

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

01/28/08

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:19 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 01/14/08 meeting by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Christensen. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker updated the Senate on the governor's recommendation for the state's budget, noting that the governor recommended funding 90% of the faculty salary bill. The special funding for the three Regent's universities for science and math education was reduced from \$5.5 million to about \$4.7 million.

Regarding his idea of having a committee to work on broadening the definition of research and scholarship for tenure and promotion, Joel Haack, Dean, College of Natural Sciences, will be serving on that committee. He has received suggested department heads names from the deans and will talk with the Council of Department Heads to get their opinion. He would also like to have two faculty selected by either the Faculty Senate or by himself, and he will also be talking with Hans Isakson, Chair, United Faculty, about getting two faculty representative from United Faculty. Discussion followed and it was agreed that the Faculty Senate will choose the two faculty representatives to serve on that committee.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari reported that the search committee for the new Provost has reviewed the applications and he will report as information becomes available.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

954 Emeritus Status request, Juergen Koppensteiner, Department of Modern Languages, effective 12/07

Motion to docket in regular order as item #862 by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Gray. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

The Faculty Senate moved into Executive Session.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Chair Licari noted that Faculty Senate Calendar Item #951 - CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee was referred to the Liberal Arts Core Committee and will be addressed at the February 11, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

859 Graduation with Honors Draft

In response to Senator Wurtz's request for clarification as to why the reduction in the number of credit hours students must earn at UNI in order to receive an honor rating, Chair Licari responded that the proposal is to reduce the hours from 60 to 55 so that students who are transferring from another institution, who are allowed to transfer in with up to 65 hours, can complete their degree at UNI and still graduate with honors. As it currently stands if they transfer in with 65 credit hours they will not necessarily get 60 hours of credit here as it is possible to graduate with 120 credit hours. This proposal will allow those transfer students to complete their degree here and to graduate with honors if their GPA is sufficient.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) discussed and unanimously passed a recommendation to support this proposal.

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

Discussion followed.

Motion passed with 2 opposed.

860 CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution - Enhancing the Professional Development Assignment Committee

Chair Licari noted that this comes from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts (CHFA) Faculty Senate to change the composition of the Professional Development Assignment Committee to include two faculty members from CHFA.

Motion to accept by Senator Mvuyekure; second by Senator Neuhaus.

A lengthy discussion followed.

The motion to accept the proposal from the CHFA Faculty Senate on enhancing the Professional Development Assignment Committee was defeated unanimously with one abstention.

Chair Licari noted that a recommendation to direct the Professional Development Assignment Committee to begin keeping track of statistical data as discussed by the Faculty Senate can be brought back to the Senate.

861 Emeritus Status request, Lucille J. Lettow, Library, effective 01/08

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

Motion passed unanimously.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, IRA SIMET

Faculty Chair Simet announced that the first meeting of the Academic Rigor/Academic Integrity discussion group that Sue Joseph had initiated is tentatively scheduled for Monday, February 18 at 3:30, and he will announce the location once he has that confirmed.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Senator Schumacher-Douglas asked about the curriculum proposal that was discussed at the last meeting, 440:120 Technology Integration for the HPELS Profession, in which there was a change in credit hours and the Computer Science Department had requested a consultation with HPELS.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that that request was dropped by HPELS and has been pulled from the Curriculum Package.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING 01/28/08 1656

PRESENT: Maria Basom, David Christensen, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Paul Gray, Bev Kopper, Michael Licari, James Lubker, David Marchesani, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Ira Simet, Jerry Smith, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz, Michele Yehieli

Absent: Gregory Bruess, Mary Guenther, Steve O'Kane, Phil Patton, Jerry Soneson

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:19 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 01/14/08 meeting by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Christensen. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker updated the Senate on the governor's recommendation for the state's budget, noting it was not good news nor was it bad news. The governor recommended funding 90% of the faculty salary bill, and the governor's recommendation is always the best-case scenario. The special funding for the three Regent's universities for science and math education was reduced from \$5.5 million to about \$4.7 million. Now the jockeying starts for how much the budget will really be and he will keep the Senate informed as he receives information.

In regards to the idea of having a committee to work on broadening the definition of research and scholarship for tenure and promotion, Interim Provost Lubker stated that he has recruited Joel Haack, Dean, College of Natural Sciences, to serve. He has received suggested department heads names from the deans but he would like to talk with the Council of Department Heads to get their opinion. In addition, he would like to have two faculty selected by either the Faculty Senate or by himself, whichever the Senate would prefer. He will also be talking with Hans Isakson, Chair, United Faculty, about getting two faculty representatives from United Faculty.

Interim Provost Lubker asked the faculty if they want to select the two faculty representatives or leave it up to him?

Senator Christensen asked if those faculty representatives needed to be members of the Faculty Senate.

Interim Provost Lubker said it could be two senators representing the faculty.

Senator Neuhaus asked if there was a deadline for the two faculty representatives being identified?

Interim Provost Lubker replied that he may be unrealistic but he would like to see a recommendation back by the first of April.

A brief discussion followed as to whether the Senate would rather choose the two representatives or have them named by the Provost. It was decided that the Faculty Senate will choose the two faculty representatives to serve on the Provost's committee to look at broadening the definition of research and scholarship for tenure and promotion. Interim Provost Lubker asked for the names as soon as possible.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari reported that the search committee for the new Provost has reviewed the applications and are in the process of narrowing down the pool of candidates. Other than that, there is nothing to report as the process is confidential and he will inform the Senate once there is something to report.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

954 Emeritus Status request, Juergen Koppensteiner, Department of Modern Languages, effective 12/07

Motion to docket in regular order as item #862 and to correct the spelling of his name on the green sheet by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Gray. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

The Faculty Senate moved into Executive Session.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Chair Licari noted that Faculty Senate Calendar Item #951 - CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee was referred to the Liberal Arts Core Committee and will be addressed at the February 11, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

859 Graduation with Honors Draft

Chair Licari noted that this document is the proposed change to the credit requirement for graduating with honors at UNI.

Senator Wurtz asked for clarification on why the change from 60 to 55 hours as the number of credit hours students must earn at UNI to receive an honor rating.

Chair Licari responded that the proposal is to reduce the hours from 60 to 55 so that students who are transferring from another institution, and who are allowed to transfer in up to 65 credit hours, can complete their degree at UNI and still graduate with

honors. As it currently stands if they transfer in with 65 credit hours they will not necessarily get 60 hours of credit here as it is possible to graduate with 120 credit hours. This proposal will allow those transfer students to complete their degree here and still manage to graduate with honors if their GPA is sufficient.

Associate Provost Kopper shared with the Senate that the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) did discuss this issue and unanimously passed a recommendation to support this proposal. In their discussion it was noted that if UNI accepts students with 65 credit hours it would be unfair not to allow them to be able to graduate with honors. Under the current policy, they did not feel it would be a good thing to ask students wanting to graduate with honors to return for a semester just to complete those hours, as graduation with honors is based on their UNI GPA.

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

Senator East noted that he had asked at the last meeting for additional information on why the maximum number of transfer credit hours is 65.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that that number is part of the articulation agreements the Board of Regents (BOR) has with the University of Iowa, Iowa State, and UNI and the state community colleges. All three Regents institutions accept 65 transfer credit hours.

Senator Marchesani asked if this would take care of the situation that was brought to the Senate last fall regarding this.

Associate Provost Kopper responded that yes, it would.

Senator East asked if we know what the graduate with honors expectations are at Iowa and Iowa State?

Associate Provost Kopper responded that she does not know.

Senator Gray asked if accepting this applies retroactively to those currently in the Honors Program or just to those that are transferring in from here on out?

Associate Provost Kopper replied that this doesn't relate specifically to the Honors Program, it relates to all students.

There was not discussion at the UCC about this being retroactive.

Senator Neuhaus asked if this will go into effect this semester, to which Associate Provost Kopper responded that it would.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas called the question.

Motion passed with 2 opposed.

860 CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution - Enhancing the Professional Development Assignment Committee

Chair Licari noted that this comes from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts (CHFA) Faculty Senate to change the composition of the Professional Development Assignment Committee to include two faculty members from CHFA.

Motion to accept by Senator Mvuyekure; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Senator Funderburk asked if the Professional Development Assignment Committee (PDAC) is a committee that reports to the Faculty Senate?

Chair Licari responded that technically the Provost is the chair of this committee, or his/her designee. This has fallen, by default, to the Graduate College.

Senator Funderburk questioned the Faculty Senate's jurisdiction to appoint someone to a committee that is not a Senate committee.

Chair Licari replied that probably the best the Senate can do is to make a recommendation.

Senator East noted that currently the members of the PDAC committee are elected by the colleges and that professional development leaves are part of the negotiated agreement so who would this recommendation go to?

Chair Licari responded that it would still be appropriate for the Senate to make a recommendation to the Provost and the Dean of the Graduate College about opening up another elected spot for CHFA.

Senator Smith asked if the PDAC currently has one representative from each college serving on it?

Chair Licari responded yes.

Senator Smith continued, assuming that the rationale for the request is that in CHFA there are "humanities" types and "arts" types, and they want representation for both. This worries him because you then undermine the one representative per college committee make-up and open it up to arguments such as we need a representative for this or for that. He worries more about the precedent this would set.

Senator Neuhaus asked if there could be a dynamic that could be set up that would cause higher membership from each college?

Senator East responded that he currently sits on that committee and that Senator Van Wormer has also served on that committee.

Senator Van Wormer noted that it would cause the committee to be lop-sided to have an extra representative.

Senator Smith asked if their experiences on the PDAC have been that college representatives on the committee tend to promote their own people?

Senator VanWormer responded that yes, that tends to happen.

Senator East responded that that happens to some degree but he believes everyone tries to be objective but you are better able to speak to someone from your college, and if you have doubts you're less likely to have them about those you are familiar with than those that you are not familiar with.

Senator Funderburk remarked that it is his understanding that often there is no one that represents the creative-side at all in the discussions. It is not so much the college end of it but as it is often a "gray" area and there is no one at all actually working in the area involved with that committee.

Senator Christensen replied that you could build a case for every college on campus to have more than one member, and doesn't see that as a prevailing reason.

Senator Wurtz noted in response to the comment that there's no one there that represents the arts, it is an elective position so are they not electing someone who represents the arts?

Senator Funderburk commented that the issue is that there are two things going on, traditional research and those people may not understand the creative side. And it may also be true that the creative person doesn't understand traditional research. There are many in CHFA that don't do paper related work.

Senator Wurtz continued if there is that much fragmentation do we need to consider expanding the committee, not just for one but for others as well? If indeed that is a true fragmentation, she can see that there would be others, and while she doesn't like the suggestion, if we're going to expand for one we better be prepared to expand for others.

Senator Smith stated that he'd be more comfortable knowing what the past approval rates were. If there was a pattern of "discrimination" of one group that was just not getting their requests approved, then a stronger case can be made. But if records showed that art-types were getting approved at roughly the same rate then the proposal loses its force.

Senator Gray commented that what we're seeing is just illuminating one of the many problems of this particular paradigm for PDA's. The presumption when faculty apply is that they have to describe their research in terminology that someone not familiar with the research can understand. From his perspective that means it's not research if you can explain it so someone not affiliated with your field can understand it. Also the presumption is people not in CHFA can't do creative work. Why can't someone from the College of Natural Sciences put together a creative proposal? It's not allowed but yet creative proposals are solicited. There are so many facets of this particular committee that just rub him the wrong way and adding more representation to the committee is just exasperating the problem. It should be more of a college-controlled entity.

Senator Funderburk noted that one of the ties with that is that historically anything that has to do directly with your teaching is automatically disallowed. Yet this institution is supposed to be about teaching.

Senator East stated that it is his understanding that the Provost is going to have someone look at professional development assignments.

Interim Provost Lubker responded that the Graduate College Dean will be doing that.

Senator East continued, stating that he sent an email out some time ago and Chair Licari had responded that he anticipated working on this as part of his administrative assignment.

Chair Licari replied that in fact, yes, but not as part of his administrative fellowship but as part of his duties here as Faculty Senate Chair. He has met with some other campus leaders and people in the graduate college recently but did not discuss these particular concerns but they are looking at the make up and how that committee works.

Senator East noted that he had actually made a recommendation that this go back to the college level and not reach the university level where someone unfamiliar with that field is expected to judge whether or not a proposal is reasonable. And also to actually explicitly include rather than explicitly exclude professional development from a PDA. If you read the rules right now, Professional Development is explicitly excluded.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas stated that the fact that it was brought to the Faculty Senate must mean that they are seeking some kind of assistance in exploring and looking at this as a problem that the Faculty Senate should be interested in. She would be interested in having more data about the history of the awards, the history of the nominations, the areas in which requests have been made, who was awarded, how many times someone has been awarded multiple times, how often is a "newbie" given it versus someone who has received it multiple times, those kinds of things. She believes this is a Faculty Senate issue that we should be interested in.

Senator Funderburk reported, based on some meetings last year, which included David Walker, then Associate Dean, Sponsored Programs, who had run this for a very long time, this data doesn't seem to be any place, which is the problem with this whole thing. It has to do with your individual perception of what's happening versus my perception, and neither one of us have the information.

Chair Licari commented that they tried to get that information last year and came up empty handed.

Senator East stated that that information is confidential. Frequency of awards and who was awarded is not confidential, who

applied and what they applied to do is confidential. The committee is explicitly told, "Do not share this."

Chair Licari continued that you don't need identifiers; you can have acceptance rates.

Senator East stated that after the proposals are read they are destroyed. There is no way to go back and create this notion of how many creative proposals that did not involve research or scholarship or publishing were submitted, that information is not available. The only thing available as far as he can tell is who got awarded.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas continued that perhaps that demographic database type of information is something we want to be kept. It can still be confidential, as it doesn't have to be by name.

Senator Yehieli agreed, saying that it's that base information, and even if we haven't kept it in the past we need to be doing it. People that have been at UNI a long time, should they get those PDAs, or those people new to UNI? Is it competitive? Is it not competitive? Is it seniority based? There are broader issues that need to be thought about.

Senator Funderburk noted that he's unaware of there being any concerns in Music that they haven't been fairly treated. It may be because their area is easier to see.

Senator Yehieli reported that there are creative areas in HPELS, such as in the area of dance, and the dance people often complain, citing research versus performance in dance, is it creative, how do you judge it? We need to look at these broader issues.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas remarked that it also ties in with the examination of what is scholarship, as with the committee that is going forward to see if we can broaden that definition. Keeping track of the demographics on these awards could either be reassuring or could point out some deficits.

Senator Gray noted that the big problem with keeping numbers is the presumption that you are going to be doing the same thing in the future. He would really like to recommend looking at the process.

Senator East stated that he seconds Senator Gray's recommendations. He's been on the PDAC three years and has hated almost every minute of it because it seems it's totally unfair to call something a PDA and then say it has to be either research or a creative component, which as far as he can tell has nothing to do with scholarship.

Senator Neuhaus asked for additional insight as to the process. There are X number of awards given out, and one would assume that there would be some fraction that's going to go to each of the colleges which may not be an even number. If we move it down to the college level, are we just handing the problem to someone else; we would now have four or five or six groups involved in the process? For CHFA, would it be any better? There are a lot of people coming from a lot of different directions trying to fairly assess a finite number of prizes.

Senator East stated there is no rhyme or reason as to how the PDAs are awarded. There are approximately thirty-some proposals of which approximately half of those are going to get awarded. The PDAC rates them according to some personal process, the highest rated ones get the awards, the lowest rated ones don't. Sometimes you get two or three from the same department and the department is then left with the burden of replacing three people at one time. There is no planning for these other than writing a proposal that meets certain specifications, the people on the committee evaluate them according to a historical mechanism, there's no prorating them to see who gets how many, it's all in the hands of this committee who does whatever it currently feels like doing. Based on comments made while the committee was evaluating the proposals, those who don't do creative proposals don't feel confident that they are doing a reasonable job of judging them, and there is probably some resentment from the people who do creative proposals. The people who do creative proposals get to go perform and they don't have to report on it like the rest who perform and then do a report. He feels there is plenty of resentment to go around and difficulty with the process.

Moving the process back to CHFA where there are some people who are more readily available to discern that problem, Senator East continued, is much better he believes than having the College of Natural Sciences and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the College of Education decide on what's a good creative proposal. Moving it back to the college level is a good idea in his opinion.

Senator Funderburk commented that he believes it is a difficult process but they are attempting to keep the same standards across and this gives it a certain degree of integrity. From what he also understands, there is a huge variety from one year to the next of the number of proposals. If we start to divvy up what is a very small number these awards by colleges, we potentially then start funding proposals that would never have had a chance previously. If every college gives one every year then somebody's going to get it every time, and that's going to be a concern because the numbers are very small. The contract issue is a minimum number, not the maximum. However, the Provost is free to give more any time he likes.

Chair Licari stated that the Senate has drifted off the subject of the motion, which was originally to support the proposal from CHFA. The Senate has drifted into some other ideas about how to operate the PDAC and how to divvy up those awards and things like that that are not the subject of the motion. The Senate needs to decide on the motion, which is to support the recommendation by the CHFA Faculty Senate.

Senator Funderburk called the question.

The motion to accept the proposal from the CHFA Faculty Senate on enhancing the PDAC was defeated unanimously with one abstention.

Chair Licari announced that he will soon be meeting with other campus leaders including United Faculty and Chair of the Graduate Faculty, and will try to convey as much of this information that was identified as useful to further these kinds of discussions.

Senator Neuhaus asked if the Senate needs to do anything in particular to put forward the idea of about keeping statistics with no identifying information from the PDAC so that comparison data would be available in the future.

Chair Licari responded that one thing that can be brought back to the Senate would be a recommendation to direct the PDAC to begin to keep track of those aggregate level statistics.

Senator Basom asked if Chair Licari would be getting back to the CHFA Faculty Senate to let them know our reasons why we opposed their proposal? And could they also be asked to look back to see how many were awarded PDAs to see if there is a discrepancy?

Chair Licari said it will be in the Faculty Senate minutes but he will contact them directly but just knowing who received the awards doesn't really tell us anything. There may be a year with no awards for creative proposals but it may also have been a year when there were no creative proposals coming forward.

Senator East noted that just because someone from the Art Department received a PDA doesn't necessarily mean that it was a creative proposal.

861 Emeritus Status request, Lucille J. Lettow, Library,
effective 01/08

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

Senator Neuhaus noted that Lucille Lettow began her professional career for the Cedar Falls Community Schools as a School Library Media Specialist in 1969 and served in that capacity until 1980 when she joined the faculty at UNI. During her productive career Dr. Lettow conducted more than 150 workshops statewide for educators, librarians and media specialists. On the UNI campus she has conducted an estimated 1,000 workshops for educators, students and faculty on a wide array of topics in young adult and children's literature. Her scholarly achievements range from co-authorship of four books, publication of over 50 articles and presentations at over 100 conferences. She has won numerous awards both state and nationally. In 1982 Dr. Lettow was awarded the State Historical Society of Iowa Recognition for Achievement in the Cause of Local History. In 1990 she received the Iowa Educational Media Association's Iowa Intellectual Freedom Award. In 1995, again by the Iowa Educational Media Association, she was awarded a Presidential Citation. In 1995 and 1996 Dr. Lettow was nominated for the UNI Outstanding Service Award. In 1998 the American Library Association's Office of Intellectual Freedom placed her on the Freedom to Read Foundation Roll of Honor. In 2000 she was also awarded the Iowa Educational Media Association's Lamplighter Award. Also in 2000 she was chosen as the American representative for Anne Khazam's BBC World Service Broadcast. And in this, her final year, Dr. Lettow was recognized on this campus with a UNI Faculty excellence Award. Throughout her career Dr. Lettow has been a champion for literacy and intellectual freedom, and there are thousands, if not tens of thousands of students, librarians, instructors and readers of

all ages that have been quite moved by her career and very much touched and motivated by her example.

Motion passed unanimously.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, IRA SIMET

Faculty Chair Simet announced that the first meeting of the Academic Rigor/Academic Integrity discussion group that Sue Joseph had initiated is tentatively scheduled for Monday, February 18 at 3:30. He will get an announcement once he has a location confirmed. He is looking at the list serve to try to identify a key theme for that meeting and would be happy for suggestions.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Senator Schumacher-Douglas asked about the curriculum proposal, 440:120 Technology Integration for the HPELS Profession, in which there was a change in credit hours and the Computer Science Department had requested a consultation with HPELS.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that that request was dropped by HPELS and has been pulled from the Curriculum Package.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Gray to adjourn; second by Senator East.
Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:13 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary