition of various types of cheating. It's not all-inclusive. This is a document that can change over time, add things or subtract things, like that. There it is. It's all here. Now, I wanted to present this and I think that what I suggest is that if the committee—if the Senate wants to discuss this, great, and I think that a logical outcome would be if you're interested, is to refer it to a committee. Now, that's where my sponsorship is going to stop because I spent too much time on this thing. I will be happy to consult with the committee, and share my experience on founding honor systems, but I've put way too much personal time into it and I still carry scars and baggage from the fact that it didn't go anywhere. But I'll be happy to cheer it on. That's what I meant to communicate.

Petersen: Thank you Senator **Strauss**.

Strauss: Did I violate Robert's Rules of Order?

Petersen: No, it's good. So I think it would be appropriate to have some discussion then and the discussion would center upon are we interested in pursuing, and then potentially a motion to refer to a special committee.

Hesse: I'm not necessarily opposed to this, but it really does need to go to a committee. This was put together in 2006 and just quickly skimming through it, it seems to overlap or even contradict a lot of policies that have been implemented since then. Like, I'm not quite clear about the relationships between the Honor Council and our Student Academic Appeals Board, which is only like four or five years old I think, and so that would have to be something that would have to be

worked out. Or the sanctions with the Honor Council from 2006 don't mesh very well with our current Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, Level 4 penalties, and so if we go with this, it really does need to be looked at again.

Strauss: Jim (**Wohlpart**) sent me something over the summer which was a completely different approach to academic honesty, so I'm not married to this thing. I agree with you that it probably needs reconciliation with other things that have happened since then. Or perhaps it needs to be completely turned over and a new approach taken. But I think some of the fundamental things here though, about having academic honesty as a central part of UNI's culture; some kind of pledge when students matriculate, and some type of system that removes faculty from the fact-finding and punishment stage would be of value.

Petersen: And it does fit nicely with Criterion 2 within our HLC work. [Laughter]

Wohlpart: Yes.

Hawbaker: Do you get a bonus every time you mention...? [Laughter]

Petersen: It's because we had an HLC meeting that it's at the top of my head here today.

Skaar: I like this idea. I agree that we should look at this stuff. The idea of taking it off the faculty shoulders a little bit more I think is wonderful. In the graduate programs, we've had some cheating issues. Plagiarism being number one and it's just so heavy. It's so heavy on faculty to make those decisions about consequences, to investigate, to do all that stuff and to have some other way to take some of that burden off the faculty's shoulders I think would be awesome

because we're biased. I love my graduate students. There's a reason that they're here, and when stuff like that happens we tend to make decisions not objectively and so to have some of that I think would be very, very valuable.

Pease: For whatever it's worth, I've sent a request to the Educational Policies Committee to review 3.01 and 12.0 this year. I am the person who processes all of that work under the current policy, and there are some sticking points and some inconsistencies within the policy, and so I'm just asking them to open that up and review it. Perhaps that's where you actually want to have this conversation.

Wohlpart: If I could build on this: The approach that this has taken here at UNI because this didn't go where I wish it had gone in 2006, has been policy and enforcement as opposed to culture. And when you move towards culture, you really embracing it as a University community and the students are embracing it as they come in. It's a very different approach to trying to catch people and then you're playing 'gotcha' on the other end, and there's a lot of work to be done. So the two can and should go hand and hand. You're not going to get rid of your policies, but your policies can be updated based on the culture that you're creating.

Strauss: I couldn't have said it better.

O'Kane: A question, Patrick (**Pease**): Are you suggesting that it may be that the committee for revising those two policies should take this up?

Pease: At least that conversation should be in collaboration with whatever other group you're talking about for more of an honors...If you're looking for some kind

of an honors statement, that may not be the right place. These policies may not be the right place for that, but they should align. They should be well-positioned and the conversations should happen together. If you really want to define in terms of what Mitch (**Strauss**) was talking about, in terms of the structure and the punishments and consequences and those sorts of things—that is policy though. I think you do want to have that conversation within the policies.

Wohlpart: I don't think that committee is the right place for this. It's a culture conversation, but it needs to be informed.

Pease: The culture, may—if that can happen soon enough, may really inform a lot of what goes on in the procedural rights of 3.01 and 12.01.

