

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

8/24/09

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 4/27/09 meeting by Senator Hotek; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost Gibson thanked the Senate for the good discussion at the retreat on Saturday, noting that she's looking forward to all we're going to accomplish this year.

Provost Gibson also noted that she is very happy to have the students back on campus.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments at this time.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz also had no comments at this time.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

985 Emeritus Status Request, Thomas L. Little, Department of Special Education, effective 12/03

Motion to docket in regular order as item #891 by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Smith. Motion passed.

986 Emeritus Status Request, Robert Krueger, Department of Modern Languages, effective 8/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #892 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Basom. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Elect Faculty Senate representative for May 2010 visit of His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama

Chair Wurtz noted the His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama will on the UNI campus in May, and with that kind of very significant visit there is planning involved. She was asked if the Faculty Senate wished to have either a senator or someone of their choosing to be the Senate's representative on the planning committee for this event.

Senator Soneson suggested James Robinson, Philosophy and World Religions, who may already be on that planning committee. Discussion followed.

Chair Wurtz and Senator Soneson will work on this and will report back to the Senate.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

890 Guidelines and Schedule for Departmental Reports on Tenure and Promotion Standards

Chair Wurtz noted that this is a follow-up action. The Senate asked for a committee to look at the issue of the variance across campus and to report back to the Senate with suggestions.

Senator Soneson summarized the process that went before this, noting that Senator VanWormer also served on the committee that was formed by former Interim Provost Lubker to review the standards for promotion and tenure across campus.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion by Senator Soneson to accept the Guidelines and Schedule for Departmental reports on Tenure and Promotion Standards and

ask faculty in each department to follow the recommendations in this document; second by Senator Basom.

Senator Basom offered a friendly amendment on the timeline, noting that this was first brought to the Senate last spring but was delayed until now. She suggested that the October 1, 2009 deadline for academic departments to present written documents to their deans be moved to November 1, 2009, which would then move the November 1 deadline for deans to provide feedback to their departments to December 1, 2009, with the final document to deans by April 15, 2010.

Senator Bruess also offered a friendly amendment to make the language in the first paragraph on the second page, under Phase II, to be more explicit in moving from associate professor to full that individuals would not be excluded from any changes in criteria, and should not be retroactive without approval of the person being evaluated. In his department that would exclude about 80% of the faculty.

Discussion continued.

Senator Soneson withdrew his motion to accept the "Guidelines and Schedule for Departmental Reports on tenure and Promotion Standards", with the second agreeing.

Motion by Senator Soneson to refer this material on to Provost Gibson for her review and return to the Senate with her own recommendations as to how she thinks we might best proceed, knowing that there is a general sentiment that Faculty Senate would like to see this done, regarding the issues of timing, grand fathering and participation that the Senate discussed, and for her to return to the Senate with her recommendations at the next Senate meeting, September 14, 2009; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Senator Roth noted that he has a class until 3:15 on Monday's and it's difficult to get here by 3:15 and suggested moving the starting time to 3:30 P.M.

Senator Soneson responded that the agreed stopping time is 5:00 and the 3:15 starting time gives us a little more time.

Chair Wurtz stated that there has been discussion as to a better meeting place, due to the long distance some people have to travel across campus to get here. Discussion followed with alternate suggested meeting places being offer up. These will be followed up on and reported back to the Senate.

Senator Basom noted the inconvenience of the Senate meeting during finals weeks. She suggested moving that meeting to the week prior, Monday, December 7.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate will need to add at least one additional meeting, possibly more, in addition to the regularly scheduled meetings due to the curriculum materials that will be coming the Senate's way later in the fall.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that the University Curriculum Committee will finish with the curriculum package at their October 28 meeting, at the latest.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate could add Monday, November 16 as an additional meeting date, as well as Monday, November 30, and Monday, December 7, in place of Monday, December 14, which is finals week.

Discussion followed and it was agreed that November 16 and November 30 will be added as additional meeting dates, and that December 7 will be added instead of December 14. The Senate will cancel those meetings that are not needed.

Senator Neuhaus commented that in light of the importance of the upcoming meetings, he urged senators to get the name of their alternates to Senate Secretary, Dena Snowden.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING

8/24/09

1665

PRESENT: Megan Balong, Maria Basom, Gregory Bruess, Karen Breitbach, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Gloria Gibson, Doug Hotek, Bev Kopper, Julie Lowell, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris

Neuhaus, Phil Patton, Chuck Quirk, Michael Roth, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz,

Absent: Michele Yehieli

CALL TO ORDER

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

Chair Wurtz thanked all the senators who attended the Faculty Senate retreat on Saturday. She will be getting the summary of the meeting out soon.

Chair Wurtz introduced Jake Rudy, NISG Vice President.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 4/27/09 meeting by Senator Hotek; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost Gibson thanked the Senate for the good discussion at the retreat on Saturday. She learned a lot and is looking forward to all we're going to accomplish this year.

Provost Gibson also noted that she is very happy to have the students back on campus. It's nice to walk across campus and see students, which is why we are here.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments at this time.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz also had no comments at this time.

Senator East noted that he would like to apologize to Associate Provost Kopper for his objection about the curriculum tool. He was able to find it and used it today, however, it is buried in there and not easy to find.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that she checked on the link that Senator East had commented on and discovered that it is difficult to find, and she has asked ITS to "unbury" it and make it easier to find because it is easy to miss.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

985 Emeritus Status Request, Thomas L. Little, Department of Special Education, effective 12/03

Motion to docket in regular order as item #891 by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Smith. Motion passed.

986 Emeritus Status Request, Robert Krueger, Department of Modern Languages, effective 8/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #892 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Basom. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Elect Faculty Senate representative for May 2010 visit of His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama

Chair Wurtz noted the His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama will on the UNI campus in May, and with that kind of very significant visit there is planning involved. She was asked if the Faculty Senate wished to have either a senator or someone of their choosing to be the Senate's representative on the planning committee for this event.

Senator Soneson stated that he was under the impression that James Robinson, Philosophy and World Religions, is on that planning committee. Dr. Robinson has done extensive work in Tibet and Buddhism, meeting the Dalai Lama several times and would suggest he be a central part of this event. If Dr.

Robinson is not already on the committee he would recommend him to be the Senate's representative.

Senator Bruess noted that he would second what Senator Soneson said, that Dr. Robinson would be an excellent representative.

Senator East asked if the Senate selects a representative that is not a member of the Senate, would that person keep the Senate informed of what's going on? Is there a formal mechanism by which they will inform us?

Chair Wurtz responded that we would want to set that up and it would depend on the task and how we want it accomplished. If this person is not a Senator we would inform them prior to serving that we want to be inform and how we would like them to inform us.

Faculty Chair Swan recommended that the Senate select two members to look into these matters, bringing a candidate forward at the next Senate meeting, along with all the details worked out as to how the Senate will be informed of the planning process.

Senator Soneson, noting that this is his area, volunteered.

Chair Wurtz will also work with Senator Soneson on this and will report back to the Senate. She noted that the Senate appreciates being asked to have input in this event.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas asked about the time factor on this, if there is a pressing time-line as to when the planning committee will begin meeting? And if so, can this be addressed by email?

Chair Wurtz replied that if it's a time issue it can be handled by email.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

890 Guidelines and Schedule for Departmental Reports on Tenure and Promotion Standards

Chair Wurtz noted that this is a follow-up action. The Senate asked for a committee to look at the issue of the variance across campus and to report back to the Senate with suggestions.

Senator Soneson summarized the process that went before this, noting that Senator VanWormer also served on the committee that was formed by former Interim Provost Lubker to review the standards for promotion and tenure across campus. There were representatives from each college, as well as a department head, a dean, and a representative from the union all serving on the committee. They asked each department to send them their PAC guidelines for promotion and tenure. In reviewing all these different guidelines they discovered several things, first of which is that very few had clear guidelines. Most didn't specify what a young faculty member or associate professor would have to do to be promoted. Most things that were looked at included scholarship and teaching, but what does that mean?

Secondly, they found where there was specificity there was very little consistency. The committee put together several documents which were discussed last spring and can be found on the Provost's website. Those documents discuss what the committee found, what their concerns were and what their recommendations were, and directed specifically to departments. This was brought to the Faculty Senate several times and they were very supportive of this, asking the committee to come up with specific guidelines for reviewing their standards for promotion and tenure, which the committee did.

Senator Soneson continued, noting that the guidelines consist of two phases that a department could go through. The idea is that each department try to make as explicit as they can the criteria that they actually use that are operative in the department for promotion and tenure, and to write them down and hand them to their deans.

The second stage would be for the committee to review the various criteria, making suggestions and recommendations for clarity; not telling people what the criteria should be but hoping they are transparent. Each department would have the chance to reformulate their criteria

Senator Soneson noted that the committee had several concerns, one of which was that young people coming into the university are not clear at all about what they need to do to get tenure and to be promoted. At times they are told in an informal way what they need to do and a year or so before they come up for tenure review they are told something else, which is a travesty of our profession. To avoid those kinds things, it is important for us as faculty to be as clear as we can be on what we expect.

The second concern, Senator Soneson remarked, has to do with service. It turns out that service is not equally distributed among all faculty. A larger percentage of women and minorities serve on committees than white males. It's not because of some kind of assumption that they ought to serve other than the fact that there are not as many of them so in order to get fair representation they get asked to serve on committee more than white males. Women and minorities end up doing more service their first five or six years, and after that as well. A committee member pointed out that the university ought not ask faculty to do something that they will not get a reward for. With that in mind the committee is suggesting that each department consider afresh the importance of service for promotion and tenure, and specific recommendations on this are noted.

The guidelines include a schedule for departments to review the criteria with the first date October 1, 2009 for departments to present written documents to their deans, which could be moved back. The committee hopes that the faculty could take action on this for the sake of their younger colleagues and themselves.

Provost Gibson asked how often are the criteria for tenure and promotion reviewed? Are they not reviewed annually?

This was met by a few chuckles from senators.

Provost Gibson stated that her experience has been that criteria are reviewed at the departmental level, at the college level, and at the university level annually.

Senator East responded that it is his understanding that the Master Agreement calls for any changes in policy to be announced to faculty annually. If it's not changed then nothing happens. Changes have to be approved by deans, and not to his knowledge by the Provost. If changes are made they must be announced by some time in September, and they must be approved by the dean.

Senator Funderburk concurred that there is no requirement to review annually. Last spring he served on a committee in the School of Music and the date of the previous document they were working with was 1998.

Senator Soneson, as Department Head, Philosophy and World Religions, noted that they do not have explicit criteria. In the time he's been in that department he doesn't ever remember reviewing the criteria for promotion and tenure. When he came

to UNI a senior faculty told him that they didn't want to write down criteria because they might be held accountable. He noted that all those faculty are now retired.

Senator Soneson continued, stating that in looking at their PAC procedures, they are reviewed annually and sent to the dean. There is nothing in them about criteria.

Provost Gibson remarked that that couldn't be true.

Senator Soneson replied that, yes, it's true and he could send them to her. There is not a word about criteria, the standards that a faculty member has to meet in order to be promoted.

Provost Gibson asked how are they going to know?

Senator Soneson responded that that is the question.

Senator Smith stated that he is supportive of what's being proposed here and his only concern is that we ought to be doing a lot more. His concern is not with the specificity so much as it is with the prioritization, the weights we give to different things. He specifically believes we don't do enough at this university to encourage and support what we call service. He believes in general those in higher education do way too much to support what turns out to be relatively trivial research. If it were possible, and if there was support for this body to do some kind of reevaluation he would push for us to do that, and push for the faculty to focus their efforts on the things that really are important for society and this institution. A lot of things that we put our efforts into he would argue aren't important, even though we think they are. He would also like to see a stronger kind of course of action to address that more broadly. He's supportive of what's being done and in getting things more specific but he would hope that we could do something more fundamental as well.

Senator VanWormer commented that she would like to emphasize the service aspect, noting that she was told two provosts ago, along with a lot of other people, that until you get tenure don't spend any time on service because it didn't count. One reason they want to emphasize service is because it's good for the university, it's good for public relations, and it's wonderful for recruiting students. Some people are spending a lot of time on service, such as serving on the Faculty Senate, and not really getting anything for it.

Provost Gibson noted that there's not any built in distance between service, teaching and research. Many times there's blending between those areas. Community engagement is something that is relative now, which integrates all three areas. Service is very important.

Senator VanWormer remarked that she's in Social Work and there is a connection between that and service. They were telling new faculty in her department to get off committees because they don't count. Then after about six years faculty are broken of the habit of serving or they've lost their enthusiasm because they haven't done it.

Senator VanWormer also noted that in coming up for full professor to consider the possibility that someone might be a specialist in one area, and their authority in that area might be considered as most faculty are better in one specific area.

Senator Neuhaus commented that from what he's heard he believes things could be more explicit. The criteria for the Library are terribly explicit, but that's library folk, they like to keep everything tidy. One concern he has, which is coming from a couple of different deans that he's talked with, is the concern that various deans try to do a "one upmanship" when it comes time for final review. "Well that would never qualify in my college." We've all run into this but we also want to respect the fact that different colleges and different departments within those colleges have very different means of expressing their intellectual and creative pursuits. There's been concern expressed that people in the library aren't publishing enough but he suspects that most faculty would like the library to focus on getting as much they can for the faculty and making sure the wheels are running smoothly. There's always this danger of once everything is spelled out then there will be this disdain for other colleges and departments over their criteria. While it is good to have something there for faculty to look at, there is going to be a tendency for those in higher positions to put the fear in others.

Senator Soneson followed up on Senator VanWormer's comment, noting that the dean on the committee said something very interesting while talking about promotion from associate professor to full, and the possibility of service counting much more significantly for that move. The dean noted that he has been to a number of universities, including Research I universities, and it's more difficult to move from associate professor to full here at UNI than at any of those other

institutions. This should be kept in mind when considering service as a significant part of promotion and tenure.

Senator East noted concern about the procedures. For those that have procedures in place and have passed them on to their dean, as does his department, Computer Science, they would not have to do anything during the first semester, the first phase?

Senator Soneson replied that that is correct.

Senator East continued, and that during the second semester changes could be made but those changes wouldn't apply to current faculty as they can only use them for faculty hired after fall 2010. The procedure seems to be not particularly useful.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas stated concern about the issue "the PAC and Head should not be designated with this task." Yet their PAC says no one can tell them what to do, the PAC decides these issues. This has already been brought up in her department and she's not sure how this will play out.

Senator Soneson responded first to Senator East, noting that there's no reason to say that these guidelines can't be revised and applied to our selves. The problem behind the statement that Senator East is referring is that we don't want to tell people one thing and then the next year say, "oops, we've changed the criteria," unless faculty like the changed criteria and want to be held to those criteria. It seems unfair to switch on them once they've been told, if they've been told clearly what the criteria are. If faculty decide they like the new criteria there's no reason why that can't be applied to all.

In response to Senator Schumacher-Douglas, Senator Soneson commented that one thing as a committee that they wanted to get away from was the kind of antagonistic approach between the union and support administration. They all have criteria they use and it seems that they could put aside their "separate domains" and work at this in a cooperative way, working together. Heads ought not have different criteria than the PAC, and if they do then there's something really problematic in that department. It would seem to everybody's advantage from the head, the PAC, and untenured faculty to all work together. The untenured faculty needs to tell us if things are not clear. Heads need to be able to say if they've been using different criteria, and then they need to have a conversation about that. That's why there's an attempt for us all to look at this as

faculty and to work to clarify what is already going on in departments.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas noted that one of the unwritten rules that she's experienced is that once you're tenured you're not on the PAC. It sounds like what we have here is a departmental committee giving the departmental PAC feedback.

Senator Soneson replied that he would hope that it would be more than just a little committee, he would hope that all faculty in each department are involved in this. We all have assumptions and we all need to be clear about them and work together. The PAC shouldn't be told anything by a committee; the PAC is independent. If the PAC is involved in the discussion then there's no problem. If you don't have the PAC in the discussion then there's a problem.

Chair Wurtz stated that this has caused her to wonder that at the university level there should be certain things we might do, and it doesn't matter what area you're in, that are true of someone who deserves tenure, certain things that are true of someone who deserves promotion. Is it reasonable to establish the foundation starting at the top and for each college there would be certain things, adding on to whatever broad-based university criteria and then going to the department and becoming more specific? Would there be benefit starting it at that broad level?

Senator Neuhaus responded that he would worry about who dominated that high level discussion, hoping for broadminded people who recognize the variety and differences among faculty. That might work well. He's seen in practices the "one upsmanship" from various colleges who felt that this is they way we do it and we're good so the rest of you aren't as good as us. That can throw things in a bit of a kilter. This gets down to how much specificity do we want? Down to counting the types of journal articles, the number, the journals themselves? Or do we want something a little looser?

Faculty Chair Swan outlined the options for the Senate, noting that this was docketed in regular order, and is being considered now. There could be a motion to accept the recommendations and ask the deans to perform the task according to the schedule. The other option would be number 5 on senator's green sheets, "Refer to (administrative officer)" referring it to Provost Gibson. The senate also could decide to do nothing and move on

with business or to continue on as a committee of the whole as we've been doing to discuss.

Motion by Senator Soneson to accept the Guidelines and Schedule for Departmental reports on Tenure and Promotion Standards and ask faculty in each department to follow the recommendations in this document; second by Senator Basom.

Senator Basom offered a friendly amendment on the timeline, noting that this was first brought to the Senate last spring but was delayed until now. She suggested that the October 1, 2009 deadline for academic departments to present written documents to their deans be moved to November 1, 2009, which would then move the November 1 deadline for deans to provide feedback to their departments to December 1, 2009, with the final document to deans by April 15, 2010.

Senator Bruess also offered a friendly amendment to make the language in the first paragraph on the second page, under Phase II, to be more explicit in moving from associate professor to full individuals would not be excluded from any changes in criteria, and should not be retroactive without approval of the person being evaluated. In his department that would exclude about 80% of the faculty.

Senator East noted on the second page, second paragraph under Phase I "that the PAC and head should not be designated with this task." As it is it sounds like they shouldn't participate, which leaves untenured faculty to do it. This can be taken as a friendly amendment or in opposition to the proposal, whichever way the Senate prefers. The problem with words is that they have to be read for what they say and this says, "The PAC and head should not be designated with this task." His first reaction to this is they shouldn't participate, which is not a useful thing to be saying.

Senator Breitbach offered "should not be solely designated but there should be participation on the part of all faculty members." It's a matter interpretation and we don't want to sound like we're excluding anyone. A statement should be included that makes it clear that these populations should be included.

Senator Breitbach also noted that this won't work unless two things happen simultaneously. First, there needs to be the hard work on the part of the faculty working with their department head, and secondly, there needs to be that expectation from the

administration that this will improve the process, and this needs to be communicated from the top down.

Faculty Chair Swan noted that in reading "The PAC and Head should not be designated with this task" is specifying that the PAC as the PAC should not be asked to do this because PAC is a creature of the Master Agreement and we're not asking anything of any creature of the Master Agreement to do anything. But all the human beings on the PAC are also faculty members and as faculty members, not as PAC members, all faculty should be asked to do this. The department head, not as department head, but as a faculty member should also participate. This is preserving the distinction between the designation of PAC, department head and faculty member. This is a Faculty Senate endeavor that has nothing to do with the Master Agreement. We want all faculty members as faculty members to participate in the generation of this document that the Provost will be reviewing at a later date if she wishes.

Senator Soneson commented that Faculty Chair's comment was well said.

Chair Wurtz stated that she's hearing broad based support for the concept. There are two issues requiring clarification, timing and how we specify the roles. We are engaging in "word smithing" using the friendly amendment process to do so and that may not be the best process. Another option that might be better would be to send it back for clarification and return with the revisions.

Senator Soneson noted that if the document is taken back for revisions and then returned, it gets to be a long process and they've already done it several times. We can spend a little more time on this to get it done so departments can begin to think about it, otherwise the dates will have to be changed again.

Senator Soneson asked Senator Breitbach is she was recommending that we as the Faculty Senate urge the higher administration to support this?

Senator Breitbach responded that she feels that is why we're in such a state of disarray because there hasn't been that expectation from the top that there be specificity and consistency. There has to be that expectation and the expectation that they will be reviewed and brought forward for approval. If that isn't there it doesn't happen.

Senator Soneson replied that he thinks that is good and at the same time he thinks it's important that we don't give up our authority as Faculty Senate. It needs to be viewed that members of the Faculty Senate are asking their colleagues to engage in this process and that we further urge the higher administration to cooperate and support this process.

Senator Funderburk commented that in reality, we don't have any authority to enforce this to come back to us and the best thing might be to give it to Provost Gibson and ask the Provost, who does have authority, to consider.

Faculty Chair Swan noted that this did come for the previous Provost, Jim Lubker, and there was this support. He would like to recommend that we ask the provost, and the deans, to execute this process, or the Senate could accept the recommendations and ask the Provost to perform the recommendations according to the schedule.

Chair Wurtz remarked that we would have an obligation, as Senators, because we didn't pass this, which would show up in the minutes. That doesn't mean that our colleagues at the departmental level are going to pay any attention to it until we as members of those departments say let's do this, or it comes down from the top.

Senator East stated that most faculty can get access to an email list for their college and send them messages saying "this is from your senators and the Faculty Senate is asking that you do X, Y, and Z, go to it." There are mechanisms to for accomplishing this.

Chair Wurtz commented that each college has their own senate. She asked if senators were comfortable on the content of the friendly amendments, even if we don't have them exactly as we want them. We're pushing two deadlines back and putting language in to allow faculty to have a choice whether they want to be covered under the old or new criteria. We are also clarifying that this does not mean that deans and department heads can't be involved; it shouldn't be their responsibility with no one else involved.

Senator Swan clarified that we're not changing the motion to ask either the deans to do this or the Provost. We're simply asking the faculty to do this.

Senator Soneson asked Provost Gibson if she would be supportive of this? Is this a good way to go about this, as the Senate, to ask her to ask the deans to ask the faculty and so on, to make sure this gets done?

Provost Gibson replied that she does support this but feels very uncomfortable in making any decision on this today and would need some time to review this. She appreciates and understands that they have worked on this all last year, and she understands that they want to move forward. Personally, she would feel more comfortable reviewing the documents, reviewing the website, and delay making any decisions until she's had time to review everything.

Senator Swan noted that another option is to select option #5, "Refer to (administrative officer)" with the officer being Provost Gibson as this is an exceptional situation as we've moved from the previous Provost who was familiar with all this to a brand new person and we should give that new person some time to review and become familiar with the situation, and we could put a date on this as to when the Senate would like a response.

Chair Wurtz remarked that she understands the committee's desire to not lose momentum but she believes there will be more momentum if we run parallel processes, with faculty saying this is something we better do and the administrative being with us on this. We can only have half of this right now, which doesn't mean we can't pass it; it just means we can't take any real action.

Senator Lowell noted that she's not clear how we can approve this with specific dates in it if we moving toward giving a general approval.

Senator Funderburk stated it might be easier to vote this down and then request a different action.

Senator Soneson asked if he could withdraw his motion, as it sounds much better than voting it down. If he withdraws it we could then ask Provost Gibson to consider it, and possibly bring it back to the Senate in two weeks.

Chair Wurtz noted that if Senator Soneson withdraws his motion the person who seconded it must to agree to allow him to withdraw.

Senator Breitbach stated that this has already been docketed in regular order, because it is "Consideration of Docketed Items." Aren't we now taking action?

Chair Wurtz stated that the standard motions are being used here as the "action" that the Senate would take.

Senator Breitbach continued, noting that we need to move forward on this. Why did we work so hard on this last year if it's just to table it? We can't keep delaying it. Delaying it puts the departments in a time bind.

Chair Wurtz commented that she believed Senator Soneson's intent is to withdraw this with support from the second and then immediately bring it back with another proposal that's more focused on initiating the parallel processes.

Senator Soneson responded that Chair Wurtz is correct. If we don't get support from the highest level of the administration it's likely to go nowhere.

Provost Gibson noted that she's not saying that she doesn't support it, she hasn't had enough time to review everything involved.

Senator Soneson withdrew his motion to accept the "Guidelines and Schedule for Departmental Reports on Tenure and Promotion Standards", with the second agreeing.

Motion by Senator Soneson to refer this material on to Provost Gibson for her review and return to the Senate with her own recommendations as to how she thinks we might best proceed, knowing that there is a general sentiment that the Faculty Senate would like to see this done, regarding the issues timing, grand fathering and participation that the Senate discussed, and for her to return to the Senate with her recommendations at the next Senate meeting, September 14, 2009; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

Senator Soneson noted that all of the committees documents are on the Provost's website and urged them to look at them prior to the next meeting.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Senator Roth noted that he has a class until 3:15 on Mondays and it's difficult to get here by 3:15 and suggested moving the starting time to 3:30 P.M.

Senator Soneson responded that the agreed stopping time is 5:00 and the 3:15 starting time gives us a little more time.

Chair Wurtz stated that there has been discussion as to a better meeting place, due to the long distance some people have to travel across campus to get here. Discussion followed with alternate suggested meeting places being offer up. These will be followed up on and reported back to the Senate.

Senator Basom noted the inconvenience of the Senate meeting during finals weeks. She suggested moving that meeting to the week prior, Monday, December 7.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate will need to add at least one additional meeting, possibly more, in addition to the regularly scheduled meeting due to the curriculum materials that will be coming the Senate's way later in the fall.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that the University Curriculum Committee will finish with the curriculum October 28 at the latest.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate could add Monday, November 16 as an additional meeting date, as well as Monday, November 30, and Monday, December 7, in place of Monday, December 14, which is finals week.

Discussion followed and it was agreed that November 16 and November 30 will be added as additional meeting dates, and that December 7 will be added instead of December 14. The Senate will cancel those dates that are not needed

Senator Neuhaus commented that in light of the importance of the upcoming meetings, he urged senators to get the name of their alternates to Senate Secretary, Dena Snowden.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary

Guidelines and Schedule for Departmental Reports on Tenure and Promotion Standards

**Developed by the Committee on Scholarly/Creative Activity & Service at the
University of Northern Iowa**

August, 2009

Starting in spring 2008, members of the Committee on Scholarly/Creative Activity and Service reviewed the PAC policies and procedures of departments and discussed the issue of tenure and promotion standards with various groups across campus. We engaged in long and vigorous discussions, motivated by the ideal of faculty self-governance and the obligation of intellectuals to think critically for the sake of improvement.

At the end of 2008, the Committee issued two reports, one dealing with tenure and promotion criteria and procedures involving scholarly/creative activities, found at:

<http://www.uni.edu/vpaa/documents/CommitteeOnScholarlyActivityandService.pdf>

and an additional report evaluating tenure and promotion criteria and procedures involving service, found at:

<http://www.uni.edu/vpaa/documents/CommitteeonScholarly-CreativeActivityandService.pdf>

Members of the committee were astonished to find an absence of clearly stated criteria for tenure/promotion and promotion to full professor in most documents. With few exceptions, faculty are not provided with transparent and objective guidelines in written form, in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activities and service. The reports listed above offer several recommendations for adoption by departments, always recognizing the significant differences between disciplines and how teaching, scholarship/creative activities and service are carried out in each discipline. The committee strongly feels each department needs to develop a document clearly delineating the criteria used in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activities and service for tenure and promotion purposes, insofar as, 1. Such a document will provide clarity, transparency and fairness for those aspiring to tenure and promotion, or promotion to full professor, ensuring that they are being rewarded for work done in fulfillment of stated expectations, and not relying on vague, ad hoc, or personal statements and, 2. Written tenure and promotion documents will foster greater consistency across campus, promoting a culture where

criteria based on rigor, transparency and fairness are common in the standards of all departments and colleges.

In order to accomplish this task in the context of the many obligations that faculty have to fulfill throughout the academic year the committee has developed a two phased approach spread out over the next year to develop a final “Departmental Tenure and Promotions Criteria Document”. See attached suggested format for document.

PHASE I: Moving From Custom to Written Rules, August-December 2009.

By November 1, 2009 academic departments must present a written document to their respective Deans detailing the **operative criteria and current custom** used in the granting of tenure and promotion as well as promotion to full professor. The criteria should provide as much detail as possible about the current standards used in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activities and service.

Given that there may be different interpretations and understandings about the current operative criteria for tenure and promotion, department heads are urged to designate a committee representative of both junior and senior faculty, to draft the current criteria document. **The PAC and Head should not be designated with this task.** All members of the faculty should have an opportunity to review and discuss the committee’s report to ensure it accurately reflects existing criteria.

By December 1, 2009, Deans should offer written feedback to departments on their draft document. Such feedback should be aimed at clarifying existing criteria and NOT the introduction of new criteria. Department faculty should discuss the Deans feedback at an appropriate meeting and any necessary revisions to their document decided on by faculty should be made before the end of the fall semester.

PHASE II: Reflection and New Directions, January-April 2010.

In light of the recommendations of the Committee on Scholarly/Creative Activities and Service reports, departments should have an opportunity to reflect on and revise the criteria currently used in tenure and promotion. Any changes in the criteria or evaluation of teaching, scholarship/creative activities or service **should not be retroactive**, and should apply to faculty beginning in a tenure track position starting in the fall of 2010.

As in the Phase I process, departments are urged to designate a committee representative of all faculty to reflect upon and propose changes in existing criteria. A draft proposal should be presented to the full department for discussion and adoption. A copy of the final document should be submitted to their respective Deans for his/her information by May 1, 2010.

The committee suggests that department faculty review their tenure and promotion criteria periodically, following the above procedure, in future years as well, so as to reflect changes in their respective disciplines and in university culture both here and across the country.

Possible MODEL for the FORMAT: Scholarship/Creative Activities For T&P-we suggest a separate document for promotion to full

Members of the Committee on Scholarship/Creative Activities and Service offer the following as one possible model for departments to consider. Departments are free to construct their own model, if they choose. In either case, it is important to attempt to state as carefully as you can the criteria implicitly (or explicitly) operative in your department discussions and decisions on tenure and promotion.

I. Preamble

A general statement regarding the importance of scholarship/creative activities to faculty development, the department's role in the university and to tenure.

A statement that nothing in the standards and requirements discussed below should be construed as in conflict with the Master Agreement, and where there is a conflict, the Master Agreement takes precedence.

II. Core Requirements

An explicit statement of required activities that are considered the minimum necessary to meet the department's standard for tenure and promotion.

Standards: An explicit listing of core requirement standards.

Example: (from Physics)

1. Publishing in peer reviewed journals
2. Presenting research at regional and national conferences
3. Involving students in scholarly and creative activities

Minimum Goals: The road map to success.

Example: (1-3 from Physics)

1. A minimum goal of one publication every two years. At least as important as the quantity of publication is the quality of the publication as judged by one's colleagues. Probationary faculty members are particularly encouraged to exceed the minimum goal while maintaining quality.
2. A reasonable expectation is one presentation per year.
3. It is recognized that in some cases the substantive involvement of students may not be practical.

III. Secondary Requirements

Standards: An explicit listing of secondary requirements that count towards T & P.

Example:

1. External funding, either received or pursued.
2. Publications in non-peer reviewed journals, including encyclopedia entries and book reviews.
3. Presentations at colloquia.
4. Receiving awards or recognition for scholarship.

Minimum Goals: The road map to success.

Example:

1. Individuals going up for tenure and promotion should have at least two of the above secondary requirements.

IV. Documentation: What the PAC/Head expect/accept as documentation for scholarship should be explicitly listed in this section.

Example:

1. Copies of published articles.
2. Letters from editors, funding reviewers regarding current status of work.
3. Letters from colleagues in the field reviewing scholarship/creative service.

Possible MODEL for FORMAT: Examples for Service Activities For T&P-suggest a separate document for promotion to full

Members of the Committee on Scholarship/Creative Activities and Service offer the following as one possible model for departments to consider. Departments are free to construct their own model, if they choose. In either case, it is important to attempt to state as carefully as you can the criteria implicitly (or explicitly) operative in your department discussions and decisions on tenure and promotion.

I. Preamble

A general statement regarding the importance of service to faculty development, the department's role in the university and to tenure.

A statement that nothing in the standards and requirements discussed below should be construed as in conflict with the Master Agreement, and where there is a conflict, the Master Agreement takes precedence.

II. Requirements

An explicit statement of required activities that are considered the minimum necessary to meet the department's standard for tenure and promotion.

Standards: An explicit listing of core requirement standards.

Example (This is ONLY an example):

4. Service on at least one department, college and university committee.
5. Service in an initiative that has significantly assisted an off campus group using their professional knowledge.
6. Service in a local, regional or national association.

Minimum Benchmarks:

Examples:

1. Faculty should demonstrate their contributions to the committee's work.
2. Faculty should demonstrate that their participation in an off campus activity contributed to their faculty development and assisted people outside the university.
3. Faculty should demonstrate their contributions to associations.

III. Documentation: What the PAC/Head expect/accept as documentation for service should be explicitly listed in this section.

Examples:

4. Letters of evaluation from committee chairs
5. Certificates of participation from outside organizations or associations.
6. Copies of final reports or committee meeting minutes documenting contributions.
7. Copies of media reports about key off-campus activities.