

**Regular Meeting**  
**UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**10/22/18 (3:29 – 5:03)**  
**Mtg. #1813**  
**SUMMARY MINUTES**  
**Scholar Space (301) Rod Library**

**Call for Press Identification:** No members of the press were present.

**Introduction of Guests:** Brenda **Bass**, Carissa **Froyum**, Terri **Lasswell**, Chris **Martin**, Joyce **Morrow**, Kristin **Moser**, Scott **Peters**.

**Courtesy Announcements**

United Faculty President Becky **Hawbaker** announced a celebration of the recertification vote on November 2nd from 5-7 at the Octopus, and encouraged faculty to be part of the many on-going campus initiatives (**See Pages 4-5**)

Chair **Petersen** clarified that on December 10<sup>th</sup> the Senate will most likely vote on the General Education Committee's Mission and Learning Outcomes, and encouraged faculty to discuss these with colleagues. (**See Pages 5-6**)

**Minutes for Approval Oct.8, 2018 – Summary Minutes & Transcript**

**\*\* (Stafford/Zeitz)** Passed.

**Committee Reports**

Northern Iowa Student Government – Vice President Kristin **Ahart** (**See Pages 7-12** )

**Calendar Items for Docketing**

1416 [Emeritus request for Kenneth Baughman, Department of Language and Literatures](#)

**\*\* (Gould/Skaar)** Passed. All aye.

**Consideration of Docketed Items**

1413 1292 [Emeritus request for Clare Struck, Department](#) of Teaching (**O'Kane/Choi**)

**\*\* to move 1413, 1414,1415 to head of the order.** Passed. All aye.

**(See Pages 13-15)**

- 1414 1293 [Emeritus request for James Hanson, Social Work](#)  
\*\* (Strauss/Skaar) Passed. All aye. (See Page 15)
- 1415 1294 [Emeritus request for Donald Briggs, Health, Recreation & Community Services](#)  
\*\* (Neibert/Mattingly) Passed. All aye. (See Pages 16-17)
- 1402 1281 Higher Learning Commission Accreditation Consultation  
(See Pages 17-37 )
- 1412 1291 Faculty Handbook Consultation (See Pages 37-56)

**Adjournment** (Zeitz/Smith) 5:03 p.m. by acclamation.

**Next Meeting:**

3:30 p.m. Monday, **October 22, 2018**  
301 Rod Library (Scholar Space)  
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa

***A complete transcript of 57 pages and 0 addendum follows.***

**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the  
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**October 22nd, 2018**

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

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

**CALL TO ORDER, PRESS IDENTIFICATION, & INTRODUCTION of GUESTS**

**Petersen:** Welcome. I’ll call our meeting to order. I don’t see any press in the room, but I do see a number of guests. So, let me ask if our guests would be willing to introduce themselves, and the topic they are here to represent or consult with us on.

**Peters:** Scott **Peters**, I’m here to talk about the HLC Reaccreditation.

**Moser:** Kristin **Moser**, HLC Reaccreditation.

**Wohlpert:** We thought you were here to talk about the road trip. The road show.

**Peters:** Oh yeah.

**Morrow:** Joyce **Morrow**, Registrar, just visiting.

**Froyum:** Carissa **Froyum**, Faculty Evaluation.

**Petersen:** Thank you and welcome. President **Nook** is not with us today. He is travelling. Any comments Provost **Wohlpart**?

**Wohlpart:** I will pass because there's lots of wonderful stuff to talk about today.

**Petersen:** Faculty Chair **Cutter**?

**Cutter:** I will pass as well. [Laughter]

**Hawbaker:** Just a quick update. I want to thank everyone who has already participated in the recertification election. As of Friday evening, 508 of us have voted out of 646—or something like this, so if we have that kind of turnout on November 6<sup>th</sup>, I think we can all look forward to a brighter future. So I encourage you to do that kind of voting as well. Regardless of the outcome, we will also be holding an organizational celebration on November 2<sup>nd</sup> at the Octopus from 5:00 to 7:00, and you are all cordially invited. We have a lot of important things on the agenda today. So part of what has been a good thing that has come out of recertification is a renewed outreach and organizational structure in our Union, and so we have a lot of people who have been talking face-to-face with other faculty, and I just want to encourage all of you to do the same. We have some important things on our agenda that we need to make sure that we're communicating out to our peers and other faculty in other departments. We are at a really key turning point with both the faculty evaluation process and HLC and General Education Restructure, and lots of other things. So there's never been a

more important time for faculty to be engaged, and to be empowered, and to lead, and so I really want to encourage you to be a part of that—of all of those processes.

**Petersen:** I would echo that sentiment as well. I wanted to clarify our role in the General Education revision process. There were some questions that came to me after our last Senate meeting. I think people were confused about what our role might be, and how we would vote, and what that would mean. And so I just want to remind everyone that we are incredibly important. And the General Ed Committee coming to us two weeks ago is just the beginning of our involvement. I expect that they will be here again on November 12<sup>th</sup> to consult with us, to provide us with an update on any revisions around their Learning Goal and Mission, and our role on November 12<sup>th</sup> will be incredibly important because we need to provide them with as much feedback as we possibly can. And so I really urge you all to reach out to your colleagues, and to gather as many questions, comments, that you might have about the General Education Mission and the Learning Outcomes that have been proposed. Our role on December 10<sup>th</sup> most likely will be to vote on that Mission and those Learning Outcomes. The more feedback we can provide, the more time they will have to revise that Mission and those Learning Outcomes, so that we can feel confident when we take that vote, most likely on December 10<sup>th</sup>. There are other avenues to provide feedback. There will be a survey coming. There have been forums, and the committee is also working to schedule visits with each of the College Senates. And so gather as much as you can. Be prepared on November 12<sup>th</sup> to ask hard questions, make comments, provide feedback. Steve, (**O’Kane**) do you want to add anything?

**O’Kane:** The survey is actually underway, and it actually ends at 5:00 today, so if you happen to have an email from Amy **Kliegl**, please read it now on your phone. [Laughter] From what I’ve heard, we’ve have had a very good response. Last Thursday we were I think close to 200 by Thursday. So that’s pretty good.

**Petersen:** This is a bit of a different process than what is typical. So, last March our Senate approved this process, and this process is different in that in previous curricular processes, you would have a college senate that would vote ‘yes’ or ‘no.’ And in an interdisciplinary proposal what would often happen is if one of those groups or senates voted ‘no,’ the curricular proposal would stall. In this process, it’s coming to us, so it does not stall out at any of the senates or other groups, and so we have a huge responsibility to be as diligent as possible in gathering feedback and asking questions, and then sharing that back with the committee.

**O’Kane:** Probably before we meet next, we the Committee will have met with not all but most of the college senates.

**Petersen:** Good.

**O’Kane:** So we’ll be getting their feedback as well.

**Burnight:** Just to clarify, they won’t be voting though, that would be purely advisory?

**O’Kane:** The senates, we are consulting with them.

**Burnight:** So we’re the only body who votes?

**Petersen:** We're the only vote.

**Burnight:** Thank you.

**Petersen:** Any other questions or clarifications around the General Ed Revision or Consultation from two weeks ago? Alright then, let us move on to the Minutes for Approval.

### **MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

**Petersen:** They have been distributed. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Thank you Senator **Stafford**, and a second, Senator **Zeitz**. Any discussion? All in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying 'aye.' And any opposed? And any abstentions? The minutes are approved.

### **COMMITTEE REPORT**

**Petersen:** As I shared two weeks ago, Jim (**Mattingly**) and I have been working on connecting with all of our Senate Committees, requesting of them to share back with us the work that they are doing, also taking a look at are they working in a way that is productive and necessary, so that we might begin to dissolve some of the committees that the charge is no longer useful or meaningful. And so, as we are doing this, we are inviting the committees to come and report to us. This week we do not have an official Senate committee report, but we did ask Northern Iowa Student government to share out a little bit about the work that they are doing. So Kristin (**Ahart**) would you like to share with us?

**Ahart:** Sure. So my goal is to be as brief and informative to you as possible. The first item that I want to talk to you all about is the work that we're doing with the other Regent executives. So Drew (**Stensland**) and I have been working closely with the Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the other two Regents schools to conduct a Regent-wide lobbying effort on behalf of Higher Education in the State of Iowa. So we've had multiple conference calls about this topic, and it kind of solidified our top four priorities that we want to be discussing after elections as we travel across the State. And so those are Affordability, Medical Amnesty, K-12 Consent Education, and discussing ways to keep our graduate students in the state of Iowa once they graduate—looking at the revenue they can bring back to our economy. So those are our four main topics. If you have any further questions about those, I don't want to go too far into depth today, but please reach out if you have any questions about the topics that we'll be discussing over the next few months with our elected officials.