Petersen: Patrick, (**Pease**) do you know who is chairing the EPC Committee? It was Scott (**Peters**) last year, but I think he's not doing it this year because he's stepped down from the head role, so I don't know who that chair is now.

Wohlpart: Is anybody on that committee in this room? Kristin (**Ahart**) is. You have not been called together yet?

Ahart: No.

Wohlpart: Because you have no chair. Oh dear.

Petersen: Is there a motion then to refer to a special committee; to put a special committee together. Thank you, Senator **O'Kane**. Seconded Senator **Strauss**. Any additional discussion? All in favor, say 'aye.' Is there anyone opposed, say 'nay.' Any abstentions?

Strauss: We got it off the table.

Petersen: Excellent. Thank you, and I will work on putting together that special committee. If there's anyone around this table that has an interest in serving, please let me know and I'll also follow up with the EPC and see if I can figure out who the chair is and do some of that legwork.

O'Kane: May I ask Mitch (**Strauss**) a question?

Petersen: Yes.

O'Kane: Do you have the electronic files for that?

Strauss: I wish I did. I looked all over for them.

O'Kane: I wonder if Otto does.

Strauss: Otto would be the one. He's been retired.

Wohlpert: Steve (**O'Kane**), are you talking about this document?

O'Kane: This document and whatever we have.

Strauss: It's been so long ago. I went through all my files and found little bits and pieces. I probably burned it on a bonfire. [Laughter]

Petersen: The next item for consideration is the Suggested Modification to the Criteria for the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence. I know we have Tim (**Kidd**) here who originally petitioned this item and we also have some revisions that Faculty Chair **Cutter** is suggesting. Tim (**Kidd**), would you be willing to get us started?

Kidd: Sure. In the two years that I was Faculty Chair, some questions came up during the process for this award. Part of it was because the qualifications are kind of vague. It's like you're excellent in all areas of university life kind of summed it up. And so one thing that we looked at was the idea that full professorship, might be if not a criterion, then highly recommended, because the challenge for the committee to accurately judge scholarship or different specific things to a different field. So it was often like, "Is this paper a good paper or a bad paper? Is that a high tier journal? Is this important? What is meant by the author list, right?" So at least if you are excellent in your field we can assume that you would be made full professor. So that was our thinking there. That was the main change that we proposed. That was the main thing that we have.

Petersen: So Tim (**Kidd**), to summarize, eligibility would require the rank of full professor?

Kidd: Either require or pass on wording that would say "highly desirable" or "in rare cases," or "in exceptional cases."

Mattingly: It already says, "However, exceptions can be made in the case of particularly outstanding work."

Kidd: Yeah. That was the idea. Right, to have a little bit of leeway there. And that is because again some departments don't have any full professors. I don't know why that is, so I don't want to make judgements on that. Or maybe a particular candidate has really outstanding in one area, like really, really crazy standing, that

would overcome say less outstanding in a different area, and that outstanding area doesn't contribute to them getting full professorship in that discipline.

Petersen: Thank you, Tim (**Kidd**). Faculty Chair **Cutter** I know you also are bringing a revision. You want to talk about your suggested revision?

Cutter: Sure, so this came out of in the summer we had some conversations with the Provost's Office with Associate Provost **Valentine** and Kristin **Herrera**, our Administrative Assistant, about...I guess there were complaints that committee members had that they were inundated with student evaluations, because one of the procedures is to provide student evaluations for this award. And so we talked about maybe cutting them down or something and then we looked at the two other Regents Universities, because it's a Regent's Award. All three of the Regents Universities have it, and neither of them requires teaching evaluations—student evaluations. They require CV's, letters of nomination and/or recommendation, and Iowa State has an option for several pages of supplemental material that are optional, and that's it. So it's a simpler procedure and also given the current literature on biases in student evaluations, and correct me if I'm wrong Provost **Wohlpert**, but I understand you have a new approach to their use at the University—more formative than summative, so it seemed that maybe this is a good time to just cut that out of the requested materials, and have it be letters of recommendation and CV and additional materials as “three representative artifacts”—is the current language—“of your choice.” So that's where the origins of this suggested change.

Petersen: Thank you Faculty Chair **Cutter**.

Cutter: And I did notice something else I had been thinking of. It says, on the suggested modifications (that did not come from me), but—should College Senates who are asked to obtain nominations also be asked to judge the candidate in any way? One of the things that the other two schools do is they request letters of nomination with the nomination, so I just thought I'd throw that out there. Tim (**Kidd**) do you have any...

Kidd: They brought that up in discussions the first year, and I talked to some people at College Senates and they didn't feel comfortable having a discussion about it of any sort, but maybe a letter of nomination, like you say, from the Chair of the College Senate or their designee. I'm not sure. It just seemed like they weren't comfortable saying, "I'm not quite approving of the candidate."

Cutter: So that's why, since I've looked at the other policies, the other policies say a letter of nomination, which might be more in line with what the sentiment was here.

Zeit: Are you saying there would be a committee tasked with the requirement to go out and identify who the people would be to receive this award, but they don't want to talk about it?

Kidd: No. The question that comes up when we have the work committee is chances are, we're not an expert in that field. Right? Chances are, we're barely in that College, right? And so it would be helpful—and we do have the—when you ask for letters of recommendation, right? So these are people you solicit letters of

recommendation from, but it would be nice if say someone from the College Senate had written something because that would provide an assessment relative to other people in that field. Does that make sense?

Zeitz: That makes sense.

Kidd: I would hope that a person could find two people to write them excellent letters of recommendation. If not, that's a sign in itself, right? But a little more impartial, but someone more related, closer to that field.

Zeitz: Sounds good.

O'Kane: However, are you asking we don't consider teaching, or just that we don't ask for the artifacts?

Cutter: It would be not asking for the student evaluations, but people can—and letters would speak to teaching, and people can include teaching artifacts if they would like to.

O'Kane: Yes.

Hawbaker: I don't know if I'm understanding this correctly, but there is a Regents Award for Faculty Excellence in Teaching and Service as well as Research. Is that correct?

Wohlpart: Yes.

Hawbaker: So, giving a clear preference or a general expectation that the person is a full professor—my concern is that we’ve only recently changed the workload assignment or made it possible for people to earn promotion based on teaching and service, and so some very outstanding teachers and service people, would not have had time to reach that rank, but their contributions may be no less worthy. I see that there’s an exception that can be made, but I don’t...I worry about that change until we’ve had time to build that into the promotion system.

Zeitz: What do we achieve by adding this part about being a full professor if we’re allowed to have exceptions?

Kidd: So the reason again—the full professor idea—is because excellence in one area alone is not sufficient, right? According to Category 2, it’s having a record of excellence across the spectrum—teaching, scholarship, and service—so that’s just the nature of the award. The award is not for people who are excellent in only one category. That’s the teaching award, or the service award, or the scholarship award. And so the exception would really be an exception—to be used only in rare cases where someone could identify this is something obvious. So that’s kind of the point, and to address the question about just teaching and service.

Cutter: Not to gum up the works, but since I happen to have the University of Iowa’s eligibility guidelines in front of me, they say, “All UI faculty members are eligible for selection. Recipients must have a sustained record of excellence across the spectrum of faculty endeavors—teaching, scholarship, service or such outstanding accomplishments in one or more of the areas as to justify their selection.” So it seems like there might be wiggle-room.

Neibert: Which is what item two actually says. It ends with “or such outstanding accomplishments in one or more areas.”

Cutter: So to me that goes back to Becky’s (**Hawbaker**) question.

Petersen: So Becky (**Hawbaker**) are you asking if this award potentially would mean that certain groups of faculty may be excluded based on their workload for eligibility?

Hawbaker: It’s not clear, as exceptions can be made, but it signals a clear preference. I was also a little confused because I was getting this confused with the Excellence Award in Teaching or in Service. There are those specific ones, and not just these global ones. I was also looking back at past recipients to see—I can’t tell. I’m trying to make some guesses but it doesn’t appear to me that all of the people would have been full professors at the time that they were named. Yet they’re all people that I think we would all respect and felt that that was a good award.

Zeitz: We might finish it the same way that I guess the University of Iowa’s doing where it says, “Outstanding work in one or more of the areas.” Finishing that red area with the exception, “However, exceptions can be made in case of particularly outstanding work in one or more of the areas.”

O’Kane: I still wonder what we gain by doing this. I don’t see a big gain.

Kidd: If I could explain the motivation here: It’s not full professorship, it’s a way to have an objective assessment from that area—from that discipline. That’s the

main importance, right? The idea is if they have achieved full professorship in their discipline, that's a metric that we can understand. When we're trying to understand—when we're trying evaluate people in very different fields, right? We're trying to add some fairness. That's the discussion that we had.

Zeit: It could also mean that they haven't published in the right spots. I've been here 26 years and I'm not a full professor. I've written seven books. I'm an international speaker. I do a lot, and I'm a service-oriented person as well. But I'm not a full professor yet and it's something I'm trying to do. Of course when you're this far along, it's difficult to prove that I can do all that—but that's a whole other state. But what I'm saying is that I think that somebody who has the kind of background that I have, who isn't a full professor could indeed be extremely good in service, etc. And as far as scholarship, like I said I write, but I haven't been writing in the referee journals, which means I don't get credit for it.

Kidd: Sure. Look, again this is something I brought up based on the discussions we had in the awarding process. The challenges again, were trying to understand the excellence of someone's endeavors in a field that is not your own. You can look at the artifacts and you can look at the recommendation letters, but what you really want to do is say is, "Hey, you person in Field A, do these things look really awesome?" We can't do that, right? We can't. So if it's something like a nomination letter, that might be the same results, right?

Petersen: Tim (**Kidd**) are you suggesting that perhaps in lieu of a full professor, a nomination letter might suffice as a way to understand a person's excellence?

Kidd: It could, yeah. We just had questions and we were trying to understand. Like for examples in some fields, maybe presenting at a conference is seen as a scholarly activity, whereas in my field that's seen as kind of a 'yeah, sure.' That doesn't sound important at all—at any conference. But if I got invited to talk at this conference though, that's a really big deal, right?" And I know that, right, but who else is going to know it? So that's all.

Zeitz: I think the letter is a good idea.

Stollenwerk: Why not put some guidelines with the letters?

Kidd: That might be a better way to go about it. Absolutely.

Petersen: I'm hearing I think a few different options. One is the full professor criteria as written in red. One would be a nomination letter that perhaps might be in addition to the full professor criteria or instead of that criteria. And then we also have the revision from Barbara (**Cutter**) regarding doing away with student evaluations as a requirement when submitting.

Skaar: I don't disagree with getting rid of the teaching evaluations, for all the reasons that they don't really tell us a whole lot of much, except for formative reasons that we've talked about in the past which I totally agree with. But I worry comparing the way we do things with teacher evaluations to the way Iowa and Iowa State do things, is not a good enough reason because they are R1 institutions, and we are more focused on teaching than they are. And so my fear is even with the three representative artifacts that we get a whole lot of stuff in publications and creative works and less on teaching, and does that then start to skew the award towards those things and away from teaching? I don't know how

to fix that, but as soon as we get rid of those evaluations, that focus on teaching goes away. And I don't know if we as an Institution want to do that because we have a different philosophy on teaching maybe than the other two institutions that are focused more on research and grant writing and those kinds of things, and we focus a little bit more on our teaching, and we talk about that a ton at this institution, and I'm not sure that we want to do that. We can get away with that, but then we maybe have to think about how do we still maintain the focus on teaching within this application?

Petersen: Could we add an additional criterion within one of those three artifacts that there be a teaching artifact?

Skaar: Potentially, yeah. I think we need to replace if we get rid of that.

Cutter: I just want to bring up the language again, that "they shall have a sustained record of excellence across the spectrum of faculty endeavors." So, it's supposed to be all three categories, unless they're really exceptional in two.

Skaar: Right. And I understand that as a committee who reviews these, those things are thought about. But as soon as you leave the three representative artifacts open, it can get skewed in one way or another. It's the way it tends to happen. I don't want to open up a whole box of worms, but thinking about other procedures on campus tend to skew toward publications in refereed...and I don't want to leave that hole open.

Mattingly: I think Senator **O'Kane** was before me.

O’Kane: Two things: I know that we have letters of recommendation already in there. Do we need to say something else in addition to that? And the second thing is, why not just have summary statistics of the teaching evaluation so the committee doesn’t have to look through everything? They just have a summary, and it’s perhaps the applicant’s job to put that together.

Mattingly: I was going to add to that, to what Senator **Skaar** was talking about, in the procedures in Number 4, and Letter B, the procedures already call for the ability of the committee—the Awards Committee—to—let me just read the whole thing: “A maximum of three representative artifacts: publication, creative work, and teaching materials should be included.” And the committee then can contact the applicant again, should they need more exemplars of work. So even if applications don’t include enough teaching materials, the Awards Committee can go back and say, “Well, we need more.”

Skaar: I understand that. But ‘will they?’ is my question. Right? As soon as you put in a ton of excellent other things, will that teaching...will they? I don’t know what it says on the criteria list with the committee when they’re sitting around saying, “Okay, what are we looking for?” Does it really say make sure there’s a lot of stuff about excellence in teaching, or does it not say that? So maybe it’s not about the application, it’s about how the review takes place. I’m not sure.

Kidd: I can answer that.

Skaar: Okay.

Kidd: We don’t have an ulterior list of anything.

Petersen: Barbara (**Cutter**) would you be willing to take these concerns and ideas back to the group for some further revision?

Cutter: Well we could, but what that means is no changes until next year because we have to get these guidelines out soon and there's not going to be time to have that discussion.

Zeitz: Could we vote on parts of it?

Petersen: We certainly could. So we have three potential parts. One, to remove the student evaluations from the criteria. One would be the rank of full professor required. And the third would be a nomination letter, I think instead of the requirement of full professor, is what I'm hearing. But correct me if I'm wrong.

O'Kane: It's already there.

Petersen: In the red? That was added.

O'Kane: No. 4C.

Petersen: I think what I heard Tim (**Kidd**) suggest was a nomination letter from a College Senate Chair perhaps—someone not of the person's choosing. Is that correct, Tim (**Kidd**)?

Kidd: Yeah. It would be someone—either the College Senate Chair or their designee—someone who could have some knowledge of the accomplishments of the person relative to that field.

O'Kane: A department chair or head? They would know better.

Kidd: Maybe. I don't know. But that wasn't my suggestion for wording because again that was the content of my original thought based on the discussions, but then I talked to people in different College Senates, and they didn't want to do that.

Neibert: What about an external person? Like I was contacted from someone in the California State system to look at an individual's scholarship record and based upon my scholarship record and the things that I...I didn't even know this person and I made a recommendation to that committee based upon it because I knew their work. I had seen their work. It seems to have a lot more weight than...

Petersen: Let me ask, what might be the most pressing revision? And perhaps that's not a good question, but perhaps that might help us narrow and prioritize what we might wish to do.

Hawbaker: No one spoke against removing student evaluations. Maybe you could start with that.

Zeitz: Could we just vote on each of the three and see what passes?

Petersen: Sure. So I would ask someone to put forward one of those motions.

Mattingly: I move that we vote on removing student evaluations.

Petersen: Any other discussion?

O'Kane: Do you want to add anything about summary statistics there?

Wohlpart: May I add to the discussion? I would encourage you all to take the SAI's out and I would add the summary statements. I think they should be used in

a formative way. I would encourage you all to include a statement of teaching philosophy. That would be my encouragement.

Mattingly: We can make that a fourth item.

Petersen: Yes. We can amend and that would align very well with the work of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, and how we are thinking about post-tenure review and the types of materials that we will submit for review and evaluation.

Stollenwerk: So we would completely remove student evaluation from determination of the award and replace it with a statement of teaching philosophy?

Petersen: That's the amended motion.

Stollenwerk: With no review summary? Sometimes I find that... and I don't like to use student evaluation—I mean they're biased. They get an 'A' and sometimes they write better reviews than if they get an 'F,' but using them with a grain of salt.

Stafford: They're still of value.

Stollenwerk: Sometimes they tell a little bit in that sense.

Burnight: Is this saying that they cannot be requested, or that they cannot be included? That is to say they cannot be submitted if the candidate chooses to?

Petersen: They're not required.

Burnight: They're not required. That's the distinction.

Cutter: And you have your artifacts, and you get to choose.

Burnight: So we're not saying that they can't be.

Cutter: Correct.

Mattingly: We would just remove the requirement off of the procedure list.

Burnight: Thank you.

Smith: So you could still include them as one of your artifacts.

Zeitz: The summary could be an artifact.

Petersen: Senator **Mattingly**, would you mind repeating the motion as it stands?

Mattingly: Yes. I move that we accept the proposal to delete the requirement for student evaluations in the procedures for the Faculty Excellence Award as proposed.

Petersen: Second, Senator **Burnight**. Any other discussion?

Stafford: Could there be even "A maximum of three artifacts," and they were giving examples of what those artifacts might be. We could add, "publications, creative works, teaching materials, comma—summation of evaluations comma, et cetera."

Petersen: Yes. Would you like to amend this motion to include that as an example under 2B?

O'Kane: Or perhaps we could make it four artifacts?

Smith: Especially if you're going to add teaching philosophy.

Skaar: That's what my question was. I thought part of the amendment was to add teaching philosophy as a 'C' or whatever.

Mattingly: I think we were going to add that as a separate option to vote.

Skaar: Oh, we're going to leave that as a separate one.

Mattingly: I think. Is that correct?

Petersen: That is correct.

Stafford: I like Steve's—Senator **O'Kane's** idea about a maximum of four though. That allows a candidate to present more data.

Petersen: So the motion is...one more time Senator **Mattingly**?

Mattingly: The motion is to remove student evaluations from the requirement on the procedures to accept Barb's (**Cutter**) proposal.

Petersen: And then to include under 2B in the example list Teaching Summations as an option?

Stafford: And, maximum of four artifacts.

Petersen: Excellent.

Zeitz: It would be teacher evaluation summations, right?

Petersen: Yes. Any other discussion? Okay. All in favor, say 'aye.' Is there anyone opposed, say 'nay.' Any abstentions? The motion passes. Excellent. Thank you. Now, do we want to consider a second motion?

Skaar: I make a motion to add a requirement as a statement of teaching philosophy to the requirements for the Awards Committee.

Petersen: Second by Senator **Strauss**. Discussion?

Kidd: May I ask for a page length on that?

Mattingly: Yes, so that would be a requirement in the procedures?

Fenech: Brief.

Zeitz: 250-words. That's one-page.

Skaar: Double-spaced or single-spaced?

Zeitz: Double-spaced.

Petersen: So the motion is a brief addition of a teaching philosophy as a requirement (one-page).

Choi: I would suggest that you require a philosophy of all three areas because this has a symbolic meaning, because this award is to emphasize or acknowledge all three areas, and to get along with other Regents universities. But brief.

Cutter: I would like to caution us against making this award make much more burdensome than the other schools are requiring people. So, I don't want to make it so much work that people don't want to follow through after they're nominated.

Skaar: The reason I like the just the teaching part is to elevate the teaching piece of this at this particular institution because we are not an R1. So I would like to keep it pure to teaching.

Smith: I also think that the person themselves could balance it out however they want. If their artifacts are more heavily towards research and publication, then they've got the teaching philosophy and they can balance it to an extent as well.

Choi: Although I agree that it doesn't have to be too burdensome, I still would like to see some general like what is the research area, what is the research interest, what kind of publication it is. Some summary briefs area would make sense.

Zeitz: Isn't there a cover letter that they're going to have where they could lay that kind of thing out? I would imagine that when you submit something like this there's a cover letter.

O'Kane: Perhaps we could approach this from two angles. One is vote on whether or not to have the teaching statement, and then vote on whether we do all three?

Petersen: So then we would need, if there's no more discussion, to vote on the current motion, which is the addition of a teaching philosophy statement as a requirement; brief one-page.

Choi: I would vote yes for including teaching philosophy as far as including all other things; the other three areas. So in that case, how should I vote?

O’Kane: ‘Yes’ to both. The motion doesn’t say only this. It says that we’re adding that.

Choi: That’s a different story.

Petersen: So your vote on the current motion would be dependent upon potentially the opportunity to vote on a second motion that would include the other two statements of philosophy, around teaching and service and research?

Choi: I just want to put an equal emphasis on the three areas. That’s my suggestion.

Smith: The artifacts statement has ‘et cetera,’ so it could include a statement on research, publication—whatever a person wants to include.

Fenech: Hi, I don’t know how many of you have been on the committees for the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence, but I was on it last year. And, as Senator **Kidd** will no doubt concur, we had some packages that were in excess of 400-500 pages, and it was extraordinarily burdensome. So my suggestion would be not to add further weight to this, because it took so much time to go through these things, and I’m quite surprised I haven’t said anything yet about it. But man, that was a lot of work. And how many were there last year? Five people? Six, seven? And it was probably 1,500 pages in total. Well, no. It was over 1,000 pages for sure and that was just brutal. So that’s all I have to say about that. It was brutal. Thank you.

Alam: What about Iowa and Iowa State. Do they have a teaching philosophy in there? Or research?

Cutter: No they...I'll tell you what each one has if you're interested. Iowa has a nomination statement by the nominator, CV, and two letters of recommendation by other people of the nominee's choice. ISU has a letter of nomination, a CV, and up to five additional pages of relevant supplemental information including letters of recommendation.

Stollenwerk: We have nothing to limit?

Cutter: We have nothing to limit it. Just four artifacts, so they could be whatever size.

Stollenwerk: We need to limit.

Stafford: If that's what's being submitted, we need to limit.

Stollenwerk: That's ridiculous.

Petersen: I'm going to call the question of the current motion, because we have just about five minutes remaining, and then we certainly can revisit this. We can send it back to committee. Whatever we might choose to do.

Mattingly: Unless Nikki (**Skaar**) wants to remove the motion from the table.

Petersen: So the motion is again, the addition of a teaching statement [of philosophy] as a requirement, very brief. All in favor, say 'aye.' Is there any opposed? Any abstentions? Three abstentions: Senator **Choi**, Senator **Alam**, and Senator **Mattingly**. So the motion carries. Now, do we need to send it back to the committee for further revision for consideration of what we've talked about?

Gould: I think that would probably be wise.

Zeitz: But she just said if we send it back it's not going to change until next year.

Petersen: So we have the current changes for this year in place then.

Zeitz: But we didn't vote on the one about the full professor. And also, we didn't vote as whether we'll have all three statements [of philosophy]. That's on the table as well. And we have to vote on whether that's going to go or not.

Petersen: Thank you Senator **Zeitz**. So is there a motion to take on either of those suggestions.

Choi: Since I already abstained, basically opposed to including teaching [philosophy] statements, I will now remove [the motion] for the three statements.

Petersen: Is there a motion for the requirement of full professor in the criteria?

Zeitz: Don't we vote?

O'Kane: We have to do one at a time.

Petersen: She withdrew her motion.

Zeitz: I move that we add all three.

Petersen: Any additional discussion? Is there a second? Thank you, second by Senator **Stafford**. Any additional discussion?

Neibert: Question: So when we say 'all three' what are we referring to?

Wohlpart: 3C would become a statement of teaching philosophy, research philosophy, and service philosophy.

Zeitz: We're talking about a philosophy for all three areas.

Cutter: I do have concerns about things like a research philosophy statement because we have CV's which give a record of your research, and I wouldn't want to make it more problematic for people who have a varied research agenda and have changed their interests throughout their career, and so their research philosophy might not sound coherent as somebody who has been working in the same area, so intellectually I think that's something to consider.

Choi: Research interests should not be a problem as far as they have some philosophy. They can share their philosophy of research and why they're changing, and how their research can contribute to the field.

Petersen: Barbara (**Cutter**) do you need...Could we table these motions until September 10th or is that too late for this year? Just in the interest of time.

Cutter: I think September 10th is still okay.

Mattingly: You can call the vote on this.

Petersen: Alright. So let me call the vote on this.

Zeitz: I'll so move...

Petersen: All in favor of adding the addition of a service philosophy and a research philosophy to the criteria, say 'aye.' [Silence] And those that are

opposed, say 'nay.' [Many nays] And any abstentions? Senator **Choi**, Senator **Mattingly**, Senator **Alam**. So, three abstentions.

Strauss: I move we adjourn.

Petersen: Thank you, Senator **Strauss**. Is there a second?

Zeitz: We have one more thing we can vote on and that's it. I would like to move we spend another five minutes on this and finish it up. Second by Senator **O'Kane**.

Petersen: All in favor of one last vote and five more minutes, say 'aye.' Thank you Senator **Zeitz**. Is there a motion then to include the full professor as criteria for the award? So moved. Thank you Senator **Skaar**. A second? Thank you Senator **Stafford**. Any other discussion. Alright. All in favor of adding the requirement of full professor to the criteria, say 'aye.' [Some aye] And those who are opposed, say 'nay.' [Many nays] Do I need to do a show of hands? No, okay. Any abstentions? [None] Alright, so the motion does not pass.

Zeitz: So we're done on this, right?

Petersen: I'm going to go back to Senator **Strauss's** motion to adjourn. Second by **Zeitz**. Thank you all.

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

Next Meeting: 3:30 p.m. Monday, Sept.10, 2018
301 Rod Library (Scholar Space) University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa