

## **SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**10/27/08**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

### **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of the 10/13/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

### **CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

No press present.

### **COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ**

Catherine Palczewski, Communication Studies/Women's Studies, and Chair, Executive Vice President and Provost Search, updated the Senate on the search. She noted that beginning next week, November 3, candidates for the position will be visiting on campus. There are four candidates and dates for their visits are listed on the UNI Executive VP/Provost Search website. The candidates will be announced only one at a time so that each candidate will be treated equitably.

Open forums with each candidate will be held in Lang Hall Auditorium and she encouraged senators to attend the open forums and to bring colleagues with them, and to ask questions of the candidates. For each presentation there will also be an informational sheet distributed with directions on how to access an electronic feedback form. Feedback will be greatly appreciated by the committee. A lengthy discussion followed.

### **COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN**

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

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

973 Emeritus Status Request, James F. Fryman, Department of

Geography, effective 6/08

Motion to docket as item #878 by Senator Bruess, noting that this is out of regular order to bring the docketing numbers into alignment; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

UNI Alert System Update

Jan Hanish, Assistant Vice President Outreach & Special Programs/Vice President for Administration & Finance, and David Zarifis, Director, UNI Public Safety, were present to update the Senate on the UNI Alert System and how that fits in with the Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom Policy.

They noted that UNI will soon install external speakers on campus to assist in alerting when there are emergencies. However, they are for external use only and are not designed to penetrate building walls. Six will be on buildings with non-penetrating roof mounts and two will be pole mounted. Activation will consist of a siren and/or real-time voice information, which is the best thing Public Safety can provide for faculty and students to make decisions about their safety. They are also looking at other options and new technology as they come available to best serve the safety of the campus community. A lengthy discussion followed.

Chair Wurtz stated that the issue before the Senate would be assessing faculty member rights and obligations. If telling students they can't have their cell phones on, does that create an obligation for me to not forget my cell phone as instructor? And to have it on so emergency information would be received. And if I forget, then do I designate someone to have his or her phone turned on? Discussion followed.

Chair Wurtz thanked Mr. Zarifis and Dr. Hanish for their input. She noted that it will be up to the Senate to decide if we'd like to put it on the agenda to revisit our endorsement of the Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom Policy as it now stands.

Imagine the Impact Campus Campaign

James Jermier, Director of Collegiate Development, Vice President for Marketing & Advancement, was present to present the new campus wide campaign, Imagine the Impact.

Mr. Jermier noted the importance of educating the campus early on to secure their ownership and commitment of this campaign prior to taking it to the external audience.

In looking at this campaign, Mr. Jermier noted, there are two distinctions from the two prior major campaigns, "Leading Building, Sharing" and "Student's First." The current goal, \$150 million, represents the largest campaign goal in the university's history. "Student's First" began as a \$75 million goal and was revised two-thirds of the way through the campaign to \$100 million. It concluded June 30, 2005 with \$112 million and brought forth the McLeod Center, the renovation of Russell Hall, the Human Performance Center and the Freeburg Early Childhood Education Center. The "Leading, Building, Sharing" campaign brought about the Gallagher-Bluedorn Performing Arts Center.

The theme of this campaign is an investment in our people, our students, our faculty, our staff and an investment in programs. Ultimately it will take UNI to even greater heights.

Mr. Jermier played the new "Imagine the Impact Campus Campaign" video, which was created through the feedback from faculty and staff across campus that shared their ideas about what they felt students, faculty and staff need to excel. President Allen and the UNI Cabinet then took those ideas and provided the Development staff with the framework for this campaign. "Imagine the Impact" supports UNI's vision to be Iowa's premier undergraduate university, a leader in education and a major contributor to Iowa's prosperity and vitality. To achieve this, they want to give all students access to UNI and it's many quality educational programs, help students to learn through research, international study, service and entrepreneurship. Discussion followed.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

879 Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities

Committee representatives, Senator's Soneson and Van Wormer, were both present to discuss this with the Senate.

Senator Soneson reported that the committee was formed last spring at Interim Provost Lubker's request. The committee consists of representation from the Faculty Senate, several union representatives and several administrators. The committee met throughout the summer and once a week once fall semester began to develop the "Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities." They were asked to think about and make recommendations with respect to criteria that are used for scholarly and creative activities with respect to promotion and tenure. They asked for all PAC documents, the official documents of a department, and noted concerns and made recommendations. They would like the Senate to receive the document and to then ask each department to look at and discuss this document, and then formulate as carefully as they can their own copy of criteria they use for scholarly and creative activity for promotion and tenure, including promotion to full, and that they submit this to the Faculty Senate by March 1, 2009.

Motion by Senator Soneson to receive the Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities and that it be sent to various departments with our request that they follow these procedures.

Discussion followed and the motion failed for lack of a second.

Motion by Senator Van Wormer to receive the Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Soneson to ask that the Senate request that each department discuss this document, formulate and turn in to the Senate a copy of their own criteria for research and creative activities for promotion and tenure, including promotion to full by March 1, 2009.

Second by Senator Bruess.

Chair Wurtz reiterated the second motion, that departments and department heads will be asked to discuss the Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities, asked to formulate a document that specifies their criteria for promotion to associate and full professor with respect to scholarly and creative activities, and that they submit that document to the Faculty Senate by March 1, 2009 for review.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion to table Senator Soneson's motion to ask that the Senate request each department discuss this document, formulate and turn in to the Senate a copy of their own criteria for research and creative activities for promotion and tenure, including promotion to full by March 1, 2009 by Senator Smith; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

Motion to table Docket Item #880 Diversity of Faculty/Staff and Students at UNI by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Smith. Motion passed.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

---

#### **DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW**

### **MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING 10/27/08 1653**

**PRESENT:** Megan Balong, Gregory Bruess, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Deirdre Heistad, Doug Hotek, Bev Kopper, Julie Lowell, David Marchesani, Chris Neuhaus, Steve O'Kane, Phil Patton, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz, Michele Yehieli

Sara Blanco was attending for Mary Guether

**Absent:** James Lubker, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Michele Yehieli

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of the 10/13/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

No press present.

**COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ**

Catherine Palczewski, Communication Studies/Women's Studies, and Chair, Executive Vice President and Provost Search, updated the Senate on the search. She noted that beginning next week, November 3, candidates for the position will be visiting on campus. There are four candidates and dates for their visits are listed on the UNI Executive VP/Provost Search website. The candidates will be announced only one at a time so that each candidate will be treated equitably. Given the candidates scheduled these visit will go for three weeks.

Dr. Palczewski stated that the search committee is very pleased with the slate and are brining in a group of people who demonstrate a very diverse set of leadership styles and skills, very diverse communication approaches, very diverse disciplinary backgrounds, and experiences with their own schools. The committee hopes that faculty will find something they like in this group because the search committee has found something they like every one of these candidates.

Dr. Palczewski noted that this is really a recruiting effort, that each candidate has a very good job that they really love, and they have no burning desire to leave their present jobs. Except, that they found UNI so incredibly attractive of an institution that they couldn't pass up this opportunity to apply. When these candidates are brought to campus the faculty needs to ask the hard questions, engaging them in rigorous consideration, and strongly recruiting them. Her goal is that at the end of the process each candidate will want the position and when one is picked, their acceptance will be a relatively easy decision. She is asking the Senate, as faculty leaders, to help participate in this recruiting effort by attending the open forums that will be announced and by asking the really hard questions to figure out what these candidates can bring to UNI. She strongly encouraged senators to attend the open forums and to bring colleagues with them. The more that fill the Lang Hall Auditorium the better the impression will be of an engaged and vibrant academic community that is ready and waiting for the new provost, and that there will be more than just a few people

willing to assist in the changes, endeavors and initiatives that a new provost might bring to us.

Senator Heistad asked for the dates and times of the presentations.

Dr. Palczewski replied that all presentations will in the Lang Hall Auditorium from 3:00 - 4:15 P.M. They will occur on Monday, November 3<sup>rd</sup>, Thursday, November 6<sup>th</sup>, Thursday, November 13<sup>th</sup> and Monday, November 17<sup>th</sup>. There will be a UNI Online posting as well as being posted on the website.

Candidates will be meeting with Academic Affairs, the deans, the UNI Cabinet, faculty leaders and department heads, student leaders, and Student Affairs. At all these presentations, including the campus presentation, there will be an informational sheet with directions on how to access an electronic feedback form. Given how quickly the search is moving the committee would like all of the feedback delivered electronically because they will be deliberating prior to the Thanksgiving break. Feedback will be greatly appreciated by the committee as they know that faculty feedback and investment in these candidates is essential to their success.

In response to a question, Dr. Palczewski noted that the open forums will be taped and streamed onto the website. It will not be lived streamed because they want everyone to attend the forums. They will upload these as soon after the presentations as is technologically feasible.

Senator Hotek asked if the identity of the candidates could be revealed.

Dr. Palczewski responded that she cannot as at this level of a search confidentially is a very high premium. The committee met with the candidates for off campus interviews just last week with final notification and arrangements for their campus visits set on Friday. Several candidates needed time to get their affairs in order prior to having their names publically released, which is not atypical at this level of a search. The first candidate will be announced on Wednesday, with a rolling announcement schedule set so all the candidates are treated equably, with the announcements coming three days prior to their campus visit.

The reason for this rolling announcement of candidates one-by-one is to treat the candidates equably so that the lead into

their presence on campus is the same. As the candidates visits are very spread out over a three-week period the committee wanted to keep campus interest up.

Dr. Palczewski noted that the search committee believes this is a strong slate of candidates with diverse leadership and communication styles, as well as disciplinary backgrounds. It is a very vibrant and interesting slate. Any one of these candidates would be a change agent for UNI in a distinct way. The committee is please with the outcome of the search in these candidates.

Senator Bruess asked with there is a reason for selecting four candidates. If a candidate backs out will the committee have to return to the pool of prospective candidates for an additional candidate?

Dr. Palczewski replied that President Allen gave them that charge, four candidates. At this point all the candidates have affirmed that they will be interviewing on campus and have booked their flights, and she has talking with them about their itinerary. It is her belief that these four candidates are locked in. The search committee had planned to go to their list of alternates if any one of these four did not accept an interview. Her expectation is if a candidate backs out after their campus visit the search committee would not go to their list of alternates but that would be determined by discussion with President Allen and the committee.

Dr. Palczewski stated that the search committee worked with a search firm, and noted that this was a very easy process.

Chair Wurtz noted that Dr. Palczewski has done an incredible amount of work on this process.

Senator Lowell asked the academic disciplines of the candidates.

Dr. Palczewski responded that they come from diverse disciplines and cannot be more specific at this time.

Senator Heistad asked if senators would have time to meet separately with the candidates in small groups as they did in the previous search.

Dr. Palczewski replied that these candidates have a shorter on campus visit than the previous search. Candidates will be on campus for a day and a half. There is a slot for candidates to



meet with "campus leadership" and she's not sure who will be involved in that other than the Chair of the Faculty and the Chair of the Faculty Senate, noting that it is a much more constricted schedule.

Senator Heistad commented that she thought that it was very useful to have the time that they did during the previous search where chairs for the college senates were invited as well as several Faculty Senators.

Dr. Palczewski continued, urging senators to attend the open forums as the committee has worked hard to make sure there is a large chunk of time, forty-five minutes, for questions. She also noted that the search committee on the previous search had a completely different membership.

Chair Wurtz remarked that the Faculty Senate could have an additional pipeline into the feedback by going to her if they feel that their comments might get lost by going through the online feedback system.

Senator East commented that senators can always identify themselves as senators on the online feedback.

Dr. Palczewski thanked the Senate, and asked that they please participate and give feedback.

#### **COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN**

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

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

973 Emeritus Status Request, James F. Fryman, Department of Geography, effective 6/08

Motion to docket as item #878 by Senator Bruess, noting that this is out of regular order to bring the docketing numbers into alignment; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

UNI Alert System Update

Jan Hanish, Assistant Vice President Outreach & Special Programs/Vice President for Administration & Finance, and David Zarifis, Director, UNI Public Safety were present to update the Senate on the UNI Alert System and how that fits in with the Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom Policy.

Dr. Hanish provided a brief history on the UNI Alert System, noting that a little over a year ago UNI initiated a contract with a firm that provides text messaging, email and voice mail notification for any declared campus emergency. That is used only for campus emergencies. That came after discussion with UNI Student Government and the Faculty Senate on the cell phone use policy, which was expanded to include electronic devices. Cell phone use in the classroom was the real issue and the recommendation was that cell phones be turned off in the classroom so that the issues of texting, use of camera phones, all of those things that would enable students to cheat would be addressed. After that policy was enacted there were a number of incidents on college campuses that pushed everyone to take a harder look at how quickly safety personnel could notify people on campus about a declared emergency. The method of providing text messaging, email and voice mail in notification of an emergency has been adopted by many college campuses. The system here at UNI has been tested and will be tested again several times during the semester, and has been used in a couple of campus emergencies.

This emergency notification system intersects with the university's cell phone use policy in that if emergency notifications are sent electronically and everyone in a classroom has their electronic media devices turned off the notification is not received. Dr. Hanish has met with Mr. Zarifis and the Critical Incident Planning Team on this and they would like to bring the issue back to the Faculty Senate for discussion and redirection if needed on the use of cell phones in the classroom. She noted that cell phone messaging is only one method of alerting.

Dr. Hanish stated that the university will be installing external speakers on the campus to assist in alerting. However, they are for external use only and are not designed to penetrate building walls. They will help some but in certain areas will run up against electronic devices being shut off. There are possibilities as to how we can consider managing the integrity of the classroom as well as allowing for notification. They wanted to defer to the faculty and Senate to have a conversation

to see if there are ways that some of those issues can be mitigated.

Mr. Zarifis updated the Senate on the voice loudspeakers that the university is looking to install. These devices will be placed in eight separate locations, six of which will be on buildings with non-penetrating roof mounts. Activation will consist of a siren and/or real-time voice. The best thing Public Safety can provide for faculty and students to make decisions on their safety is with real-time information. They are looking at having these speakers in place as soon as possible. The roof mounts are being fabricated and should be delivered to the vendor next week. There will be six building locations with two pole-mounted speakers, one in the University Apartments area and one out by the university warehouse because they are also concerned about sporting events that will take place on the west side of the campus. These notifications will cover weather related emergencies as well as man-made emergencies.

Mr. Zarifis reported that the Department of Public Safety Advisory Committee met last week and discussed assessment and protocols and asked the senate what information they would like to have as a response. They have managed the protocol using "ADD"; "advert" a problem so the campus population can steer clear of the situation or incident, "deny" access into a building or classroom if appropriate, or "defend", all depending on the nature and extent of the emergency. He would like to hear from the Senate as to what information they would seek in the event of an emergency.

Senator Neuhaus commented on the emergency last spring, noting that it was his belief that things went really well. However, one of the confusions they had in the library, which is configured differently than classrooms, is people coming in from Maucker Union reporting that the Union was being closed and that the library also needed to be shut down. There was no official notification for them to do so but it did cause some confusion for library employees. People were looking for some place to go and as the library was open, that's where they went.

Mr. Zarifis responded that they really need to take a look at the types of protocol they need to have depending on different situations and circumstances. It is a misnomer to call it a "lock down" because anyone can exit a building. Therefore, if you have an incident and someone exits than someone can come in. They are looking at protocol to address that and as well as

training. Weather protocols are much easier because it's a little more predictable. He encouraged the senate to offer input.

Dr. Hanish noted they could set up meetings with any department that would like to meet with the planning team to review protocol and ask questions. What's specific to a building such as McCollum Science Hall, because it has chemicals, might be different than Baker Hall. They are more than happy to meet individually with any area with specific needs. Buildings that serve the public more than the classroom buildings have separate guidelines. It is always good to have an external reviewer come in to discuss plans. In the case of Maucker Union that Senator Neuhaus referred to, they were locking the building and people interpreted that as a lock-down, which it wasn't. They were simply locking the building. She also noted that you can't permit anyone from exiting. It is really a judgment call.

Chair Wurtz reiterated that there are two issues here. The first being that each department, each building, each unit needs to assess where the points of vulnerability are and what makes sense for response. The second, and more immediately for the senate, is a policy that they approved whereby they stated that every instructor has the authority to restrict or prohibit the use of personal electronic devices. In looking at things now in light of the numerous incidents both here and on other campuses, for an instructor to tell a student that they can't have their cell phone on when that is the primary means of individual notification is creating some problems.

Mr. Zarifis replied that depending on where a faculty member is teaching, it may be that the outside voice notification will provide that information. They are also looking at integrating voice notification into the fire alarm system in those building that have that kind of system.

Chair Wurtz asked Mr. Zarifis if, at this point, it would be his recommendation that any faculty member could exercise their authority to say "no cell phones". Knowing that that could result that in no one in that particular classroom knowing there's a problem.

Senator Funderburk noted that in his class it is the policy that no cell phones are allowed. However, he brings a cell phone, which is turned on. There are ways to address this situation. The probability of cheating is far higher than the probability of there being an emergency.

Dr. Hanish responded that yes, there are ways to accommodate that. The instructor must be signed up to receive UNI Alerts. They want to look at ways to help preserve classroom integrity and well as allow for emergency notification, knowing that someone in the classroom will be getting that information.

Senator O'Kane stated that it seems that more and more classrooms have a computer running in them, maybe even most classrooms. IT or individual department IT's have remote access to those computer. Have they looked into the ability to have some type of warning announcement flash on every computer on the UNI system? With a computer running no one would need a cell phone.

Mr. Zarifis replied that they are looking at that as well as messaging boards and other things.

Dr. Hanish also noted that while they're not there yet, these are all multiple ways of approach the same problem.

Mr. Zarifis continued that they are looking a multiple ways to get that information out in real-time. This is why they feel that the voice notification is extremely important to provide the campus community with the information that they need to make a determination of what's best and safest.

Senator Funderburk stated that one of the things that have previously come up is the inability to lock a classroom from the inside once you're in it. Has there been additional discussion on this?

Mr. Zarifis responded that because of the fire codes they have to be the way they are. He cautioned the senators in that the thing that you can use to keep people out can also be used to keep people in but they are looking at this.

Dr. Hanish remarked that they have looked at the cost of putting hardware on the exterior doors to buildings on campus that could be locked remotely or selected buildings.

Mr. Zarifis noted that with the current electronic technology they have the ability to lock buildings down.

Dr. Hanish continued that they are trying multiple ways.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas asked if there's been any discussion about false imprisonment versus detention to protect them? Some students had related to her that they had been told they could not leave an area.

Dr. Hanish replied that she was unaware that students were told that they could not leave but the people she's familiar with that were involved are trained and know that you can't really prevent someone from leaving.

Mr. Zarifis added that they have the duty to protect and to warn.

Chair Wurtz stated that the issue before the Senate would be assessing faculty member rights and obligations. If telling students they can't have their cell phones on does that create an obligation for me, as instructor, to not forget my cell phone? And if I forget, then do I designate someone to have his or her phone turned on?

Senator Neuhaus asked if they know how many students are registered to receive emergency alerts?

Mr. Zarifis responded that there are approximately 20,000 registered.

Dr. Hanish noted that initially it was about 20% but that has increased. With each incoming class those students typically register because that's what they're advised to do.

Senator Funderburk asked how the list of those registered is being maintained; are student's numbers being purged when they graduate?

Dr. Hanish replied that they purge seniors as they graduate just as they are taken off all the other roles on campus such as IT.

Dr. Hanish continued, that they hope this will be a topic of discussion as it is in everyone's best interest. Anyone with questions or those that would like further discussion, they would be happy to meet with them. She noted many schools are also doing this and they are faced with the same issues.

Chair Wurtz thanked Mr. Zarifis and Dr. Hanish for their input. She noted that it will be up to the Senate to decide if we'd like to put it on the agenda to revisit our endorsement of the

Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom Policy as it now stands.

Imagine the Impact Campus Campaign

James Jermier, Director of Collegiate Development, Vice President for Marketing & Advancement, was present to present the new campus wide campaign, Imagine the Impact.

Mr. Jermier thanked the Senate for the opportunity to speak today and noted the importance from the University's Foundation perspective of educating the campus early on to secure their ownership and commitment prior to taking it to the external audience.

In looking at this campaign, Mr. Jermier noted, there are two distinctions from the two prior major campaigns, "Leading Building, Sharing" and " Student's First." The first thing is the goal, \$150 million, which represents the largest campaign goal in the university's history. "Student's First" began as a \$75 million goal and was revised two-thirds of the way through the campaign to \$100 million. It concluded June 30, 2005 with \$112 million.

The centerpiece of the "Leading, Building, Sharing" campaign was the Gallagher-Bluedorn Performing Arts Center, a bricks and motor component. "Students First" campaign brought forth the McLeod Center, the renovation of Russell Hall, the Human Performance Center and the Freeburg Early Childhood Education Center.

The theme of this campaign is an investment in our people, our students, our faculty, our staff and an investment in programs. Ultimately it will take UNI to even greater heights.

Mr. Jermier played the new "Imagine the Impact Campus Campaign" video for the senate. "Imagine the Impact Campaign" was created through the feedback from faculty and staff across campus that shared their ideas about what they felt students, faculty and staff need to excel. President Allen and the UNI Cabinet then took those ideas and provided the Development staff with the framework for this campaign. "Imagine the Impact" supports UNI's vision to be Iowa's premier undergraduate university, a leader in education and a major contributor to Iowa's prosperity and vitality. To achieve this, they want to give all students access to UNI and it's many quality educational programs, and to

help students to learn through research, international study, service and entrepreneurship. Stories of how faculty, staff and gifts from others have made a lasting impact were presented.

Mr. Jermier noted that Vicki Collum, Director of Annual Giving, Vice President for Marketing and Advancement, has asked that each campus campaign volunteer give a personal testimony as to why they support the campaign. Mr. Jermier said that it's very simple for him, that he loves UNI. It's not a hard decision to make as he bleeds purple and old gold. It's provided incredible opportunities for him, both personally and professionally, and he's proud to support UNI.

Mr. Jermier continued, that the needs of the university are unlimited and gifts can be designated to any area the giver wants.

Senator Neuhaus asked if this video is available online.

Mr. Jermier replied that it is not yet but it will be at [www.uni-foundation.org](http://www.uni-foundation.org).

Senator Heistad asked if contributions to KUNI could also go through "Imagine the Impact."

Mr. Jermier responded that he was not sure but will check on that and will get back to her personally.

He also noted that this campaign is scheduled to conclude June 30, 2013. To date, approximately \$65 million has been raised in planned and outright gifts.

Mr. Jermier thanked the Senate for the opportunity to present this information.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

879 Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities

Faculty Chair Wurtz asked that the committee representatives provide a review on when this committee was established and why, and what action they are requesting from the Faculty Senate.

Committee representatives, Senator's Soneson and Van Wormer, were both present to discuss this with the Senate.



Senator Soneson reported that the committee was formed last spring at Interim Provost Lubker's request. The committee consists of representation from the Faculty Senate, several union representatives and several administrators. The committee met throughout the summer and once a week once fall semester began to develop the "Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities." They were asked to think about and make recommendations with respect to criteria that are used for scholarly and creative activities with respect to promotion and tenure. They asked for all PAC documents, the official documents of a department, thinking this would give them the best access to information. They noted concerns and made recommendations. They would like the Senate to receive the document and to then ask each department to look at and discuss this document, and then formulate as carefully as they can their own copy of criteria they use for scholarly and creative activity for promotion and tenure, including promotion to full, and that they submit this to the Faculty Senate by March 1, 2009.

Senator Van Wormer asked if there was some way to include their report and recommendations in the Faculty Senate meeting minutes so more faculty will read it.

Chair Wurtz suggested that we take this in two steps, first to receive the document.

Motion by Senator Soneson to receive the Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities and that it be sent to various departments with our request that they follow these procedures.

Senator Soneson stated that the motion is for faculty members in departments to discuss promotion and tenure criteria for scholarly and creative activities, and to formulate a document in which they are specific with respect to those criteria. This document, the Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities, is meant to prompt and prod them to think about things they may not have thought about. They don't have to follow the recommendations as stipulated but they are asking departments to come up with their own document in which they are clear about what criteria they want to use for promotion and tenure.

Chair Wurtz continued, in keeping it all together, that that document would be brought back to the Faculty Senate by March 1, 2009 for review. She reiterated to get the motion straight,

that the Faculty Senate would receive this report and would ask departments and department heads to read and discuss this report, to formulate a document with their own specifications of criteria, to submit that document to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Smith noted that this motion seems like two separate things. The Senate should first receive it and then talk about what to do with it.

Motion failed for lack of a second.

Motion by Senator Van Wormer to receive the Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Soneson to ask that the Senate request each department to discuss this document, to formulate and turn in to the Senate a copy of their own criteria for research and creative activities for promotion and tenure, including promotion to full by March 1, 2009.

Senator Lowell asked for clarification on what is meant by "departments discuss".

Senator Soneson responded that it means the whole department.

Second by Senator Bruess.

Chair Wurtz reiterated the second motion, that departments and department heads will be asked to discuss the Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities, asked to formulate a document that specifies their criteria for promotion to associate and full professor with respect to scholarly and creative activities, and that they submit that document to the Faculty Senate by March 1, 2009 for review.

Senator East noted that it sounds like we're asking them to review their PAC procedures.

Senator Soneson replied that no, that's not what we're instructing them to do because the Faculty Senate cannot ask a union body to do that. However, we can ask the faculty to review the criteria, make them explicit, write them down and send them to the Senate, in light of what's been talked about.

Senator Funderburk noted that the PAC is a faculty entity so it would be possible to ask the PAC or for the full faculty to do that.

Senator Soneson continued that it would also be good for younger faculty to discuss this. These are the people who are confused about this whole procedure.

Senator O'Kane stated that it's unclear to him what the Senate would actually do.

Senator Soneson noted he has some background material that might help in this discussion. In looking at PAC documents two things became very obvious. First, there is lack of clarity about criteria, with many being very vague. Secondly is consistency. In light of these two problems, there seems to be a lack of clarity and consistency. We make recommendations that we hope would bring about more clarity and consistency from department to department.

With clarity, Senator Soneson continued, it appears to younger folks that this is a real power on the part of senior faculty with younger faculty becoming confused thinking senior faculty are being mean-spirited and don't really want them to become tenure faculty. Being clear seems only fair.

There are a couple of issues that also seem to be at stake Senator Soneson continued. He was shocked to hear from a dean that has been at a number of universities that he has never been to a university that guards the passage from associate to full professor as tightly as UNI, making it as difficult as it is. For the most part, promotion to full, and from assistant to associate, is based largely on scholarly and creative activities. The university asks of its faculty that they engage in a certain amount of service. It seems unreasonable and unfair for the university to ask us to do something and then not reward us for it. Service has never been considered essential to promotion to either associate or full. We are asking departments to consider various options as ways in which service might be included in a concrete significant way in promotion.

Senator Soneson continued with what the Senate would do with the documents once they're returned. He suggested that a sub-committee be formed, or re-constitute the committee that made these recommendations, to review those documents for consistency and clarity. Not saying whether we approve or disapprove but

respond to departments that are not careful and ask them to reconsider.

Senator East stated that instead of producing a document related scholarship and creative accomplishments we ought to recommend that all departments, in light of this document, reconsider their PAC procedures. We can't make or change PAC procedures, but we can recommend it. A better idea would be for this committee to be willing to either draft a document stating what is meant by "clarity" or serve as a reading committee to advise about clarity, but not to collect all these documents.

Senator Van Wormer noted that they don't want to say PAC because there are reasons, having to do with boundaries, collective bargaining and so on. We want to keep the working recommendation to say to look at criteria. In examining documents for obtaining full professor they found that they were so vague, especially the step between associate and promotion to full professor. In looking at other documents from other universities they found that when you get to the full professor level a number of them said that your department could decide that you might excel in one area, such as teaching or scholarship. That might be an interesting point for the faculty to discuss, and good for departments to also discuss.

Senator O'Kane stated that he agrees that it would be a good idea to have departments discuss this but it's really unclear that the Senate has anything to say to the individual departments. In Biology, service is important and is assessed.

Senator Funderburk noted, that after three years as Vice President of the Union, in charge of dealing with grievances and such, things are all over the place from elaborate procedures in writing that are followed to written things that have nothing to do with what goes on to nothing in particular written down. This is only advisory and we can only ask departments to only go so far in drafting their criteria because we have absolutely no clout whatsoever. The discussion part is the important part. His department is currently in discussion on this right now and they were very upset that creative activities, which has been a hallmark, doesn't show up in this.

Senator Neuhaus commented that the library got on this right away and there was concern the folks in the library and folks in music suddenly need to produce the same type of materials that folks in natural sciences or business would, all following the same model. They concluded that, no, they didn't, and that each

department feels it is the best judge of what they do. This is a touchy subject and we should encourage discussion rather than demand discussion.

Senator O'Kane stated that he seconds everything Senator Neuhaus just said. It is his belief that we should offer this document back to the departments as a talking point but doesn't see that the Senate has any responsibility beyond that.

Senator Soneson continued, noting that the question the committee debated was what to do with the document. One option was to give it to Provost Lubker and let him do with it what he wants. Another way would be to say it is faculty who looked at this and it's faculty who are bringing it to the Faculty Senate and saying that we're not being fair to our younger faculty. We're asking departments to not only discuss it but clarify the criteria they are using so that younger faculty would have a better idea of what's expected of them when it comes to promotion and tenure.

Senator Funderburk stated that he doesn't disagree but ultimately whatever criteria the faculty drafts has no impact on this because it's an administrative decision and there is no clarification for that. There is only so far that we can go. He really wishes some departments would have more discussion on this, and if we do send it out he hopes that it is clear that we're not trying to force anyone to do anything.

Senator Van Wormer noted that she could see departments coming back to us saying that they did discuss it, that's all. But she hopes that they will find it a really exciting document.

Senator Soneson remarked that the people that have the most at stake in this. As things are now, the younger faculty, wouldn't really have a voice in this. If we asked for a document then they'll be forced to address it.

Senator Smith noted that he was hoping to get some clarity on what's meant by clarity, in saying that "they're not being clear", what would amount to clarity? Would it amount to saying you have to have a certain number of articles, which he doesn't feel is a good thing. But if you don't specify, what do you say? How do you establish what is clear versus what isn't? Is this something departments can do, can they be clear enough without getting to specific numbers? One thing that could be done is to give thumbnail sketches of people in the past that have gotten tenure and those that have not. This would give a

sense of what it takes without identifying any individuals. The notion of clarity seems very unclear at this point.

Senator Soneson commented that one of the purposes of the document is to get this kind of conversation. We're getting clearer about what we mean by clarity by talking about it.

Senator Lowell noted that she has several thoughts on this. One being that she doesn't think we should get in a situation where we pass it on to higher level administrators to pass it back down and tell us what to do as we've had too much of that. It is her belief that most of us would rather do our research in our teaching. It has been her experience as a PAC member that the untenured faculty call their PAC members when they're uncomfortable about things and that the PACs do get together and talk about these things and clarify them. We are always trying to clarify our procedures and we don't need anyone from up or down telling us we need to do it again or more.

Senator Van Wormer added that the committee talked about numbers but decided they want that. This is for the new faculty so there would be that clarity for them. In looking at going from associate professor to full there was almost nothing to indicate what was expected and it would be good to have that spelled out.

Chair Wurtz stated that in the provost interview process she had made the point that our faculty have been asked to do so many things and have poured their heart and soul into them, and then things get shelved. This is very frustrating for faculty and there needs to be resolution. Also, the role of the Faculty Senate is a leadership role and we can use the Internet to get that information out there and for faculty to begin a discussion. If there's not clarity, let's not waste our time making a report on it.

Senator Funderburk commented on the amount of time that could be spent on this but in the end, who ever is the provost and the deans, get to decide. It is good to make sure everyone is doing the best they can and departments need to make sure they are addressing things the way they think is right but that is as far as we should go with most areas. There are some areas that desperately need to do something but it's hard to say what it is for sure, what it takes to get through some of these things.

Senator Heistad remarked that as departments prepare their PAC procedures, with the PAC chair and the dean signing off on certain procedures, this should indicate some connection between

the dean's criteria and the departments. While it has to be a faculty initiative she agrees it means nothing if she tells them what she thinks they need. The connections have to be there from the faculty up, and they have to be real connections when it comes to criteria rather than hoping administration will go along with them.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas noted that she likes the idea of having examples of what does get you tenure/promotion and what doesn't. It's similar to your weight, we all know the general guidelines for what you should be weighing but we don't make you declare it, as it's a sensitive issue. Tenure and promotion is also a sensitive issue. So having something whereby the administration will go along with us and have that as a communication rather than having us say this is what we do is preferable. There are privacy issues involved that people are hesitant to share. The problem with this is you are set on what happened before and you don't re-calibrate.

Senator Neuhaus stated that this whole issue centers on the administrators, we can do all this work and will administrators care about it? This is something faculty in the library have decided to engage their administrators in as they're a small college and it's very easy to do but it's not been an easy discussion. We can only encourage people to do this and administrators in the library have looked at this report and considered it. We can only suggest having this dialogue between faculty and administrators. And while they haven't gotten it all figured out, he feels they are better for having the discussion.

Senator O'Kane added that we should continue to discuss this and it seems that the motion as it stands, having departments come back and report, is not going to pass.

Motion to table Senator Soneson's motion to ask that the Senate request each department discuss this document, formulate and turn in to the Senate a copy of their own criteria for research and creative activities for promotion and tenure, including promotion to full by March 1, 2009 by Senator Smith; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

Motion to table Docket Item #880 Diversity of Faculty/Staff and Students at UNI by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Smith. Motion passed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Senator Bruess to adjourn; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden  
Faculty Senate Secretary

---

**Committee on Scholarly Activity & Service****Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities****August 28, 2008**

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

**I. Areas of Concern: Criteria, Evaluation and Standards**

The Committee was asked to examine research and scholarship criteria and standards at UNI.

After a preliminary discussion, we solicited the PAC procedures from all departments on campus and carefully examined research and scholarship criteria as set out in those documents. As would be expected, PAC procedure documents showed significant variation in scholarship & research tenure requirements. However, the committee also found significant weaknesses that call into



question both the rigor and clarity of the standards used to judge research and scholarship.

Findings from this review that were of special concern to members of the committee include:

- The absence of specific guidelines as to what counts as scholarship and research activity, or in some cases the absence of any mention of scholarship, among numerous departments.
- The inclusion of either vague criteria (“continued study”, “inquiry”, “innovation and experimentation”) or criteria that are extraneous to a traditional understanding of research/scholarship (“curriculum development”, “major curriculum revisions”, “consulting”).
- The lack of an explicit mention in many PAC Procedures that work that is part of a file submitted for tenure and/or promotion should have been subject to external peer review.
- In virtually all departmental PAC procedures, there was not a separate set of criteria and standards for the promotion to full professor that specifies requirements distinct from tenure and promotion to associate professor.

## **II. Recommendations on Criteria, Evaluation and Standards**

Based on the concerns expressed, members of the committee voiced a strong belief in the need for clearly stated criteria for tenure and promotion rooted in scholarly work. The object of PAC documents in this area should be to provide faculty with transparent and objective guidelines. To

address the weaknesses of current tenure and promotion standards on campus, the committee urges the adoption of the following recommendations by all Deans and Heads, their inclusion in departmental PAC procedures and where relevant, in university documents pertaining to research and scholarship:

1. The listing of specific research and scholarship requirements, spelled out in clear and concise language. Faculty should be able to know with reasonable accuracy what counts and what does not count for tenure and promotion.
2. A prioritization of requirements in the area of research and scholarship. Core requirements (e.g. publication in peer reviewed outlet) should be spelled out and separated from a listing of secondary requirements (e.g. pursuing external funding). The balance between primary and secondary requirements should be clearly stated so that faculties have a clear understanding of where to put most of their effort in working towards tenure and promotion.
3. A statement of the minimum goals needed to achieve tenure and promotion to associate professor, as well as for full professor. A statement of minimum goals would offer both departments and tenure/promotion candidates a road map to research and scholarship success, while not offering any explicit guarantees. The committee encourages colleges and departments to set specific goals and benchmarks, including indications of both the quantity and quality of work expected for tenure and promotion.

4. There should be a clear statement in all PAC Procedures that major works counted in the core requirements of research and scholarship, including publications, exhibitions or performances should be subject to an external peer-review process. The committee strongly believes that a peer review process, involving pre-screening of publications or letters of evaluation for creative performances or presentations, is not only the best guarantee of quality research and scholarship, but also serves as an important external validation of the quality of scholarship that is being conducted on this campus, and through the wider exposure of external review, enhances our regional and national reputation. As a result, external peer-review for works of scholarship should be considered a base-line in measuring the quality of research and scholarship produced at the University of Northern Iowa. It is the obligation of faculty members to offer evidence that works of scholarship they are presenting in the area of research/scholarship have undergone an external peer review process, and it is the obligation of both the PAC and the department Head to question candidates and request additional documented evidence for tenure and/or promotion if they have concerns regarding the peer review status of individual works being counted for tenure and/or promotion.
5. For those departments that encompass activities not normally subject to a standardized peer-review process involving pre-screening prior to acceptance of a work, which is the case for some creative activities, the committee suggests the adoption of Tenure Evaluation Dossiers (TEDs), whereby those works accomplished during the probationary period are gathered as artifacts or in such forms as CDs, DVDs, or web-based files, and

sent out for external peer-review. The expectations and procedures for TEDs should be explicit in all PAC documents.

6. Elimination of all current criteria not specifically linked to faculty research and scholarship in this area of PAC requirements, particularly those criteria more appropriate to service or teaching requirements, such as consulting, curriculum revisions and student paper supervision. Works involving the scholarship of teaching or the scholarship of service that are subject to an external peer review process should count in the area of research and scholarship, while those not involving external peer review should be listed in the teaching and service categories.
7. Although the committee recognizes and appreciates the importance of the independent Head review of faculty during tenure and promotion, it nonetheless believes that the Head and members of the PAC should work with each other in forging departmental standards and criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Where there is a significant divergence regarding departmental standards and criteria, it is important that there be open, honest and timely communication with candidates for tenure and/or promotion concerning these differences.
8. Recognizing that faculty have different interests and strengths and keeping in mind the mission and goals of UNI, the committee believes that promotion to full professor should be judged differently than tenure and promotion to associate professor, allowing for greater flexibility in the balance between research, teaching and service while at the same

time making promotion contingent on the quality of work as a post-tenure faculty member. Members of the committee do not believe that criteria and standards used in the promotion to full professor should necessarily mirror those used for tenure and promotion to associate professor. While continuing to be productive in teaching, research and service, candidates for full professor should have demonstrably excelled in at least one specific area. To achieve this rebalancing, the committee recommends the adoption of “Alternative Assignment Portfolios” (AAPs) for post-tenure professors. Versions of this system can be found at the University of Iowa, Boise State University, and the University of Indiana. This system would allow post-tenure faculty to negotiate an agreement with their Heads, subject to approval by their respective Deans and in consultation with their PACs, to allocate their time and effort differentially between research, teaching and service over a limited period of time, renewable and subject to a mid-point review. The committee believes that such a rebalancing of activities can allow senior faculty to explore in depth their own areas of interest while addressing an important need of the university. This could range from a program to develop a new innovative teaching technique which through workshops, presentations and publications is shared with the campus and broader academic community, to a faculty member taking on a particularly intensive service obligation on campus or in a regional or national association, to an extended period of field research abroad. Much as faculty currently “buy-out” of other obligations due to research that is funded or course reduction requests, the AAPs would allow faculty to rebalance their obligations at the university for a set period to focus on specific projects. It is the view of the committee that AAPs can assist senior faculty in their professional development and allow them to broaden their contributions to the

campus and the academic profession. It should be noted that rebalancing does not imply a dedication to one specific area, whether research, teaching or service. While reduced for a designated period, faculty still must maintain obligations in other areas and promotion should be based on faculty members overall record. During the period of participation in an AAP, faculty would be evaluated on the documented quality of work carried out and decisions regarding merit and promotion would be based on the progress towards achieving the agreed upon goals set out in the initial agreement, which should be as specific as possible. We urge the Provost and Faculty Senate to work with United Faculty in designating a committee with the specific task of designing the policies and procedures to govern AAPs.

9. The committee believes that high standards and expectations in the area of research and scholarship should not dilute the commitment of faculty to other areas, especially to service. In this regard, the committee urges department Heads and Deans to ensure that all faculty, including junior faculty, understand the importance of service to professional development and to good university citizenship. We ask that administrators ensure that service obligations are part of all faculty assignments and are distributed equitably to help foster a culture of service on campus.