**Mattingly:** Can you just go through those four again, one more time please?

**Ahart:** Yes. So: Affordability, Medical Amnesty, K-12 Consent Education, and Keeping Graduate Students in Iowa.

**O'Kane:** What is Medical Amnesty?

**Ahart:** That is a fabulous question. So something that is something our student government has been working with a lot over the past couple of years. But it would be granting everyone, but particularly benefitting college students in the fact that you wouldn't necessarily have to worry about legal repercussions for getting a friend or someone in need help, if they were under the influence of



drugs or alcohol. So we came very close to finishing this up last year in Des Moines, but we're looking to kind of seal the deal this year. That's something that our legislative liaison team has been working a lot with in student government.

**Zeitz:** What is K-12 Consent Education?

**Ahart:** Yeah, so all of our Regents schools have recognized that we're taking great efforts at our institutions to educate our students on sexual assault and gender violence as a whole, and so we decided that something that we would like to have the State of Iowa put as a priority is K-12 Consent Education, because it shouldn't be our job as a university to be to educate the students of Iowa. They should have that education prior to coming this University. And so, we've identified that as a problem in all of our institutions, and saw this as a great way to address that.

**Zeitz:** Would it then be dropped at this level, or would it be reinforced?

**Ahart:** Reinforced. So we're looking at more proactive steps to this which would be implementing it in K through 12.

**Zeitz:** Thank you.

**Smith:** Have you consulted with Family and Children's Council on that? They have a full-time educator.

**Ahart:** I will write that down.

**Smith:** Family and Children's Council in Waterloo.

**Mattingly:** Kristin (**Ahart**), you mentioned that we could keep abreast of what's happening as we watch these issues play out in the student government. What's the best way for us to keep watch on what's going on?

**Ahart:** Well you could come to our Student Senate meetings every Wednesday [Laughter] at 8:00, or you're more than welcome to come into our office anytime or set up a meeting. Drew (**Stensland**) and I as well as all of our directors have office hours of at least 12 hours a week in the office, and then Drew and I are around 20 hours a week. And so we'd love to see you all come in and have a more involved dialog outside of this meeting. We have a great team that's working with us. Student government as a whole is around 43 individuals, and so I'm trying to give a concise report of what all of us are doing. But please come to our Student Senate meetings. *The Northern lowan* live Tweets our meetings if you are a Twitterer and want to watch the live Tweets of what's happening, or come into our office. I'd be happy to give you any updates.

**Zeitz:** What's the hashtag?

**Ahart:** They don't use a hashtag in all their Tweets, but they have a full Twitter account. It's #NISGONTWITTER.

**Zeitz:** Thank you.

**Ahart:** Sometimes they're hilarious. They're riveting. Any other questions before I move on? Again on the topic of our Regents schools, I'll be having one or two Regents coming to shadow me before the end of the semester, and so I'm looking at my coursework. As much as I love the courses I'm taking now, I'm looking to

find a greater variety that can better showcase what we are doing here at UNI that is innovative and particularly intriguing to someone who's outside of our social circle. So if you have any ideas of professors or courses that would be really interesting to have a Regent come in and sit in on, I would be more than happy to put that into my calendar to stop by and see what you all are doing there, because you all know better than I do what some of your colleagues are doing in the classroom. So please let me know if you have any suggestions.

**Petersen:** Kristin (**Ahart**) will that be while they're here for the Board of Regents meeting in November?

**Ahart:** We're looking to find a different date, so I've talked to three Regents already and we are setting up tentative dates this week, and we're going to look through both of our calendars and see what is the most prime time on campus so we can do more than coursework. Maybe go to an event or two. Once I have dates solidified, I'll let you know as well. Any riveting courses, I'll be happy to write them down. The last thing I wanted to go over quickly is the Panthers Vote Campaign. I know Dr. **Peters** is over here, so he can elaborate on that a little bit. Our team just really just wanted to stress the importance of educating your students on how to vote, where to vote, and endorsing that in your classrooms. It's a campus-wide effort to get our students to the polls, and it's something that Student Government has put as a top priority this semester. So, remember that your students look up to you, and you all can connect with them in a way that we can't engage with them, and so use that to your advantage and help them get to the polls and influence our policies, particularly in Higher Education in the State of Iowa.

**Zeitz:** Is there a source as to when--they had an early voting poll over at Schindler. Is there a source that will tell us when and where those are going to be on campus so we can share those?

**Peters:** You got an email from Amy **Kliegl** last week about it.

**Zeitz:** Okay. Thank you.

**Ahart:** There's a whole table [in Maucker Union]. If you want to go to NISG's Social Media, we've shared that as well with all the locations, times, and days for satellite voting.

**Zeitz:** Thank you.

**Ahart:** We have a nice little campaign going in collaboration with the Political Science Department called Panthers Vote, so feel free to share Tweets with that hashtag and promote that to your students. That concludes my report.

**Petersen:** Thank you very much.

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

**Petersen:** Alright, we have one item for consideration to put on the docket. It is an Emeritus Request for Kenneth **Baughman**, Department of Language and Literatures. Is there a motion to move this item to the docket? Thank you Senator **Gould**. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Skaar**. Any discussion? All in favor of moving the Emeritus Request for Kenneth **Baughman** to the docket, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstention? The motion passes.

## CONSIDERATION OF DOCKET ITEMS

**Petersen:** So we go ahead and move on to our Items for Consideration on the docket. I'm going to suggest that we move the three emeritus requests to the head of the order because we have Dr. Terri **Lasswell** with us here to share on the first emeritus request for Clare **Struck**. Is there a motion to move those three emeritus requests to the head of the order? Thank you Senator **O'Kane**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Choi**. Any discussion needed? All in favor of moving the three emeritus requests to the head of the order, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? Alright. The motion passes. That means we will begin with the emeritus request for Clare **Struck** and Dr. Terri **Lasswell** is here to share a bit about Clare **Struck** with us.

**Lasswell:** I'm a little bit surprised that those two words, Clare **Struck**, just didn't call a vote, because she's been around for a long time and we know how valuable her service has been, but I would like to tell you a little bit about Clare. She dedicated 33 ½ years to the University of Northern Iowa as part of the Lab School and the Department of Teaching. She served as a school counselor. Clare published with folks even though it wasn't part of her requirement. She published with folks from different departments and around the campus. She also presented. Her passion was the legislative agenda for ASCD with Paul **Child** and as NCLB (No Child Left Behind) was transitioning over to ESSA, she was a powerful voice in that in the Midwest, and also at those legislative meetings. Clare (**Struck**) was a mentor. She had to shift basically her whole frame of thinking when the Lab School wasn't in existence. She was no longer the school counselor, and the thing I will say about her there is that she was loyal even when it wasn't easy. She

continued to be loyal, and continued to serve students. Clare (**Struck**) is the definition of a servant-leader. She mentored school counseling students after becoming a field experience coordinator, and continues to work with many folks in our Cedar Valley Schools just on her own, so representing UNI and the Department of Teaching and the profession as a whole.

**Petersen:** I know many of us around the table know Clare (**Struck**). Would anyone else like to speak to Clare's service and teaching?

**Zeitz:** I taught down at Price Laboratory School and was a technology coordinator down there for six years, and I was also a parent. And I know that Clare many times was there to help out our sons as they were progressing through the program, and we thank her greatly.

**Petersen:** I remember Clare (**Struck**). She was my daughter's—one of my daughter's first teachers. She taught Charlie to play tennis and what I remember most is when the Lab School closed and all of our kids moved to Lincoln, Clare (**Struck**) would regularly go down there and eat lunch with them, and it was not a school that she was assigned to, but she wanted to ensure that they had smooth transition, and she wanted to stay connected to them. I think she did that for two or three years; just an amazing woman with an amazing heart.

**Hawbaker:** I should have brought a puppet.

**Petersen:** I was thinking that, too.

**Hawbaker:** Clare (**Struck**) was a puppet lady and that was the other thing she did: She gave a puppet to almost every kid as she left the Lab School, so I imagine my puppet saying, “Be a buddy, not a bully.” [Laughter]

**Petersen:** Thanks. Any other stories or discussion? All in favor of approving the Emeritus Request for Clare **Struck**, please indicate by saying ‘aye.’ Any opposed? Any abstentions? Excellent. The motion passes.

**Petersen:** The next emeritus request we have is for James **Hanson**, from the Department of Social Work. Is there a motion to approve the Emeritus Request for James Hansen? Thank you, Senator **Strauss**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Skaar**. I have a written statement written on his behalf sent from by Cindy **Juby**, the Department Head of Social Work. She indicates that “Dr. James (Jim) **Hanson** was hired by the Department of Social Work in 1990. He received tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in 1994. He was one of the first Department of Social Work faculty to develop and teach online classes. His online Stress and Stress Management course was very popular with students. Additionally, he was faculty advisor for the Student Social Work Association for several years. He retired in 2018 after 28 years of service.” Does anyone know Dr. **Hanson** and would like to offer additional discussion or story?

**Petersen:** All in favor then of approving the Emeritus Request for Dr. James **Hanson**, please indicate by saying ‘aye.’ And opposed? Any abstentions? Excellent. The motion passes.

**Petersen:** The last emeritus request we have is for Donald **Briggs** from Health, Recreation & Community Services. Is there a motion to approve this emeritus request? Thank you, Senator **Neibert**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Mattingly**. I have a written statement on Donald **Briggs**, so I will read it. “He graduated from the University of Iowa with a B.A. in Physical Education, received a M.A. degree in Physical Education, and Doctor of Education degree in Leisure Services from UNI. He taught and coached in the College Community School District in Cedar Rapids before joining the Department of P.E. for men, University of Northern Iowa as an Instructor, and Assistant Wrestling Coach, and later became Director of the UNI Sports Camps. He taught at the University of Northern Iowa for 43 years. He created the backpacking, rock climbing, and ice climbing classes, and was an excellent instructor who inspired many students. An excerpt from a paper submitted by one of his students summarizes the sentiment many students shared about Dr. **Briggs**, ‘He was the most amazing professor I ever had in my life. He is extremely passionate about everything that he loves to do, and he cared about student success to no end. I loved going to his class every day because it inspired me to start living the life that I knew I would love, and also to push others to take advantage of all the opportunities. I could come out of his classes every day with a new idea, and that was the best feeling ever.’ Dr. **Briggs** led UNI class and outdoor recreation trips including 16 rock climbing expeditions to Devil’s Tower in Wyoming, hiking trips to Gunnison National Forest in Colorado, 12 hiking trips to the bottom of the Grand Canyon, and canoeing expeditions to the Boundary Waters of Canada, Minnesota and down the Rio Grande. He also served as head wrestling coach from 1982 to 1997. He has more NCAA Division 1 victories than any other coach in UNI history. He’s won 12



consecutive NCA West Regional Titles, placed in the top 25 in NCAA Division Nationals 13 times, had 15 NCAA All-American, 14 National champions.” The list goes on and on. It’s extensive. Is there anyone else who would like to offer discussion or additional?

**Neibert:** I met Don (**Briggs**) when I came here in 2010 when I left Xavier University and I met Don, within the first week that I was here, and he was just one of those guys that felt like when you met him for the first time—it was like an old pair of shoes. It just felt so comfortable around him. Seriously, he was just a great guy. I remember we talked again the second time we met, and it was actually in the locker room at the Rec Center in the faculty locker room, and he was just always interested in you as a person. I thought very highly of him. And then, when I found out—which is not in here—that Don **Briggs** was also a sky diving instructor, I always wanted to sky dive, but I was always fearful. I met Don **Briggs**, and I’m like, “Don, I’m skydiving with you.” That was the kind of person he was, you could set so much trust in him, and he cared so much about people. Of course, I haven’t done that yet. [Laughter] When I’m 50, and I don’t know, Don (**Briggs**) may have to recertify if he’s still doing it now. He’s just a phenomenal individual. His accomplishments are amazing but he’s just a phenomenal person. If you know Don **Briggs**, you want to talk about him. Just a phenomenal guy.

**Petersen:** Thank you for sharing. Anyone else? All in favor of approving the Emeritus Request for Dr. Donald **Briggs**, please indicate by saying ‘aye.’ Any opposed? Any abstentions? Excellent, the motion passes.

**Petersen:** That brings us to our first consultation of this afternoon, the Higher Learning Accreditation. We have Dr. Scott **Peters** and Kristin **Moser** here to share.

**Moser:** We were a little nervous when you said NISG was live tweeting our presentations, because we went back and looked, and we couldn't find anything at first--when we went to present at NISG a few weeks ago, and we thought, "Oh, it was just so riveting that weren't even Tweeting. And then we thought, "It was just so boring that weren't Tweeting. Well we found it and they did have some Tweets. It was not as funny as we thought it was coming out.

**Peters:** We have to step up our game, clearly. [Laughter] Thank you for having us. We have been around. For those of you who don't know us, I'm Scott **Peters**. I'm Department Head in Political Science.

**Moser:** Kristin **Moser**, Director of Institutional Research.

**Peters:** And we are co-chairing the Steering Committee for the University's Reaccreditation with the Higher Learning Commission, and so we want to talk with you today to explain to you a bit about that process. We've been going around to anyone we can talk to on campus to start helping them understand this process. We spent the summer talking to groups of staff members and administrators. We're now going around to all the faculty. We had originally planned to have talked to all of the College Senates before we came to talk to you, but we had to reschedule a couple of them. So far, we've only talked to the CHAS Senate. Next week we talk to CSBS Senate, and the College of Education Senate is not too far behind that. So, by the end of the semester we will have talked to all the academic senates I think. So we want to kind of walk you through

the process; let you know what it's about and answer any questions you have along the way. And your very first question might be, "What is this accreditation thing anyway, and why do we care about it, and why do we have to worry about it?" Well, all universities across the United States are required to be accredited by one of several regional accrediting bodies to receive federal funds, and that includes federally subsidized loans. So, as best we could tell without getting into too granular of detail, about 23% of all the revenue that UNI receives comes from federal aid. Between subsidized loans and Pell Grants, 23% of all of our revenue. It's about \$70 million, and just a quick back-of-the-envelope calculation: If you add up the salaries of the faculty and staff from the four main academic colleges, that comes right to about \$70 million--\$73 million or something like that. So, if we were to not be accredited, and were no longer able to get any of those federal funds, we'd be out of business as a university. It's extremely important just from that sense. We have to go through this every ten years and one of the things we'll talk about here in a few minutes is how it's changed in the last 10 years. One of the big changes is that there is increasing pressure from the federal government. The federal government puts pressure on the accreditors, who put pressure on us. But at the moment at least, this process is still based in peer review. So the people who will ultimately assess us, and ultimately give their recommendation about whether we get reaccredited or not—they are people like us, professors from around campuses around the country who travel around doing these reviews for the Higher Learning Commission.

**Moser:** Scott (**Peters**) mentioned some of the—that there were changes that happened from ten years ago when we last went through this process. But we

would be remiss if we didn't stop and take a look back at what we found out in 2010. We know that when they come back in 2020, that they will be following up on some of the things that they indicated were either concerns or just points of interest in the last Assurance Argument that we provided to them. So I won't read through all of these for you. I just want to highlight a couple. This feedback they gave us, it wasn't necessarily a set of recommendations. It was more observations from them and they said, "You might want to consider this." A few of them, which I've put in bold, those were more of the recommendations that need to be addressed. So Academic Program Review was one, and since then we have expanded quite dramatically the work that we do with our seven-year academic program review cycle. Assessment was a big one. It wasn't shared widely with campus when we had our last visit, but after our visit in 2010, we paid to participate in what was called the Assessment Academy. And I liken this to essentially our "Get Out of Jail Free," card, if you will. Had we not participated in the Assessment Academy, we likely would have had some concerns with our accreditation when it was passed in 2010. And again, that was not shared widely on campus. It's something that we've been working to make sure we share that now. But it's something that we will need to address when they come back here in 2020. When they talked about assessment, they broke that out into Graduate Program Assessment—at that point it was virtually non-existent. We've made great strides in that area, but we're not quite there yet. The Liberal Arts Core and Gen Ed Assessment was another one that we'll talk about in a little while. And then Faculty Involvement with Assessment: They wanted to see more faculty involved at all levels of campus related to assessment. The other big piece that they mentioned was **Number 8** that I highlighted in bold here, and that was

General Education and LAC. That was also something that they highlighted in 2000. So, for essentially 20 years, the Higher Learning Commission has been telling us we need to think about how we provide General Education to our students, and what it means to have a General Education Curriculum as a University of Northern Iowa student. That is something that looking back—if you look back 20 years, our Gen Ed Curriculum and our LAC hasn't changed a ton, and so we're working to create that dialog now to explain what changes have happened, and then the Gen Ed Revision Committee is working now, not in tandem with that, but with that in mind: Thinking about some of the recommendations that they made related to restructuring and revising.

**Peters:** So you see here that this is maybe the final paragraph of the main Reaffirmation in 2010, and you see the emphases there about those issues that Kristin (**Moser**) pointed out. If we had not gotten into the Assessment Academy, they would have recommended additional reporting. It would not have been a free and clear reaccreditation. We would have had to do additional work to get reaccredited. But then you notice that very last sentence: They assume that with our involvement in the Academy, we'll have "ample proactive opportunities to address these challenges." Well, we haven't addressed all those challenges yet. We're on track to at this point, and that will be part of the story that we tell. But we can expect them to pay a lot of scrutiny to this when they read our [Assurance] Argument and when they come visit.

**Moser:** You talked about this a little bit in your introduction, but you know, just kind of thinking about some of the changes since 2010, and just sort of the increase in federal regulations, a lot of it brought on based on some of the

predatory lending behavior that was happening around the country in the for-profit institutions. We're all accredited by the same body, and so then we all need to meet these higher standards. Obviously, we don't have a hard time doing that, but it does create additional work, and additional regulations that we need to be able to speak to and account for. Our federal compliance section is literally thousands and thousands of pages that we're showing just compliance with these federal regulations that have been pretty much added in the last ten years or so.

**Peters:** And so we'll talk more about these in a moment, but a lot of these things filter down to us as faculty members. So, how does HLC—Alright, so if the federal government wants to know that when it gives out loans, it's giving out loans for real college credit. Okay? So how do you demonstrate that? Well, we say the credit you offer has to be rigorous. Right. So how do we demonstrate that? Through syllabi. Okay. Which means we have to have learning outcomes on all our syllabi. We have to have explanations, if we have courses that don't meet face-to-face for example, or courses that are internships or something like that, we have to have explanations of how much work is expected to make that obvious to regulators and to accreditors. So, these things that you hear about, that your department heads are saying, "We need learning outcomes on these syllabi," or "I know you've never done a syllabus for a Readings course before, but we need a syllabus now that lays out learning outcomes." This is the reason. It's because of this kind of pressure, and of course we know there's increased pressure on assessing student learning and demonstrating continuous improvement.

**Moser:** It used to be—at least in 2010, they wanted to see that you were doing assessment and that was okay; that was enough. Now, assessment is an assumed practice, and they expect us all to be using the data that we’re collecting in assessment to genuinely impact the student experience and student learning. So, a big change from just doing it, to sort of working through that whole continuous improvement cycle.

**Peters:** So, the process now is a lot different for those of you who were around ten years ago. The process now is a lot different: There are four key parts of it. We’ll kind of go through each one to give you a sense of how this works. First, the University is expected to complete a study of anything we want to—anything we’re interested in improving on campus—carry out this activity and then report on it. That’s essentially done. The Quality Improvement Project—we’ll show you another slide on this in just a minute, has to do with Service Learning. And that’s essentially done. We have to compile and submit literally thousands and thousands of pages of documents to demonstrate that we’re complying with those federal regulations. Then there’s the main part that we might think of to the extent that if you’ve been involved in accreditation before, you might think of the self-study right? That is now called an Assurance Argument, and we have to submit that. We have committees working on that right now, and that all culminates in an on-campus review.

**Moser:** Scott (**Peters**) mentioned our Steering Committee. We had a lot of success over the past several years with cross-divisional collaboration and leads in a lot of the committees, and so we followed that approach. You’ll notice the list: Going down the five criterion committees, and then the Federal Compliance Committee,

and the QIP Committee has a co-chair more often than not from cross divisions when possible. We've found that's really lent a lot of additional richness in the information that we didn't have before. So, that's working very well so far for this committee. We'll share a website a little bit later, and that has all of this on there. I'm not going to go through and read the names for all of you. You can check that out later.

**Peters:** And all told, we have 100 faculty members and staff members and others on campus.

**Moser:** Students.

**Peters:** ...working on these committees. So the Quality Initiative is, "To enhance Service Learning at UNI." As I said, this work is almost done. The top component of this is the one that they're still working on, and that is having a University-wide definition of Service Learning, so that it's very clear what Service Learning is, how it's indicated in the catalog, criteria to have that course designation in the catalog, and things like that. The committee is still working on that, but otherwise most of this project is done. Some of you may have been through the Service Learning Institute. I did it last summer and then we had our recognition of Service Learning on campus last year. We'll have another one this year as well. So that's quite in-hand and going very well.

**Moser:** Federal compliance: We actually have one of our co-chairs here. Joyce **Morrow** is sitting back there and she knows very well how involved this is. Federal compliances—we've been told often takes more time than writing the actual Assurance Argument itself, because there are a lot of things you need to do sort



of behind the scenes to make sure we're up to speed. So one example would be our Institutional Record of Student Complaints. So, evaluating the student complaint process on every level from academic grievances to complaints to the Dean of Students. How do we coordinate that? How is that centralized? How is that managed? Really doing an intense look at all of those systems and policies that we currently have in place. One of the big things that Scott (**Peters**) mentioned a little while ago was demonstrating rigor and demonstrating that the courses that we deliver are meeting some of the federal guidelines. So, there is a federal definition for a credit hour. That's something that we need to be able to demonstrate. So if we have a student taking a practicum or an internship, how are we calculating those clock hours? Is that consistent across departments or across colleges? Or what does that look like? Or what is that definition for a UNI student? It's resulted in some additional work from the Registrar's Office in terms of cleaning up some of the stuff that we have currently in our information system in terms of how courses are being set up; working with department to make sure we have courses that are if they're arranged, we can work out some of the timelines and when those classes are being offered, and how often they're meeting because we will actually have to go through and fill out this worksheet for all of the classes that are sort of non-standard meeting times. And we need to be able to demonstrate the amount of work that a student is doing in that particular class.

**Peters:** Right, and so that's where on syllabi, for example, we might have to say "This internship requires "X" number of hours of work," for the three credits you're earning, or something like that. We have to start making these things much

more clearly stated. There are five criteria around our self-study. As I said, this is called an Assurance Argument. Part of what we're trying to do in getting out to talking to people early is to familiarize them with some of the vocabulary. HLC places an emphasis on some the terminology being recognized across campus when they come for the site visit. They'll talk to faculty members. They'll use these terms, so we need to make sure that people are familiar with them.

**Peters:** There are five criteria. **1. Mission.** If you ever wondered why universities have to do—or why universities do so much strategic planning, and why there's emphasis on mission statements, one answer is, "Our accreditors make us." There might be other really good reasons to do it, but one answer is, "Our accreditors expect it," and that flows through some of the other criteria as well. They expect other parts of the criteria to be linked into Mission, for example. The **second criterion** is essentially, "Are we acting with integrity?" The claims that we make about our students, about our student successes for example, can we back them up? Are they true? Do we have policies in place to assure ethical actions on the part of faculty, students, and staff? **Criterion 3: Teaching and Learning.** One the big things here is the General Education Program. Another big thing here is academic rigor. So, we know that when they come to campus that they will pull hundreds of syllabi possibly from across campus, and they will look to see for example: Does a course that's offered online have the same learning outcomes and appear to be equally rigorous as the same course offered face-to-face? Is there a discernible difference between being in undergraduate courses and graduate courses? Courses that are not meeting face-to-face, are they sufficiently rigorous to be considered college-level courses? We know they will look a look

these things when they come. **Criterion 4** has to do with assessment for the most part, so assessment of student learning and also things like retention rates and graduation rates. And, as Kristin (**Moser**) said, closing the loop: Using that information to improve is key here, and then **Criterion 5** is linking our resources to our planning and to our Mission.

**Moser:** One of the big changes from 2010 to today is the sort of shift from a Self-Study to an Assurance Argument. The Self Study was a document, and I'm sure some of you have seen it. It was a beautiful—almost like a catalog that University Relations printed; had beautiful pictures of campus and students smiling and faculty engaged, and it was a lot of fluff, for lack of a better word. The Assurance Argument is much different. We will not be producing a similar catalog-type experience for the Assurance Argument. Everything we state within the Assurance Argument must be linked to evidence. So, no more filler. No more exciting stories about what we're doing on campus. But we have a statement. We have a link to evidence. So all that evidence is up-loaded into a system, and then that's where the peer reviewers will look to see if what we are saying about the University is appropriate, based on the evidence that we provided. So what we have here is just one example where we took out—this is 4B—Scott (**Peters**) mentioned assessment and student success. Looking at whether or not programs are adopted by all faculty members. So if we want to say something like “There was participation at all levels of the faculty,” what types of evidence could we provide to show that? In the interest of time, we won't go through the exercise, but this is what we do with our committee. We make sure that we are able to fill in; we'll provide faculty minutes where assessment results were discussed at a faculty

meeting, and here's where they were. All of that will be laid out very nicely for them.

**Peters:** So as departments are filling out their assessment reports right now that are due November 1<sup>st</sup>, one of the things they have to provide now is minutes from faculty meetings that demonstrate faculty involvement in setting the learning outcomes. Faculty involvement in discussing them, and linking them to Continuous Improvement Plans and things like that.

**Moser:** In addition to the change over to the [Assurance] Argument instead of the Self-Study, we also have a word limit. It's cut down drastically. I know 35,000 words still seems like a lot, but we're filling that up pretty quickly. We're going to have to do some cutting back on the work that our committees are doing. As Scott (**Peters**) mentioned, we're collecting this data now, and we're writing now. The goal is to have the first draft of the Assurance Argument done by the end of the Spring semester. What that means for all of you though is there are still some people who may be contacting you in your various departments asking for pieces of evidence to be able to link to our Assurance Argument. Please note that they are working on a tight deadline, and if possible provide them with whatever they're asking of you as quickly as you can, and understand that it is a priority that we get this evidence in for this written report before the end of Spring semester.

**Peters:** That will give us plenty of time to revise before our site visit, which will happen in 2020-2021. We have actually now submitted four possible dates: Two in early November, and then two in late March or early April. And at some point in the next six to twelve months, we will be told which of those they are coming.

When they come, it's a day and a half intense audit essentially of our Self-Study. They will have already read our Assurance Argument. They will be auditing to verify our claims, and then any areas of concern or issues that they need more information about, they will have decided before they get to campus what they'll be looking at. Included in that will be meetings with faculty, with students, and we will probably in the 2019-2020 school year and in the lead up to whenever the site visit is, we will probably be doing some sort of "mock visit day" kind of things, to help familiarize the faculty, staff, and students about what those visits will be like and what kinds of questions might be asked.

**Moser:** One thing I wanted to add to that too, was we're going to be honest. So let's talk about our assessment for a minute. We're going to talk about the growth that we've seen, and we're going to talk about how far we've come since 2010, but we're also going to be honest and indicate our areas for improvement. And we're going to be telling them obviously some things we need to work on and that we're still focusing on. So we'll give them a couple of really stellar department--we'll give some examples of some really stellar Department Assessment Reports, and they will be able to look through that. They will see a long history of continuous improvement. I don't know that we'll give them examples of departments where that doesn't happen. But it's possible that when they come and visit they will ask for that. Often times it depends on the background of the review team. Maybe there's somebody from computer science who is really comfortable with computer science, and they will say, "Hey, I want to look at all of the assessment for computer science," and we will be asked to provide that on site when they are here.

**Peters:** In the Assurance Argument, we might not point out examples of the things we don't do quite as well, but we will acknowledge when we have some deficiencies or some room for improvement. So we might say, "We do have some programs that are not quite meeting the mark on this." It's better to acknowledge it in the Assurance Argument than it is to try hide it we've been told many times by others who've gone through this process recently. So, anyway these are the areas that institutions are being cited for. Being cited is fairly common. Jim (Wohlpart) what was the?

**Wohlpart:** 60%

**Peters:** 60% of all visits end up with institutions being cited as having deficiencies in at least one category. Is that what the...?

**Wohlpart:** Yes.

**Peters:** And these are the areas where people are most likely to be cited. 4B is Assessment of Academic Programs. 5A—when you think about what small liberal arts colleges and state universities like ours have been going through the last decade financially, it's not a surprise that there's a lot of institutions being cited for insufficient planning. 4A is also related to overall quality of educational programs and assessment. 3A is that academic rigor piece that I mentioned a few minutes ago.

**Moser:** So looking back throughout the work that we've done so far, we've identified a few areas that we are working closely with the committees to make sure we address. We've talked about this in our comments, but I'll just go through

them again: Gen Ed and Assessment—I've mentioned the feedback from them from 2000 and from 2010. We know that when they come in 2020 that they will be diving in very deeply to look at assessment. Clock hours, as we mentioned a little while ago, and that's why we're doing all this work with the Registrar's Office, to make sure we clean up a lot of stuff within our system, so we're able to demonstrate that we can meet the requirements, and also academic rigor: Being able to show that our courses are rigorous.

**Peters:** You have the PowerPoint in your records, and so these links will provide additional information. I know there's another big consultation coming, but if we have time for questions, we're happy to answer some.

**Mattingly:** I have one question. What were the areas of academic rigor that we were dinged for in the last visit?

**Peters:** I don't know that we were dinged. So that "Top Cited Areas." These are nationally—so this isn't referring to us.

**Mattingly:** I'm looking at the bottom thing on the next slide.

**Peters:** Oh, areas of concern right now?

**Mattingly:** Yes.

**Peters:** That is coming from when we look across the University, keep in mind: How do they measure academic rigor? It's largely but not entirely by the syllabi. So we have a few departments who don't routinely collect syllabi. So we've recently surveyed department heads, and we found that we have a few departments that don't routinely collect their syllabi. There's a problem, and we

need to fix that soon. We're going to be collecting syllabi from this semester sometime in the next couple weeks. We're going to ask departments to send us all the syllabi they have from this semester, so we can find out how many of them don't have learning outcomes. Because we need to start getting learning outcomes on syllabi. We need to make sure that even a Readings and Arranged Readings course that you have with one student—you need a syllabus on it with learning outcomes. So we all need to start doing these things, and we have to pass the word down. One of the big things that nationwide that people are cited for on Criterion 3 is something I don't think we have to worry about too much, because we have good online education here. But, there's a big concern about online education being lower quality than face-to-face. I think there are a few things we need to pay attention to, but we're in pretty good shape on that dimension.

**Burnight:** The page of resources and the links, is it possible to see the 2010 report somewhere?

**Peters:** I believe it's on the accreditation website. I think so. Yes.

**Burnight:** Great. Thank you very much.

**Zeit:** When we're talking about outcomes, are they talking about identifying the standards and then also identifying the specific outcomes for that class? Because I know when we were looking over the syllabi for a project we were doing, that in a lot of cases they didn't include the standards; like the INTASC standards or whatever it might be that you're supposed to align. Is it going to be that specific where you need these?



**Peters:** I don't think so. I think it's course-level outcomes. When they're talking about academic rigor, they're looking at course-level outcomes. And here's another thing that my department will have to deal with for example: HLC expects that if you're offering a single course, all sections will have the same outcomes. Okay? We don't do that in my department now. Right? So, we're going to start working on that this year.

**Zeitz:** Good.

**Peters:** That's just another example of some of this work that will filter down to us in our departments. So, if you don't currently do that in your department, when your department head comes to you in the Spring and says, "We need to start working on this to get this course to have the same learning outcomes across all sections." You'll know where it's coming from. It's coming from our accreditor. And these are the kinds of things that when you talk to your colleagues, we really need you to help get the word out on these things, because we don't as faculty members—we don't always know 'why.' The stuff comes down, and we don't always know why. Right? And at least if we're told why, and if people understand that this is something our accreditors are demanding of us, I think it makes the work—it makes us at least understand why we have to do the work.

**Moser:** And it is a lot of work. It will be something that I think some people might think is too much work, but the alternative is they come and they give us a list of concerns, and so rather than them being here to visit, and then doing a sampling of a few departments over the past couple of years, they will come back and they

will say, “We need you to provide every course, every faculty, every person for the past five years. And we need all that information.” And so I try to kind of balance that. It is a lot of work up front now and we acknowledge that, but it could be a lot more if we don’t do this now.

**O’Kane:** It seems to me that asking that every section of a course has the same outcomes flies in the face of academic freedom.

**Peters:** So, Jim—Provost **Wohlpart** and Kristin (**Moser**) can tell you that I asked that exact question at the HLC conference, and here’s the answer that I was given: The answer I was given was that if it’s a course, you’ve got objectives of that course. You’ve got a course description in the catalog. If you’ve got a course with a course description, you should have a set of outcomes for that course. How you reach those outcomes, what textbook or other materials you adopt in order to reach those outcomes, what perspectives you adopt in order to reach those outcomes are entirely your own, and therefore it does not violate academic freedom.

**O’Kane:** It sure seems like it does to me.

**Hawbaker:** I will just note on many of the AAUP publications, they acknowledge that one limit on academic freedom is the need to provide students with consistency, and to have that kind of accountability for outcomes. So that is something that AAUP recognizes.

**Zeitz:** In articulation throughout the classes, I need to know what the foundation is that my students have, so that when I have them I can then build upon that rather than having to reteach the whole thing.

**Peters:** At Council of Academic Department Heads last week or the week before, Provost **Wohlpert** was there, and one of the department heads asked him whether sections could have like—multiple sections could perhaps core outcomes and then maybe some outcomes that are specific to the section. And having just been through training with HLC, your impression was that that is allowable, right? So long as that there have been some core outcomes identified?

**Wohlpert:** Yes.

**Peters:** So, that might be another way if it's particularly difficult within your department to reach that agreement, that might be one way to reach that agreement. Let's focus on the core things that we know this course has to cover, and then if your particular perspective leads to an additional outcome, that might be allowable.

**Wohlpert:** I did ask however, that the core outcomes are separated out and labeled as the core outcomes.

**Peters:** Yes. We want to make everything as easy as possible for the peer reviewers, right? Absolutely.

**Hawbaker:** I'll also note that the outcomes are identified by faculty. Right? That's the important part, is that they're not dictated by administration or by anybody else.

**Peters:** Right. Correct. Absolutely.

**Hawbaker:** It's the faculty that teach those courses collaborates to the identify core outcomes.

**O'Kane:** I bring it up because we in Biology have a non-majors biology course; two of them actually, and depending on who you take that from, you get a very—I mean very—different experience. All of them high-quality experiences, but to force those in our case, those three or four people to have the same outcomes—I find objectionable.

**Wohlpart:** So, all sections of it wouldn't teach critical thinking?

**O'Kane:** Of course they would do that.

**Wohlpart:** That's what we're talking about Steve (**O'Kane**).

**O'Kane:** That level?

**Wohlpart:** That's what we're talking about.

**O'Kane:** Okay.

**Wohlpart:** We're not saying you have to use this textbook and teach this chapter and cover this material, we're talking about high level, critical thinking, communication, problem solving, scientific literacy—that's what we're talking about.

**O’Kane:** Thank you. Got it.

**Petersen:** Here’s a question because I opened our conversation today by talking about the General Education Revision, and our job to approve or to vote upon the Mission and the Learning Outcomes. So those Learning Outcomes that we might all settle upon and vote on, would they suffice as the Learning Outcomes within syllabi?

**Wohlpert:** Yes. That is what we’re talking about. And so as the Gen Ed program gets populated, and once we have a structure, folks are going to say, “My course will meet ‘x,y,z’ learning outcomes.” Well those are the ones to put on your syllabus.

**Peters:** The only thing that I would add would be that there would be some courses you’re offering that would have—might also fulfill requirements in your major or things you might need in your major, and so it might include those outcomes but not necessarily be limited to those outcomes.

**Petersen:** Any other questions? Comments? Thank you both.

**Peters:** Thank you.

**Moser:** Thank you for your support and your time today.

**Petersen:** The next item on our docket this afternoon, I’m inviting any of the Faculty Handbook or Faculty Evaluation Committee members to join John (**Vallentine**) & I up front, is an update from the Faculty Handbook and [Faculty] Evaluation Committees. Let me just begin our conversation by giving kind of an

overview of the work, and then we can dig into some of the details and hear your feedback, comments, questions. The Handbook Committee met a few weeks ago, and we as a Handbook Committee voted up a few sections within Chapter 3 of the revised draft, and those sections included 3.1F and 3.12. Those sections are primarily concerned with overarching University standards for teaching, research, and service. The reason that we took it to the Handbook Committee first was because we knew that we needed to get the College Review Committees together so that the trickle down could happen where departments begin to work on departmental standards and criteria that align with those larger University standards. And so what we would like to do is have some additional conversation about 3.12 and 3.14 which are those University Guiding Standards. And then we'd also like to open up the conversation to have some additional comments, questions, around the draft of Chapter 3, which is fairly large. And we certainly could focus those comments, questions, on post-tenure review, the new proposed merit system: some of those big chunks within Chapter 3. Is that sufficient introduction? Do you want me to go a bit further with the College Review Committees?

**Vallentine:** I can jump on and just explain the process. So this is in the Faculty Handbook—what we're following right now is to have this consultation with you. So the Faculty Handbook Committee has approved those two sections, which are really getting the departmental standards and criteria that Amy (**Petersen**) mentioned as well as the University Guiding Standards. We were here last year to go over those Guiding Standards. If you look at them now, what Amy (**Petersen**) sent out—they are totally different. That was after the feedback from the Senate.

And then we had open forums last year and then earlier this fall. So it's totally changed, and Carissa (**Froyum**) can maybe speak about the Guiding Standards and talk about what we've done with those.

**Froyum:** Sure. The Guiding Standards are arranged by the different ways that we break up our work: teaching, librarianship, scholarship & creativity activity and service. So, each of the Guiding Standards is also broken down by faculty rank and then portfolio. The big change here is remember the option for a teaching-intensive portfolio for tenured faculty that they may request. And so we have these University-level Guiding Standards arranged by those different sections, and each section within it has the criteria—they're really guiding posts for people to take back to their departments and then actually operationalize at their departments. Each one has "Meeting Expectations," "Exceeding Expectations," and then "Needs Improvement." The way that we drafted it, "Meeting expectations includes all of the requirements for teaching, scholarship, service. We would expect faculty to meet all of those standards. However, "Exceeding Expectations" and "Needs Improvement" are just examples of what we are expecting at the University-level. So that the task for departments, we met with the CRC, which is the College Level Review Committee—was that just last week? Yes, we met with them just last week, and the task is for departments to create their own specific standards and criteria, including for these new areas of evaluation that have not existed before. So that would be the teaching portfolio. Also, we're recommending that there be a career ladder for our non-tenure track colleagues, and so that would require new criteria. Also, around the University when we reviewed all of the University documents, there were some places that

had some specific criteria around teaching, but surprisingly not very many. And then very few places had anything at all about service. So those are some of the new areas of work that faculty need to work through at their department level.

**Wohlpart:** Carissa, could you talk about the process of department and faculty working together which is very different?

**Froyum:** One of the things that we've been really working hard on I would say our committee, but also around the University and all of these committees that have been coming to you, is really, truly being collaborative, and really having strong faculty governance. And so our structure that we have created is actually getting rid of having two different documents with two different standards and criteria, and combining them into a single one at the department level. So rather than faculty having to figure out and wade thorough, "What does my department head want versus what does my PAC want?" We're actually encouraging people to talk together, and come up with a single set that works for everybody. So, the expectation is that there will be a department-wide collaboration that includes all of the people who will be evaluated, and having those people part of the conversations, and creating a single set that works for the department, rather than having contradictory criteria within the department. PAC procedures are still an entirely separate document.

**Petersen:** So you should expect to see in your department a meeting convened that is co-chaired by your PAC chair and your department head.

**Hawbaker:** That should include also adjunct faculty then, correct?



**Froyum:** Yes. Right. Especially as you're crafting these new criteria that apply to them. They should be part of the conversation if we take faculty governance seriously.

**Zeitz:** Do most departments have a whole set of criteria as to what they expect, that is separate from the PAC? Because I believe we...

**Froyum:** There's two. Most departments have a department head criteria and a PAC-criteria right now. Right now, that's what people have.

**Vallentine:** The department head criteria--that document that was always sent out early September: This is how you're going to receive merit at the end of the year. And then of course PACs had their own criteria, and sometimes those were in conflict. Now, they're melded together in one department standards and criteria document. So, probationary candidates will not be walking up and down the hall asking people, "What do I have to do to be retained for next year?" Or, "How do I get tenure?" It will be very, very clear to them what the expectations are.

**Zeitz:** And we'll have merit pay to actually make that work?

**Vallentine:** Yes. That's why our goal is to have these departmental standards and criteria finished by February 15<sup>th</sup>, because then we can get it into place for next year's Handbook and be ready for 2020 with merit pay, which the Provost has promised... in writing. [Laughter]

**O’Kane:** A non-substantive comment: In the section it says, “access to your PAC file,” it tells you where the PAC file is, but doesn’t say who has access to it.

**Froyum:** Right now, that access is determined by the department head. The department head is responsible for people’s access.

**Gould:** On that same note, there’s a phrase in there which has been interpreted differently, that a faculty member is allowed to add documentation to their file. Some people are taking that as they can go and add stuff into their own files that are held in the department office, or whatever. Other people are thinking, “No, that’s just kind of more figurative.”

**Vallentine:** Faculty members can request to have something added to their file, and it’s with the approval of the department head.

**Gould:** Yes. So, they can’t actually physically...

**Froyum:** Through the approval of the department head.

**Gould:** They can’t actually physically like go in and put something in their file?

**Vallentine:** If someone is there. If there is a departmental representative there, they can.

**Gould:** Okay.

**Petersen:** I think the biggest change is there’s no longer a PAC file.

**Gould:** Right.

**Petersen:** There's only an evaluation file, which is housed in the department office and for some departments, that's different.

**Gould:** Right.

**Smith:** Another question related to access: So the department head couldn't just tell any other faculty that they have access to look at any other person's file, correct?

**Vallentine:** That's correct. They'd have to have a reason.

**Smith:** They'd have to be on the assessment team or something like that.

**Vallentine:** Right.

**Petersen:** The PAC committee.

**Vallentine:** The PAC, right.

**Smith:** Okay.

**Zeitz:** If I could verify the difference between the PAC file and the department file: Now, PAC files are often in huge boxes with lots of things in them. Does that mean we have to get additional office space to hold all those on a 24/7 basis?

**Froyum:** There will no longer be PAC files. There will be a single set of files called Evaluation Files. So, different departments do this very differently around the University, including some places not having any files. So, your files need to be physically located in the department office.

**Zeitz:** But when you come up to be evaluated and you have all those other materials you put in there, that isn't going to be kept in the office, correct?

**Froyum:** Yes. Those are part of your evaluation file.

**Zeitz:** There are literally boxes that are this big [Gestures] that are filled with books and other things that people have created so that they can be part of the evaluation that is looked at every three years or seven years or however. Are those going to be stored in there as well?

**Vallentine:** Yes, and Leigh (**Zeitz**) they should have been in the past because it was required. Certain department heads did not do that. But for legal cases, if someone wanted to know 'Why did you tenure this person and not that person?' All of that information is available.

**Zeitz:** Okay, along these lines, we haven't seen much progress towards a digital portfolio which would be easier to address I think. [Laughter] That is one of my great interests and my writings and things on digital portfolios. What's going to happen with that?

**Froyum:** Who's going to answer this? [Laughter]

**Vallentine:** I'll come after you. You can go first.

**Froyum:** No, you can go first.

**Vallentine:** At HLC, actually there was a company there that specializes in this, and so we recently had them come to campus and just show representative groups with the Faculty Leadership, the Dean's Council, the department heads on

campus to get some ideas flowing about electronic portfolios. And then ironically, the Provost had the first three colloquiums of new faculty together at a function a couple of weeks ago, and they requested, “When are we going to get electronic portfolios?” So I think these large boxes will hopefully disappear as we can put everything electronic into an electronic form for ease and all the constituent groups being able to evaluate them, for you to be able to do it at your leisure, when you want to do it as a faculty member, and for candidates to have access to their files 24/7.

**Wohlpart:** We have heard that some campuses use Blackboard for this.

**Froyum:** My department does--we have some files on Blackboard right now. But my position is that we need to pay our faculty better, rather than invest in another technology system.

**Zeitz:** Please don't use Blackboard for that. There's so many other great things you can do with portfolios. I've done lots of templates and things like that. Blackboard would be a good resource that you could access as part of your portfolio. That would be good.

**Martin:** Leigh, (**Zeitz**) I was going to mention there is a line about bulky things—things that don't fit into your file. You just need to make some kind of documentation within your file that this thing is big and is somewhere else.

**Zeitz:** Oh, really. “Come to my office and I'll give it to you when you need it.” That kind of thing?

**Martin:** I don't know how we define bulky, but say you had a boat that you made [Laughter] and somehow that was part of your package. You could say—put a piece of paper in there and say, “The boat is located in this accessible place.”

**Zeitz:** Let's say you've written twelve textbooks or something like that, and that takes up a lot of space. You could probably put a note in there saying, “Come see my books.” Okay. Got it. Thanks.

**Burnight:** Carissa (**Froyum**) I'm sorry to ask for a repetition on this, but I just want to be sure I followed in terms of teaching standards—or standards across the board in terms of “Meet” versus “Exceeds” versus “Needs Improvement.” So you said that “Exceeds” and “Needs Improvement,” are both examples..

**Froyum:** Yes.

**Burnight:** ...but that each department will determine what exactly fits in there, but the “Meets Expectations” is more standardized?

**Froyum:** Yes. The expectation is that we're doing all of those things...

**Burnight:** Doing all of those things...

**Froyum:** ...doing all of those things versus the other two categories. They're not exhaustive lists essentially.

**Burnight:** Okay.

**Froyum:** They're just examples, and you'll see when you read through that some of them are much more field-specific, and so...it's what it will look like in your field, which will be very different. Versus we should all be teaching some version of critical thinking. We should have syllabi with our stuff in it that aligns with our programs. Those sorts of things.

**Burnight:** Thank you very much.

**Peters:** Along those lines. We started working on this in our department last week, and a little bit of disconnect between the annual requirements for meeting expectations and the things that are required to be in the file came up. So, at the moment in the current draft, it's not required to have syllabi in the file. In the evaluation file, I don't believe. But you have to have syllabi to meet expectations.

**Vallentine:** Right, and your comments Scott (**Peters**) are perfect, and that's why today an email went out from me to all faculty and the entire Chapter 3 is there. Today, we're really consulting on the departmental standards and criteria formation, and then also the Guiding Standards. We'll be coming back later to talk about the rest of Chapter 3, and it's wide open for anything you see that's missing like that. Some things that I listed today, the materials and methods for measuring faculty performance and teaching, the awarding of merit and post-tenure review, are the most important pages to look through this week. The rest of the chapter we still have time. But, as we're—as you know we're doing this in stages, but we didn't want to push all of Chapter 3 off without really getting everyone to give us comments, Scott (**Peters**). That's a perfect example.

**Wohlpart:** Let me say I appreciate how incredibly thoughtful and detailed this committee has been in their work. There is no question that we're going to have to refine this going forward. When we start using it, we're going to realize that there are all sorts of ways that things may not fit. We're going to have to be flexible, and come back to this process. No question about that. So let's be thankful and appreciative, but at the same time we're going to have to be flexible. We can't think of everything. We can't think of everything with this kind of overhaul.

**Smith:** My question is, is anyone else concerned about subdivision 3.6B, where a faculty would discuss their goals and need for resources with just the department head? I've seen cases where the department head will sabotage a faculty's goals and be extremely biased towards certain faculty members, and keep resources away from other faculty members so, can the faculty member request having some other—I don't know if you want to say 'witness'?

**Bass:** The Committee's talked about, in fact I think just at our last meeting—talked about the potential, because that's been raised by some other people, of having the department head and the PAC chair meet with each individual faculty member as they discuss their goals. It provides both those checks and balances of what you're discussing. It also potentially helps enrich the PAC's knowledge of what each individual faculty member is looking to achieve, you know in terms of their goals in the various areas.



**Smith:** In the case where the PAC chair or the PAC might have more of a hazing versus mentoring approach, could the faculty member also request like Union representation or someone else?

**Froyum:** You are always welcome to request somebody come to meetings with you, and Becky and I do that routinely. Any meeting that a UF representative would come to, John (**Valentine**) would come to as well, as a representative of the administration. We've been working extremely collaboratively through all sorts of problems this year. So that's not necessarily unusual, and if you need extra support, we have support systems in place.

**Smith:** Great.

**Valentine:** Those are the kinds of things we're talking about Sara (**Smith**), so that's a great idea.

**Smith:** Okay.

**Hesse:** If you could go forward two pages to 3.6D.2 on Page 15. It says faculty should provide a reflection of student's assessments annually as part of their FAR. That's fine for Fall student assessments, but Spring student assessments you're not going to have back yet for your faculty evaluation form, because those are due in like late April, and we don't see student evaluations until May.

**Froyum:** Right. It basically in terms of functionality would be Spring/Fall instead of Fall/Spring on this calendar.

**Hesse:** Oh. Spring/Fall. That makes sense. Okay.

**Froyum:** Since the annual review is staying in the Spring.

**Hesse:** Okay. So it's Calendar Year.

**Vallentine:** At one time, the Committee tried to change the whole calendar and it was...shot down by everyone [Laughter]

**Froyum:** We got over-ruled.

**Vallentine:** All the faculty members, the department heads and the deans. We tried.

**Petersen:** Any other comments, discussion? There's a lot here, so please do send feedback to us as you get into these documents, as you begin to work with your departments because we are still working on this Chapter 3, so we are appreciative of everything we can get.

**Zeitz:** Do you have any models as to how a Senator such as myself would work with Curriculum and Instruction? How are other people doing this, as far as getting this kind of feedback and working actively with your department to find out? Over and above simply sending feedback to you after you sent out the email? I'm just sitting here thinking, "How am I going to do this?" And I'm just wondering what are other people doing?

**Petersen:** Sure. So your department head and PAC Chair—every department head and PAC chair across the University--participated last Monday afternoon in some training, if you will as part of the College Review Committees. They received instructions on how to get it started, and it was recommended that they

immediately start to convene the PACS and begin to review the tables—the University-wide tables for research, service, and teaching, and then begin to have those conversations. We suggested that they work backwards. So, start from “What would your ideal in terms of a full professor? What would be your expectations?” And then begin to work backwards in drafting those tables. We provided a template that your departments can use. Your departments could also go back to the documents you currently have, and develop something that would work for your department. I think it will vary across campus because there is so much variability in terms of each department across campus, that I expect it would look very different depending on where your department is, and the kind of documents that they currently are working with or have. Do you want to add anything?

**Vallentine:** Just Appendix A is a great thing to go to. It will be really helpful. It’s a nice template.

**Zeitz:** So it’s the department head and the PAC chair who are really going to be spearheading this, and I’ll be giving them support as necessary?

**Petersen:** So, your contribution will be incredibly important, so I would imagine that your sitting down—and you’re in a very large department, so it may be a subcommittee—there is the option to put together a subcommittee with representatives from across the faculty in your department. And you’ll be having conversations about, “What does it mean to ‘Meet Expectations’ in teaching as a full professor, and as Associate Professor, as an Assistant Professor?” And really

articulating, describing, what that would mean and look like in your department in your field.

**Varzavand:** Just a comment about regarding our actually Handbook, if you compare it to our sister institutions, our Handbook gives an unprecedented amount of power to the department head. The handbooks of our sister institutions out there, you can download and look at.

**Mattingly:** Do you mean in the evaluation process?

**Varzavand:** The evaluation process of the faculty so on and so forth. And since every administrator is supposedly a faculty, right? That's where they hide behind.

**Petersen:** I can tell you, as our Committee struggled with this issue and how to design evaluation and post-tenure. We struggled with how to include PACs and when to include PACs and how to also think about the workload of PACs, and try to develop a system that would not do what you are concerned about. We may not be there. And other suggestions, feedback that you might have would perhaps shift that a bit--we would welcome those.

**Hawbaker:** I would just note that maybe the correct comparison is to the system we had before, where your annual evaluation by department head had no written standards. That there was really no accountability for how that happened and that was why we ended up having to do the Salary Equity Study and correct some of those things that had gone wrong. So, I see this as an improvement that at least there has to be that connection with the PAC and with faculty. I've also heard some people say that this is an example of how faculty governance is

broken. Faculty have no voice, and I could not disagree more. The only reason this would not work is if faculty refuse to participate. And if they say, “I’m not going to spend time doing this.” Well, then it will get done some other way. But this is an open invitation for faculty to be engaged and to write this—these criteria and standards for ourselves—for our discipline, for our department.

**Wohlpart:** I would just echo what Becky (**Hawbaker**) is saying. The opportunity to grieve a process or something like that: If you don’t have anything in writing, and nothing is agreed to, then it’s impossible to do that. Now we’re going to have stuff on paper that we have agreed to for evaluation. That’s really, really important. I talked with a couple faculty who were putting their portfolios together for promotion and tenure together, and they were struggling because they had no idea what it was that they need to put in their portfolio. As Provost, I ran into them over the weekend, and I was like, “I wish I could help you. Help’s coming.” But how unfair is that to faculty that they have no idea what the criteria is to get promoted and to have tenure?

**Petersen:** And hearing this concern, there were a few revisions that we made. For example, we put in a clause or a statement that faculty at any time could request an evaluation from their PAC. So if there is a sense or a feeling like things aren’t quite right with the department head, as faculty we can ask for a second opinion by engaging the PAC right away. There’s also a clause in there, “Upon the third year, the PAC would automatically be involved,” if there were any issues that came about. And so I think what we tried to weigh was not creating a tremendous amount of workload on PACs, but also keeping PACs involved.

**Froyum:** The assumption, when it comes to post-tenure review is that faculty are doing their job. Right? The assumption isn't that we're not doing our job and we're trying to catch people not doing their job. Right? So, we've tried to create a system that builds that assumption into the process, and creates fail-safe and protections along the way in terms of the process. But you all are writing the criteria for your own department, and the department head isn't doing that alone. That's how it used to be.

**Varzavand:** Once again, my concern is not about whether it's for tenured faculty, or non-tenured, or for promotion. What would be the way we are going about it—we are putting the minorities in charge of majorities. So, the decision of the department head outweighs the decision of the group of faculty which comprise the PAC. Is there going to be some formula in there eventually which says 50-50, for the decision for tenure or promotion or whatever the issue is? We are not talking about this.

**Vallentine:** Remember, these are always recommendations as they move forward, so the department head does not make that decision, nor does the PAC make that decision. It goes through the dean's office, and then to the Provost's Office.

**Varzavand:** But are they equal?

**Petersen:** I think what I hear—correct me if I'm wrong...

**Varzavand:** Is the recommendation of the department head and the recommendation of the PAC is considered equal throughout the process?

Throughout the administrator? Or, is one weighed heavily, and the other one not as much? That's the question.

**Wohlpart:** Shahram (**Varzavand**), I think still in this document I believe, if there's a disagreement, then the department head has to explain why there a disagreement. I know that's been true in the past. I believe that's still true. If the dean disagrees, the dean has to explain why they disagree. But you have to explain it, so it's very transparent.

**Vallentine:** And has to meet with the PAC--the department head does.

**Hawbaker:** That underscores the need for clear criteria. You know if the criteria were there, it's very difficult to reach completely opposite conclusions.

**Wohlpart:** I have probably seen 120-130 tenure and promotion cases. How many times have the PAC, department head, and dean disagreed? Three or four.

**Varzavand:** I have seen cases which the department head goes one way and PAC another way and...

**Wohlpart:** Yeah. I would say three or four times of 130-140 cases.

**Froyum:** And there is still the grievance process available, but unfortunately the reality is when we lost our collective bargaining rights, that empowers not the faculty, right? And the result here has been more collaboration, not more top-down. And so I think we need to assess the actual current situation and where we are, given that environment that we can't bargain over evaluation. It is solely the

purview of the administration right now, and yet we have a collaborative process, governed by faculty governance, and seize the moment and use it.

**Varzavand:** Once again, compared to the sister institutions, they don't have a bargaining right either. Compare theirs to ours.

**Froyum:** I would love some specific feedback on what you want it to look like, that would be different from what we have written, that you feel like would be adequate. Give us that feedback so that we know.

**Petersen:** I know we are right at 5:00. I saw one last hand, if you might be just patient. Senator **O'Kane**, is it a quick question?

**O'Kane:** I hope so. Actually it's not a question, it's a comment. Several years back, we had a faculty member who PAC did not recommend for tenure, nor did the department head, nor did the dean, but the provost gave that person tenure. That wasn't you, Jim (**Wohlpart**) [Laughter] So, it can happen.

**Varzavand:** It causes friction among the faculty.

**O'Kane:** Oh, yeah.

**Varzavand:** Among administrators. That is what you are trying to prevent, I think.

**Petersen:** Thank you. Thank you for all the thoughtful comments. Is there a motion to adjourn? Thank you Senator **Zeitz**. And a second? Thank you Senator **Smith**. We are adjourned. All in favor?

**All:** Aye.



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

**Next Meeting:** 3:30 p.m. Monday, November 12, 2018  
301 Rod Library (Scholar Space)  
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa