

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
4/22/19 (3:30 – 5:06)
Mtg. #1824
SUMMARY MINUTES
Scholar Space (301) Rod Library

No members of the Press were present.

Guests: Brenda **Bass**, Mary **Connerly**, Danielle **Cowley**, Susan **Etscheidt**, John **Fritch**, Carissa **Froyum**, Ana **Kogl**, Eric **Lange**, Jacob **Levang**, Chris **Martin**, Ryan **McGeough**, Siobahn **Morgan**, Theresa **Westbrock**.

Courtesy Announcements:

President **Nook** thanked all faculty, and especially the work of the Faculty Senate this year for wrestling with challenging issues. (See pages 4-5)

Provost **Wohlpert** also extended thanks to the work of the Faculty Evaluation and the Faculty Handbook Committees for their collaborative work this year. He explained the purposes of the Vision 2051 process that will begin to explore the future needs of the University. (See pages 5-8)

Faculty Chair **Cutter** explained her reasons for voting in favor of the Faculty Evaluation process, and how she believes post-tenure review provides essential safeguards for tenured faculty. (See pages 8-12)

United Faculty Chair **Hawbaker** also extended thanks for the collaborative work of faculty and administrative leadership and listed groups and persons who won awards at the recent Faculty Dinner. (See pages 12-13)

Faculty Senate Chair **Petersen** expressed gratitude for the opportunity to serve as Faculty Senate Chair and for the collaborative committee work on important issues. (See pages 13-14)

NISG Vice-Chair **Ahart** introduced NISG President Jacob **Levang**, who will be serving as liaison with Faculty Senate next year and explained NISG's

recommendation regarding and the Panther Shuttle and Panther Safe Ride. (See pages 14-15)

Minutes for Approval: April 8, 2019_(Mattingly/O’Kane) All aye.

Consideration of Docket Items

** (Zeitz/Burnight) Motion to re-order docket. All aye.

**1332/1453 (Zeitz/Burnight) Emeritus request for Christopher Edginton.
All aye. (See pages 16-18)

**1333/1454 (Stafford/Hesse) Emeritus request for Carol Weisenberger
All aye. See pages 18-20)

1323/1444 GERC Consultation (See pages 20-33)

1291/1412 Faculty Handbook Consultation (See pages 33-49) and Addendum 1

New Business

** (Burnight/Stafford) Motion to extend meeting by 15 minutes. Motion passed.

** (Mattingly/Gould) Motion to move to Executive Session.

Adjournment: (Strauss/Acclamation) 5:06 p.m.

Next Meeting:

3:30 p.m. Monday, Sept. 9, 2019

Scholar Space (301) Rod Library

University of Northern Iowa

A complete transcript of 50 pages and 1 (one) addendum follows.

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

April 22th, 2019

Present: Senators Imam **Alam**, John **Burnight**, Cathy **DeSoto**, Faculty Senate Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Senators Kenneth **Hall**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair Jim **Mattingly**, Senators Amanda **McCandless** and Steve **O’Kane**, Faculty Senate Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Mark **Sherrad**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gloria **Stafford**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Shahram **Varzavand**, and Leigh **Zeitz**. **Also Present:** NISG Vice President Kristin **Ahart**, UNI Faculty Chair Barbara **Cutter**, United Faculty Chair Becky **Hawbaker**, UNI President Mark **Nook**, Provost Jim **Wohlpert**, and Associate Provost John **Vallentine**.

Not Present: Senators Peter **Neibert**, Sara **Smith**, Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**.

Guests: Brenda **Bass**, Mary **Connerly**, Danielle **Cowley**, Susan **Etscheidt**, John **Fritch**, Carissa **Froyum**, Ana **Kogl**, Eric **Lange**, Jacob **Levang**, Chris **Martin**, Ryan **McGeough**, Siobahn **Morgan**, and Theresa **Westbrock**.

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Petersen: Thank you. Let me call our last meeting of the academic year to order. Thank you for the treats. Let me ask, are there any press? Then let us move on to the introduction of our guests. I know we have a number of guests with us today

to talk a number of the issues on the docket. So let me ask our guests to introduce themselves.

Cowley: I'm Danielle **Cowley**. I will be an incoming Faculty Senator representing the COE.

Bass: Brenda **Bass**. I'm here with the General Education Revision Committee.

McGeough: Ryan **McGeough**, also here with the Gen Ed Revision Committee.

Froyum: Carissa **Froyum**, Co-chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Etscheidt: Susan **Etscheidt**, Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Lange: Eric **Lange**, Faculty Handbook Committee.

Connerly: Mary **Connerly**, Faculty Handbook Committee.

Morgan: Siobahn **Morgan**, meeting junkie.

Fritch: John **Fritch**, General Education Review Committee.

Petersen: Alright. Thank you all and welcome. We will move into our announcements and we'll start with President **Nook**.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

Nook: No real announcement—I just want to say since this is the last faculty meeting, thank you for the work that you do as faculty, but especially as Faculty Senate members. This takes time. It takes a pretty big commitment. It's not always easy work. I know that. Sometimes there's issues that are controversial and have to be wrestled with, and that's really what universities are really all

about—wrestling with these difficult and challenging issues from time to time. But that doesn't mean we shouldn't take a little bit of time and say thank you to the people that actually sit down and take on that responsibility for the entire University, and University Senate is absolutely that function. I can't imagine a university operating without a Faculty Senate; without the protections for faculty that go along with that in the form of tenure and some of the promotions and things, and so I just want to take a minute to say thank you very much for your commitment to the University; the work that you do here. Your commitment to making this place a great place to work; a great place to learn, and a great place for many of us to live. So, thank you for that. Also, I wanted to say congratulations to all those people that got promotion, since the Board was supposed to vote on it the other day. It got pushed off the agenda. It will be on the very next one. There was a little incident at the meeting and it delayed things a little bit, and it was one of the items that didn't really get there. So, again--thank you for everything you've done for this University this year. I look forward to working with you again this next year.

Petersen: Thank you.

Nook: You bet.

Petersen: Provost **Wohlpart**?

Wohlpart: Let me echo President **Nook**'s thank yous. I especially want to thank the Faculty Handbook Committee and the Faculty Evaluation Committee for a really heavy lift. Not just this year, but over the last two years in really creating a strategic and I think comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System that recognizes

and rewards excellence over the arc of faculty careers. That was the charge that I had as I came into this, and I think that has happened—is to really look comprehensively at the career of a faculty member here at UNI, and to think about how we can better recognize and reward the excellence that happens. So you all will get to have some consultation and conversation today, but the conversations were often challenging: Lots of different points of view, and what is remarkable is the way in which all of the members of that group worked through those challenges and those different points of view to really land in a what I think is a really good place. As much as I think the document is something that should celebrate, I think it's also the process that should be celebrated on this campus. This is a coming together of different perspectives to move the institution forward and to support the faculty in ways that President **Nook** mentioned.

Wohlpart: I also want to thank the General Education Revision Committee. Again, comprehensive work over the last two years. This is really remarkable—the way in which we've had this conversation and collaborative and inclusive ways—really transparent. What I would ask you to do as you go through this conversation today about these frameworks, is not to place your course someplace in here. I was even going to say, although I understand that there's a model out there that has learning outcomes—don't place learning outcomes. The conversation today should be about the journey that our students go through as they learn. What journey makes sense for UNI? What is that experience that we want our students to have? So think philosophically. Think 'big picture.' Please think beyond yourself, your program, your courses—about the learning that our students should experience when they come here. I'll also say real quickly that we are moving towards the end of having accomplished almost everything on the

Academic Master Plan which we created in that first year that I was here, which is again really, really remarkable. We need to begin to have a conversation about what we want to do next in Academic Affairs, and this needs to tie in with the Vision 2051 work that's going. How do we position Academic Affairs for the future? How do we lay a foundation; a groundwork now, so that people in ten years, 20 years, 50 years—look back and say this was a time that really created the opportunity for all of us to thrive. Everybody who's here in 20, 30, 40 years, when none of us are here.

Wohlpart: We're going to begin that conversation actually on Wednesday morning. We've gathered faculty leadership: Chairs of the Faculty Senate, the College Senates, to begin to have a conversation about how do we talk about the future thriving in this institution? What does the conversation look like? Who does it involve? It's a comprehensive conversation. It will take three years before anything would be implemented out of that. I will tell you that one of the concerns that I've had as Provost is when I go to the Council of Provosts Meetings, which then lead into the Academic Affairs Committee, which then lead into the Board of Regents Committee, is that Iowa and Iowa State are constantly churning through new programs and changes to their departments. And we're static. They're eating our lunch to be quite frank, because we simply aren't thinking: What are the programs we want in five years, or ten years, and then how do we make certain we have the resources for those programs? They do some wonderful things like reorganize a department and change its name, which then makes it very attractive to students. There's probably not that much change in what's happening there necessarily, and we simply haven't been doing that kind of work. So that's part of the work that we will begin to have a conversation with,

with faculty leadership on Wednesday. We need to have a list of what programs we need to develop over the next 10 years or changes that we want. What is the academic structure that we should have in Academic Affairs that make sense, so that students would be attracted to us and then be successful when they come. So as that conversation unfolds, we will send information out to the institution and obviously, this body will be instrumental in consultations and feedback as will the whole University community. We will talk about a process for that; we'll talk about parameters. I will tell you that generally when you have conversations like this on a college campus, you want to make certain that you're not only educating the college campus, but also educating up and out. So, we'll use this as an opportunity to educate the Regents as well. And that's really one of the reasons you go through a process like this.

Wohlpart: Please remember that at the end of the day, the Regents actually own control, maintain control of the names of our academic departments or colleges or programs. Any time we want to change the name of a department, the Board of Regents have to approve it. So they have pretty tight control of this. As I'm thinking about this national narrative about higher education, and about the liberal arts in particular, I ask myself: What have we done to educate the Regents, the legislators, so that they understand why these things are important? And this will be an opportunity to do that, so I want to make certain that we involve the Regents in appropriate ways in this process, so that in fact at the end of this pathway, we are stronger and that they are championing who we are. If you have questions about that, thoughts, want to be involved, please let me know and I will certainly keep you posted. But you all have a heavy agenda so I'll stop there.

Petersen: Thank you, Provost **Wohlpert**. Faculty Chair **Cutter**?

Cutter: Thank you. So my comments are going to be on the Faculty Handbook because that's obviously a big agenda item for today, and as I'm sure you all know at this point, I'm one of the members of the Handbook Committee, and I echo Provost **Wohlpert**'s comments about that committee. I don't know about me, but the rest of them were a really great group to work with. You'll have to see what they say about me. [Laughter] A very thoughtful and dedicated group of people who were willing to listen to each other and work collaboratively, which is really lucky because this was a really hard task. And I also want to thank the Faculty Evaluation Committee, of which I was not a part, for also being collaborative with the Faculty Handbook Committee as well, and I know they did a lot more work than we did—which is kind of hard to imagine.

Cutter: Finally, I want to talk a little bit about the document that you have before you today, and specifically the evaluation chapter, Chapter 3, because that's the really big changes. The first thing I want to say is that I voted to approve Chapter 3, and I think there are some real positive things about it. I also do still have some concerns about some of the things in it, and that's why I want to explain why I voted for it, because I know that in the past, faculty members have talked to me, and they've had some concerns about some of the things that were in Chapter 3. So, I want to focus specifically on the issue of tenure and protecting tenure, because for me that was—that wasn't the only issue obviously, but that was a key issue—to make sure that this new evaluation system doesn't undermine tenure. I voted for it because I think in the end, I think in the end, this particular document does protect tenure, and so I just want to explain why I think that a little bit, since that was such a big concern. And so, I just wanted to go into a little bit of

background about how tenure protections work for people who have not been thinking about this nonstop, like those of us on the Handbook Committee. Right? Because under the current Faculty Handbook and this is also best practices, according to the American Association of University Professors, tenured faculty are protected from being fired unless there is “just cause” to fire them, which refers to issues like incompetence, malfeasance, or failure to perform their duties. Or, the university’s facing a financial exigency—a crisis, program closures—things like that. Right? And the point behind this is that tenure is a rigorous, long process. You spend six years proving that you’re a good teacher and a good scholar. And because of that, you don’t earn the right to a job for life, but you do earn the right to use your own best judgement in teaching and research, as long as you can continue to fulfil your duties in a competent manner.

Cutter: And so, in order to not undermine tenure, we need to make sure that a post-tenure review system doesn’t change the standard of dismissal from “just cause” to something else. For example, something like “Needs Improvement.” This can be sort of a tricky issue, because I understand the reason to want “Needs Improvement” as a standard in a document to deal with issues of merit pay, and to have a formative process for faculty development. Right? Just because you’re competent, doesn’t mean you couldn’t get better. So, I’m not saying that that’s a problem. What I’m saying is it’s important to make sure that “Needs Improvement” and incompetence aren’t blurred together into one category. Because sometimes, something that’s in our “Needs Improvement” category might be an issue of competence. For example, something like “Found to have engaged in research misconduct,” clearly a serious problem. However, “Does not demonstrate any leadership regarding curriculum, teaching, or learning,” maybe

you want that to happen, but it's certainly not an issue of incompetence. So it just needs to be clear that there are two processes here: One is a formative, faculty development for tenured faculty, and the other is sanctions for incompetence. And so this is how the Handbook currently addresses this, I think anyway. In Chapter 3, there's a section 3.16 on Page 53 that talks about the purpose of post-tenure review, and it says that post-tenure review is not a re-evaluation of the tenure decision, and that academic freedom is paramount, and that the University is guided by the minimum standards for good practice established by the AAUP. So, there's protections in there. There's also existing protections in Chapter 2 that didn't get changed this year which specifically refer to that "just cause" language that you have to have "just cause" to terminate a tenured faculty member, and it also details a process where a tenured faculty member would have to go through a hearing of their peers for this to happen. So, all of this is to say if somebody gets a number of negative post-tenure reviews, they can get an Improvement Plan, and if they aren't seen as improving, it's possible that someone might want to have a hearing to investigate whether or not there is "just cause" to have a sanction. But, the getting the "Needs Improvement" itself would not lead to some kind of major sanction. You'd still have to go through the same tenure protections that we've always had, and that gets me to the final point, which is paragraph 3.16F4 on Page 57. So, Page 57, let's call it: Sanctions. Now, in the version you got, it had some language, and we were changing things at the last minute, and at the last minute what ended up happened is that language is now struck, and the Faculty Handbook Committee is going to work on language that administration and faculty both feel comfortable with; that suits these protections and also insures faculty competence; that that's going to be

worked out next year, but in the meantime, we have all this other stuff in the Faculty Handbook that protects tenure. So, I just wanted to give you that little overview on this one topic. There's tons of other topics on this, and I'll stop talking now so we actually have time to discuss them. Thank you.

Petersen: Thank you. United Faculty President **Hawbaker**?

Hawbaker: I'll try to be very quick. Like Barb (**Cutter**) and everybody else—thank you to all of you for your hard work on all of these matters. When I went into the meeting on Friday, I wasn't sure how I would vote. And it really came down to the last two or three issues got resolved, but I'm really proud that faculty and administrators together were able to come to consensus and to say, "Okay, if we can't reach an agreement we can support, then we're going to keep working on it for next year." And so I voted for this as well, and it is a process that I hope will lead to beautiful things together in the future. [Laughter]

Hawbaker: Second, President **Nook** mentioned the disturbance at the Board of Regents meeting, and I just wanted to note that another part of that disturbance was faculty—there were faculty at the University of Iowa who have been trying to advocate for a sick leave bank for a faculty member who has a catastrophic illness, and who hadn't been there long enough to accrue sick leave. People wanted to donate their sick leave for this person, and there's nothing in place for them to do that. The person had to go on unpaid leave until they can get to long-term disability. And the faculty who were protesting said, "Thank you UNI. Thank you UNI for taking care of your faculty," and talked about our policy and our sick leave that has been there in our contract for many years, and even when we went

from the contract to the Handbook, there was no push to get rid of that, even though we can't bargain on it anymore. It was recognized by everyone that this was a good thing for all of us. It's a family friendly—and just a good thing, right? So I want to echo what they said, "Thank you UNI."

Hawbaker: And then finally, for those of you who were not able to come to the Faculty Dinner, I don't know if you noticed this lovely award here, but you were all recognized with an award. So I wanted to run through really quickly the awards: Phil **Fass** was given the UF Faculty Member of the Year Award for his work with logo and branding with our recertification campaign. Craig **Van Sandt** was UF Member of the Year for his salary analysis leading to bargaining. Angela **Waseskuk** was our Emerging Leader of the Year. She serves on the Faculty Handbook Committee and represents Contingent Faculty. Catherine **Miller** from Math was our UF Department Liaison of the Year. John **Vallentine** and Brenda **Bass** were our Faculty Administrators of the Year. Ras **Smith** was our State Legislator of the Year. Christopher **Schwartz**, who was our keynote speaker was our Community Advocate of the Year. Hawkeye Area Labor Council was our Friend of United Faculty, UNI Faculty Senate, in recognition of our unified faculty leadership between Faculty Senate, Faculty Chair, and United Faculty. Barbara **Cutter** also got a Friend of United Faculty Award, and then finally the student organization, Northern Iowa Democrats. So, thank you to everyone who could be there and many of you in the room were recognized, and so thank you very much.

Petersen: thank you, Becky (**Hawbaker**). I realize that we have much to discuss here yet today, but I do want to echo all of these comments. I have had—I am so grateful to have this opportunity to serve as your Chair this year. I have

interestingly, very much enjoyed this work, [Laughter] particularly the process that the Provost is describing and Becky (**Hawbaker**) has noted. It has been incredibly collaborative and we have been energized around very important issues and it has been an opportunity to explore those issues through multiple lenses and perspectives, and so I thank you all for being a part of our University Senate and sharing in the work of shared governance. With that, I do also want to give Kristin (**Ahart**) an opportunity to update us on student issues and perhaps make an introduction as well.

Ahart: Yes. I wanted to start by introducing my replacement. This is really sad because I don't want to leave you all, but you'll be in good hands. Jacob (**Levang**), would you care to introduce yourself?

Levang: Hi everyone. My name is Jacob **Levang**. I'm a Junior Business major from Des Moines. I will be serving as the NISG President this upcoming year and I'll be stepping in for Kristin (**Ahart**). I'm excited for the chance to work with all of you. She says this is one of her favorite meetings, so I'm hoping to feel the same way. [Laughter]

Ahart: You have a high standard to hold. Yes, so I'm looking forward to making the transition and you all will be in good hands, as I said. He has to step out quickly. One thing that I did want to bring up that's at the height of our student attention over the past couple of weeks has been in regards to the Panther Shuttle and Panther Safe Ride that I know you may have heard a lot of student concern about, and a lot of students have been taking it upon themselves to

speak up on that concern, and so I wanted to inform you all as to where to direct students who want to continue to give feedback with that. But first, I want to start with sort of an educational piece that you can transfer to your students quickly. So this is in regards to the Student Services and Activity Fee Committee's recommendation to President **Nook**, which removes funding for Panther Shuttle as well as Panther Safe Ride, which were two of our student services. This was made under careful consideration by the Committee after reviewing a decreasing ridership since its implementation, which is over 75% ridership decrease. While we're paying an increase per student rate for the same service, as well as limited accessibility to our student body as a whole. Remembering that these are services that each student pays for and they're mandatory fees, as well as looking at our University's mission to maintain fees flat for this upcoming year. So those are just three quick snippets of what led to this recommendation, but we do as NISG want to urge students who are wanting to learn more (I had the privilege of serving as Co-Chair—I should have said that) for this fee committee with Vice President Paula **Knudson**, and so we will be presenting on this recommendation to the Student Senate as they will then be giving their feedback to President **Nook** in the next week. So if you have any students who are eager to learn more, or to ask questions of our committee, we are willing to accept those with open ears. We're moving forward with a very transparent process through this, and we're excited to engage students in that conversation. So that will take place at 8 p.m. in the University Room where our NISG meeting is. If you have any students that have concerns, feel free to direct them there. We'd love for our greater student body to be there, and not just our Senate.

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Petersen: Thank you Kristin (**Ahart**). The minutes for April 8th have been distributed. Is there a motion to approve these minutes? Thank you, Senator **Mattingly**. Thank you, Senator **O’Kane**. All in favor of approving the minutes from April 8th, please indicate by saying, ‘aye.’ And any abstentions? Any nays—any opposed? The motion passes. The minutes pass.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKET ITEMS

Petersen: We do not have any items for docketing today, but we do have a number of items on the docket, and I am going to suggest that we re-order the docket just slightly in the interest of guests being here. And so I am requesting a motion to move the two emeritus requests to the head of the docket, followed by the General Education Revision Consultation and then last, the Faculty Handbook Consultation. Thank you, Senator **Zeitz**, and a second by Senator **Burnight**. All in favor of reordering the docket, please indicate by saying ‘aye.’ Any opposed? Any abstentions? Thank you. The motion passes. The first emeritus request then for consideration is the Emeritus Request of Dr. Christopher **Edginton**, and I do have a letter from one of his colleagues in the Department of Health, Recreation, and Community Services, Rodney **Dieser**. Before I read the letter, is there anyone who wishes to speak on behalf of Dr. **Edginton**? Chair **Petersen** reads:

“Dr. Christopher R. **Edginton** is a Professor of Leisure Youth and Human Services in the Department of Health, Recreation, and Community Services at the University of Northern Iowa. In recent years, Dr. **Edginton** served as the R. J. McElroy Professor of Youth Leadership Studies. Established in 1989 by the R. J. McElroy Trust, this endowed professorship seeks to enhance the youth leadership studies program at the University of Northern Iowa as well as improve the quality of youth leadership programs throughout the United States.

“Dr. **Edginton** served as the Director of the School of Health, Physical Education and Leisure Services from 1991-2010. From 2004-2014 he served as the Secretary-General of the World Leisure Organization. Dr. **Edginton** is the founder of Camp Adventure Child and Youth Services, an award-winning services learning program operating in over 20 countries and serving 500,000 children and youth on an average basis. He is a member of the Academy of Leisure Sciences, American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration, the American Leisure Academy, North American Society of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Sport and Dance and The World Leisure Academy.

“Awards received by Dr. **Edginton** include: Distinguished Service Award & Order of the Eagle Exemplar, United States Sports Academy; Distinguished Service Award, World Leisure Organization; Legend in Parks and Recreation, American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration; Regents Award for Faculty Excellence, State of Iowa Board of Regents; Charles K. Brightbill Alumnus Award, University of Illinois; R. Tait McKinzie Award, American Alliance of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; Distinguished Scholar Award, International Council for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Sport and Dance; Honor Award, American Alliance of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; National Literary Award, National Recreation and Park Association; J.B. Nash Scholar Award, American Association for Leisure and Recreation; Honor Award, American Association for Leisure and Recreation; Distinguished Fellow Award, Society of Park and Recreation Educators.

“In regard to scholarship and research, (this is incredibly impressive) Dr. **Edginton** has authored over 350 articles and 31 text books. Many of his textbooks are adopted at the leading universities throughout the United States and in other countries (including some textbooks translated into different languages). Dr. **Edginton** has received \$85 million in grants and contracts, over \$7 million in donations and provided oversight to the development of the Wellness/Recreation Center and the Human Performance Center. Dr. **Edginton** has supervised countless graduate students and provided them with numerous leadership positions at the University of Northern Iowa (e.g., Institute for Youth Leaders, Camp Adventure) and throughout the world when he was Secretary-General of the World Leisure Organization. From 2014-2018 graduate students in the Institute for Youth Leaders published 15 peer reviewed journal articles in top-notch journals in the field of leisure, youth, and human services (e.g., *Annals of Leisure Research*). As Director of the School of Health, Physical Education and Leisure Services, and throughout his career, Dr. **Edginton** had a “student-first” motto and constantly directed faculty to focus their most important energies toward undergraduate and graduate students. I have witnessed, firsthand, many of his former students share that he thought he was the most amazing professor they have ever met and how his mentorship helped create a pathway toward a wonderful career.”

Rodney. B. Dieser, Ph.D. CTRS LMHC
Professor
University of Northern Iowa
Department of Health, Recreation and Community Services
Affiliated Faculty, Clinical Mental Health

Petersen: All in favor of approving the Emeritus Request for Dr. **Edginton**, please indicate by saying, 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? Excellent. The motion passes. Is there a motion to approve the Emeritus Request for Carol **Weisenberger**? Thank you, Senator **Stafford** and thank you, Senator **Hesse**. I do have a letter here from professor and head, Dr. **Martin**.

Mattingly: Would you like me to read it?

Petersen: Am I tiring?

Vice Chair **Mattingly** reads:

"I am very pleased to support Professor Carol A. **Weisenberger**'s application for Emeritus status. Dr. **Weisenberger** joined the faculty of the Department of History, at the University of Northern Iowa, in August 1989, as the result of the search for a historian to offer courses in the newly created interdisciplinary Public Policy Program. She was a fortuitous hire for all concerned, since in her thirty years at UNI she has developed a commendable record of instructional, service, and scholarly contributions to the university and the Cedar Valley community. Throughout her years here, she has remained deeply involved in the Public Policy Program, annually offering the course History and U.S. Public Policy, as well as serving for six years as Associate Director of the program and as acting director on two later occasions. Her instructional contributions to the Department of History include providing the Liberal Arts Core courses American Civilization (now History of the United States) and Humanities III. Her courses offered in our major have included, but are not limited to, Introduction to the Study of History; U.S. History since 1877; Recent U.S. History; U.S. History from 1919-1945; U.S. History from 1929-1960; U.S. Economic History; and History of Iowa. In addition, she has contributed to the evolving delivery of distance education in a variety of ways. She initially provided several U.S. history courses, first as traditional correspondence courses and then made the transition to Guided Independent Study. She later delivered an evening class in Iowa history over the Iowa Communications Network. As a result, Professor **Weisenberger** was well prepared to help launch the distance education Social Science Masters for Teachers graduate program over the ICN and later through Adobe Connect. She has taught a course in this program to every cohort since the program's inception in 2007, and she will do so again this summer. Most recently, she made the transition to electronic course delivery in the restructured Public Policy Program, offering History and U.S. Public Policy over Adobe Connect.

“Dr. **Weisenberger**'s service contributions are too numerous to discuss in depth in this letter. Suffice it to say that she has served on numerous departmental search and standing committees, such as Graduate Studies, Curriculum, and Diversity. Typical of her service to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences are her contributions as chair of the CSBS Senate and membership on the CSBS Diversity Council. She served the university for many years as a member of the Committee on Admission and Retention. She has also contributed to UNI' s community engagement efforts, not only through her work in various dimensions of distance education but also as a teacher in the Lifelong Learning Program on several occasions and through her efforts on behalf of improving race relations through her participation in community study circles.

“We are fortunate to have had Carol **Weisenberger** as a member of our department, college, university, and the Cedar Valley community. She will be retiring from UNI on June 30, 2019. She has admirably served UNI for the last thirty years, and I trust you will honor her request for Emeritus status. If you have any questions, please contact me.”

Sincerely, Robert F. Martin.

Petersen: Is there anyone else that would like to speak on behalf of Dr. **Weisenberger**?

Cutter: I will say something quickly since she's in my department. One of the things that I think is clear in this letter, but I'd like to reiterate is that Carol (**Weisenberger**) always put the University first, and this meant putting students first. She was always available to advise students. She worked with tons of students, and also putting the department first. For example, when we unexpectedly had a department member pass away. She volunteered to from scratch—totally new field, learned to teach the History of Iowa class because we had to offer it for the History Education students. It was a class nobody else was teaching at the time. You can see that with her community service, the lifelong learning: she was always very excited about being able to offer those kinds of things to the community as well as people here.

Petersen: Thank you.

Hesse: When I was a student here in the 1990's I had her in a class because I doubled in History and Philosophy, and I'm tempted to vote 'no' for her emeritus status because she gave me the lowest grade I received as an undergraduate. But, looking back, I deserved it. [Laughter] She's good. She was a straight-shooter. What you see is what you get and she is a good faculty member.

Petersen: Thank you. All in favor of approving the Emeritus Request for Dr. **Weisenberger** please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? And any abstentions? The motion passes.

Nook: To think an A- could hold that up. [Laughter]

Petersen: This brings us to the General Education Revision Committee.

Kogl: I do have more pieces of paper for you. One is a very simple chart because we realized that the other charts are not so simple. As you know, we meet on Fridays and so whatever we share with you here on Mondays is very much hot off the presses. So what we have in the multi-colored chart that's going around—yes charts—there are three separate approaches to thinking about structures. They are drafts. They are approaches. They are not set stone and the details mostly can be mixed and matched with each other. So, my hope, and I'm sure this is your hope too, that we don't get too deeply into the weeds on these, but that we do hear your thoughts thinking about taking this out to the faculty in general in a survey later this week. So, if you'd like, I can go over them very generally, but I could also just go over the brief chart that compares them because that kind of breaks down the elements that appear in each, or in some of them. And so I'm

not sure how you'd like me to proceed. It depends on how much time you want me to take.

Petersen: I'm going to suggest maybe about 15 minutes.

Kogl: Okay. So let me identify two major approaches that these models represent. There are two of one approach and one of the other approach: a Distribution Model which we're all familiar with, because that's what we have right now. It's kind of a fairly unstructured menu of classes: take what you want to take. And so the model on top is called Distribution Model with Certificate. It's the least structured. It gives students the most choice. It doesn't consider at what point in their career do students take a particular class. It doesn't start them off freshman year doing one thing and then build over time. It sort of says, "Here's a long list of classes. As long as you take a class with all the outcomes, you're good." The other broad approach is more tiered, or we've been calling it on the committee Developmental, but a model that requires students to take different classes at different times. So, a freshman seminar for example. A senior seminar for example. And so the other two models have more of that tiered or developmental structure. So one of them is called a Tiered Model, and that's the model where it indicates on the left-hand side what year students take which classes or which requirements. And then the other one, I don't remember our most recent name for it, it's now called the Multi-Disciplinary Model. I think the way the graphic appears it's a little bit harder to see how that is also a tiered model, but it is. So those are two broad approaches that we need to consider and that's maybe the most important structural question, is "Do we want to think about students, kind of taking their classes whenever"—as long as they fulfill the outcomes, which is

more a Distribution Model, or do we want to think about, “What do they need as freshmen? What do they need as sophomores and juniors? What do they need as seniors?” and I admit that those—that we have perhaps three faculty committee members and perhaps the tiered approach folks are over-represented. Slightly. Maybe. No. They are over-represented. So, then some other things to think about as you look at this is it the Distribution Model or not, is that in fact even in our Tiered Models, there is a distributiony-kind of element. Sorry for inventing that ugly adjective. But there is an element where, okay so in the Tiered Model for example, yes—you’ll take a freshman seminar. Yes—you’ll take a couple of freshman-only classes, but then you’ll have four domains within which you’ll choose courses. So, there’s still an element of a menu. There’s still some element of choice in that model. So, there’s some element of choice in all of these.

Kogl: The other broad thing to think about as you look at these is, “To what extent do they integrate skills with content, or skills with other kinds of outcomes?” which is related to, but not identical to, “To what extent are they interdisciplinary?” So the Distribution Model as I understood it is not terribly interdisciplinary. The model that’s now called Multi-Disciplinary is very interdisciplinary. It has two courses required that would require three separate faculty members from three separate disciplines. So that one’s extremely interdisciplinary. So that’s another thing to think about. I think they all actually have some kind of an Interdisciplinary Certificate, or some sort of element where students can opt to choose to do additional coursework, three or four courses in a particular interdisciplinary area, and those would need to be driven by faculty interest, what those areas would actually be. So, if you turn to this chart, which I

made this chart because it made my thinking about this clearer, but if it doesn't work for you, I'm not going to be hurt. I like charts. I'm not good at charts. But you can kind of see the separate elements that I think are important to think about are pulled out. Does it have a first-year experience element? Does it have a distribution element? Is it tiered or developmental? Does it have an integration element? Does it have a certificate? Does it have an upper-level requirement, something like a Capstone? Does it have an interdisciplinary element?

Everybody's mind grasps this kind of information differently. We wanted to present it in different ways to make it clearer. We realize it's a lot of detail. Again, we assume that you don't want to get into the detail right now, but start to think about these broad approaches, and then we wanted to hear from you if you have suggestions as to how we should proceed at this point.

Bass: Our goal, at least the plan now, and this is what we want your feedback on, our plan is to try to get out by the end of this week or the beginning of next week, whatever—hopefully the end of this week, a survey to all of Academic Affairs that would show these models along with a brief paragraph description of these key aspects of each one that Ana (**Kogl**) has described, along with asking questions about the different elements. And so yes, wanting people's feedback about each of these approaches, but then in addition to that, pulling out the different elements and allowing faculty and advising staff, as well as Kristin (**Ahart**)—we're working on getting something out to students too, so that they can—everyone can give feedback on the different pieces. Because to some extent, the different elements could be mixed and matched into an entirely different look of a model,

depending on what the preferences are of campus, and what people are excited about or interested in.

Petersen: I'm just wondering how did you come--Why a survey and not potentially some campus-wide focus groups? Because this seems really complex. If I were to receive a survey, I don't know that I would understand; that I would have enough information to complete a survey well.

Bass: The goal is—John (**Fritch**) do you mind?

Fritch: Thank you. Last time we did focus groups and then the survey. This time we're thinking about reversing the order. The reason the survey now is to get us some information to use during the summer. I would say rather than looking for something to be affirmed through this, we're looking at things to be negated. Instead of these three big models, if we can get—or if people go, “No, we're not at all interested in some of this,” “We really don't want an interdisciplinary experience,” or “We don't want the certificates,”—then we can drop those off the Development plate before we come back. And that gives us, the committee sometime over the summer to go, “Where are we at?” One of the things we talked about was keeping the survey open for quite a while because this is a busy time, and really taking information as it comes.

Bass: The goal would be to do focus groups—make our rounds in terms of listening at the start of the fall, with whatever the next iteration would be, and taking into account if we don't get a lot of clear feedback, then that tells us something too, and we need to take that into account starting up in the fall.

Kogl: Amy (**Petersen**) I don't want to misconstrue what you're saying, are you concerned that people just won't be able to take in what we're communicating? That they'll look at it and say, "What? I don't even know how to respond." I mean, I'm just going to be honest...

Petersen: People might need more background. You would need to have a conversation with people before they would have...to be able to be informed about participating in a survey.

Kogl: The reason I asked, to be honest I had to miss a meeting and when I looked at a couple of these, I was confused, so I wanted to know if I'm the only one that found it a little bit of a...

Cutter: Yeah. I'd like to answer that question. Honestly, I'm pretty confused. About some things I feel like I have a sense of what they are, but other things like the Distribution Model with Certificate, I'm confused about what exactly this interdisciplinary certificate would entail. How courses would qualify, or what this OR thing is. Right? I can't figure out that. The Multidisciplinary Model: I can't figure out what the integration stuff would look like. I see that it's interdisciplinary, but I wouldn't feel like I could respond to a survey and say anything meaningful based on this information.

DeSoto: That's somewhat like what I was going to say, that maybe I missed something. But when talking about one model has—like it does or does not have an interdisciplinary program, what is a concrete example of what a program

would or would not have that would be an interdisciplinary program? I'm sorry if I'm supposed to know that. Sorry.

Kogl: No. So I think the purposes of the really simple chart that I made was just to give us some ways of categorizing the similarities and differences between the models, and I think they're actually quite different in the way they think about interdisciplinary. So the one that's called the Multi-Disciplinary Model actually calls for—please correct me if I'm misunderstanding this—it calls for two courses that are taught by three separate faculty members. That's what the interdisciplinary course would look like.

DeSoto: Faculty members would be from different disciplines.

Kogl: Yes. And actually, Steve (**O'Kane**) can speak more to that, because I think you were on that subcommittee?

O'Kane: That was kind of the idea that—Everybody, this is super-preliminary. But we were thinking perhaps of something like a week shared experience, where all the students come to one place and then breaking that out then into three separate groups of students, each of which would go to a different faculty member, and then coming back together at the end of that experience to present some kind of project that integrates all that.

Zeitz: I've got a couple of questions; a few questions actually. Actually I like that idea of creating kind of a pod where you've got people working together.

Question is: When we talk about going through this process, I'm just going to look at the Tiered Model, because it's the easiest one to understand, and that is that

you see an articulation of content between classes as they go through. You see that there's a pathway that they'll go, and they'll end up with the Interdisciplinary Certificate?

McGeough: Yeah. I think that the thought process underlying that, and this is where we clearly have given you all lots of information, and there's a whole lot more that we've hung onto, and so maybe some of these distinctions between them, we haven't provided you the data to make sense. The idea with that particular model was that when they get to that Interdisciplinary Certificate, so you'd have between two or three departments put together courses looking at a similar issue from different perspectives. But the idea with that, and again this isn't indicated on there, would be down in Year 1 they have to work on written communication, oral communication, critical thinking. That's part of the first year experience and that as a part, somewhere in those four interdisciplinary certificate courses, there'd have to be another round of oral communication, written communication, and critical thinking that would have to happen that somewhere within those courses, in addition to one high-impact learning experience. And so, the University-Level outcomes, right? Communication and critical thinking happen in year one, at kind of a general foundational-level, and then happen in year four, five—whatever, as part of the Interdisciplinary Certificate. So there's at least the connection there. Obviously, critical thinking pops up also in the Distribution Model that happens in the middle there, because lots of courses...

Zeit: So we're actually talking about articulation? Level One is talking to Level 3?

McGeough: Yes, that was the idea.

Zeitz: Okay. Does that mean we're going to end up with General Education minors? Because that's kind of what it sounds like.

Bass: That was part of the discussion of the Committee, and that is part of what they're saying with the certificate approach, is that embedded within the General Education program, depending which paths students would take, they would not only complete their General Education requirements—and that would be shown on their transcripts, but they could also earn a certificate along the way with it.

Zeitz: Now, another thing is like in our Elementary Education in the College of Education, in many cases when we're talking about subject areas, we're depending on the general education or liberal arts classes to take care of that. So it could very well be that the certificate could be, and that's something that would work in other programs too, where there are certain courses or certain pathways that people would take to prepare for Elementary Education. And I think a really important part of that--Many times we get things going, where they're developing things and they're not—the groups aren't talking to one other, and so this would be something you really have to work hard on collaborating and coordinating with the content areas, to see how that could all fit together.

Bass: I would say each of the three models in different ways has elements of exactly that, Leigh (**Zeitz**) and it was discussed in the Committee that that was the intention, is that faculty would be speaking with each other, coordinating with each other, and certainly in the model that Steve (**O'Kane**) is talking about, they would actually be teaching together as well.

Zeitz: I think that's a really important thing and it would be nice like—I keep talking about articulation: It's nice to know what they know.

Bass: Yes.

Zeitz: Of course we also have to deal with transfer students that come in, and what is their background? But that's a whole other bailiwick.

Kogl: One of the models addresses—the one that has the most explicit freshman experience has a transfer student seminar.

Hesse: On that similar issue, whatever model you go with, you want to make sure that students are able to transfer in credits relatively easily. We don't want scenarios where someone does like 40 credits at Kirkwood, and we only accept 15 because we have a very narrow model. So I suggest you keep that in mind. The other related point deals with the certificates. Are you going to require that all four classes have to be taken at UNI? It seems kind of weird that we could meet a certificate requirement by taking classes somewhere else and transferring them in. So you might want to specify they have to be at UNI to gain the certificate.

Fritch: To complete the general education requirement somehow.

Hesse: Yes, but just for this certificate, it has to be at UNI.

Kogl: Yes, we hadn't thought about that, but yeah. It's a good point.

Petersen: So in terms of your timeline, you're looking at putting out a survey here before the end of the semester to gather information to continue the work this

summer, that delving more deeply into these approaches and models in the fall with faculty. Is that correct? I don't want faculty to miss an opportunity, but I'm concerned that they may not know enough at this moment to respond well.

Fritch: I would say we're listening to what you're saying. I'm starting to already run through my head ways to change the survey a bit.

Petersen: I was even just thinking about this table. It seems you're interested in what are the characteristics of an approach that might...

Fritch: Would you like to see a certificate possibility? That's what the bottom half of the survey really is about.

Kog: What if the survey—and I'm just speaking for myself—What if the survey only addressed elements, and didn't even throw models out? Would that make it less confusing?

Cutter/Petersen: Yes.

Mattingly: Yes, with some narrative description, yes of what the main variables are.

Bass: That's good feedback.

Fritch: We talked about the ability to mix and match. We talked about that we don't want people to pick this—I don't like this model, and the reason is it doesn't have anything interdisciplinary within it, for instance. You could add that very easily. We're trying to tease out where people are on those kinds of questions.

McGeough: I had a quick question for you all, I suppose to think about how we move forward. One thing that we'd talked about providing along with the survey as we hadn't done it this round, but as we decided to go forward with it was basically a one-minute video where we could talk through the different components; talk through each of these models if we're going through the different elements it doesn't make as much sense. But if we went through on one hand, I think that does provide people with the information they need to maybe make more informed decisions, or more informed responses around this. On the other hand, that's going to take a little bit—we're not getting that out by Friday. Then, there's the fear of like—do you want to dump this on people during finals week? Are faculty going to feel like we're just trying to push something through, and so there's a tension to be balanced there. Any guidance you all could provide would be quite helpful I think.

Zeit: I think that video idea is a great idea, and making a video isn't that hard. Even if it's crude, you take your phone and you simply do the talk. That's what I do with my classes sometimes. But the idea is getting the verbal and medium in a way in which many people like to do that. I mean if you give me a survey and it's got 27 questions on it, I'm not even going to do it. But if you have something and there's an introduction, and maybe even have a couple of places...The nice thing is it's going to be delivered digitally anyway, and so you can always add links to go out there and put in parentheses saying, "Want more?"

DeSoto: I have used Panopto this semester and I found out that you can have a little talk about something and then right there they have to answer the question. And then you could talk again and have a question.

Fritch: That would be really interesting.

Kogl: If we like seven or eight elements, then I don't know that we need a video, and I know for myself, I don't want to watch a video. I just want to read. I can read really fast.

Petersen: I think if you focused on the characteristics, or what are the elements that most people are most interested in, that would then narrow or help guide your work this summer, and you could come back to us then with more fully developed approaches or models based on that feedback.

Cutter: I was just going to reiterate, I really like the idea of stepping away from the model and going back to the elements, because with the models, there's several different things going on at once. Right? And I don't think we're ready for that yet.

Petersen: But I am really impressed at what you have developed so far, especially since you were only here just a few weeks ago.

Hesse: With the elements approach, you might want to include a question about how many credit hours you think is appropriate, just to get some faculty feedback.

O'Kane: Just so you know, all three of these proposals are at 37 hours.

Kogl: I think whether they have a science with a lab, might move it to 37. Some of us like labs.

Hesse: You might want to have ranges: 36-38 or 38-40...

O’Kane: There’s no range.

Hesse: I mean in the survey of what faculty would prefer—whether a shorter Gen Ed or a longer one.

O’Kane: I see.

Zeitz: So we can tell our faculty that a survey is coming as of when, we don’t know.

Petersen: Thank you so much, and I know we’ve rushed the conclusion of this discussion a bit, so if you have additional feedback, please reach out to the Committee before Friday.

O’Kane: Actually, before Thursday.

Petersen: Before Thursday.

Mattingly: Before Friday. Okay.

Petersen: Thank you.

Kogl: Thank you.

Petersen: That brings us to the Faculty Handbook. We’ll try to spend about 20 minutes or so here so that we can leave time for our election of our next Vice-

Chair and recognition of our outgoing Senators. We'll just try to be mindful of our time and the conversation. John (**Vallentine**)?

Vallentine: Thanks for setting that up Amy (**Petersen**). I did want to start by showing you the Committee members, just as a reminder for those that did not know who participated on this, and I do have to say a few words about the Faculty Evaluation Committee on the left. Carissa **Froyum** did an incredible amount of writing for this Chapter. Just an incredible amount, so huge accolades to her for work. Chris **Martin**, he's in the back, back there—Chris had the former department head/faculty look at things as we moved through the document and he really spent a lot of time on the calendar so that everything flows really, really well when we get this all started. Amy **Petersen** up in the front—this will come as no surprise to all of you, but she was the middle of the road person who would if there was conflict, Amy would say, “Well have you thought about...” and then as the years went on, she would really assert her opinion at times and really represent the Senate really, really well. Brenda **Bass** represented the deans really well. You know the deans have a different perspective sometimes that we don't have because we haven't been in those roles, and Brenda did a fantastic job. Paul **Shand** from Physics. Paul was the person that would sit back and just listen and listen, and if things weren't going well, all of a sudden Paul would come in with a great compromise and get things worked out. I just kept calling myself the middle man—I was getting information from anywhere and everywhere and trying to put things together. The people on the FHC, (Faculty Handbook Committee) some of whom are in this room, represented themselves very, very well and their departments, and their colleges at times. They had to bring the viewpoints of

colleagues that they were hearing from. So, as you look down that list, just a great group of people to really put it all together. They were meeting once a month and then sending things back to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, saying “Redo this. We don’t like this,” and the committee would be, “Oh, great. Here we go again.” But again, great leaders in those two groups.

Vallentine: So today’s consultation and process: If a majority of the entire FHC [Faculty Handbook Committee] votes to adopt a proposed change to the Handbook, the FHC will consult with the Faculty Senate (That’s why we are here today), and the faculty leadership, all three of those colleagues are here. Before presenting to the Provost any recommended changes to the Handbook. So, today we’re consulting with you on proposed changes that received a majority vote of the FHC. So all of these items that I’m going to be showing you today were approved on Friday. The Provost shall either approve or reject the recommendations of the FHC. If the Provost rejects the recommendations, the Provost will provide the FHC written reasons for the rejection. And then the changes will become effective on July 1. So, the collaboration and the feedback over the two years—I never put one of these diagrams together—it was pretty fun. I told Krista (**Herrera**) in our office if I could have just had them moving in and out and jumping and hitting one another—but you can see: You participated in part of this when we were at the Senate and previous times. We had all the faculty’s input at the open forums, surveys, the Senate, emails, and a lot of conversations around campus. You can see United Faculty was involved. The Associate Council and the President’s Office, the department heads, the two committees we’ve been talking about, Dean’s Council—constantly giving

feedback, the Provost—Jim (**Wohlpart**) was always giving feedback. So we had a big, a large group of people giving input all along the way.

Vallentine: So here are some of the accomplishments and the results: Clear University Guiding Standards were developed with revised and updated Departmental Standards and Criteria documents. You all know this because your departments developed these, or you're in the process of finalizing these right now. And of course, having PAC procedures. The Committee reviewed every single one of the former documents and read every single one of them. Some were at least decades old: They had not been changed and updated, and so that was one great thing about going through the process, although our faculty were really busy across the campus doing this work this year. One of the things you will see in the new Chapter 3 is the re-establishment of a Merit System. It's a University-wide system that is fair and equitable. So we now have a Merit Formula. It's based on the total Merit Score for each faculty member, based on their portfolio and performance as measured by the Departmental Standards and Criteria document. So, it's all going to go back to your individual Department Criteria that you developed. So, faculty will be awarded, up to a maximum of four points now for merit for each area of performance: that is, in teaching, scholarship, and service. So, if you receive a "4" in each Exceeds Expectations. If you receive 1, 2, or 3 points, that means you're Meeting Expectations. One of the culture changes most folks are going to get "Meets Expectations." The bar for "Exceeding" is extremely high. So if you think of the most incredible semester or year you had, that would be a big "Exceeds." Or, if you were doing tons of service, like University Service, Departmental Service, College Service, you might get

“Exceeds Expectations.” And zero of course is the “Needs Improvement” category. If you did not do any service and receive zero, that needs improvement. So you need to work on your service. So you would get a score. You multiply each designation by the percentage for the areas of teaching. Right now the standard portfolio is 60% teaching, 25% scholarship, and 15% service. Last of all, the total amount allocated for Merit Pay is divided by the total number of points for all the faculty, ranging from zero to four for each faculty member within each college. So then, there will be a money formula and you will get appropriate rewards at the end of the year. So we really wanted to make sure that faculty were rewarded with their accomplishments.

O’Kane: Can I ask a question?

Vallentine: Can I keep going and can you hold it? We’ll definitely want great questions at the end.

O’Kane: Sure.

Vallentine: Review and Promotion of Renewable Term and Adjunct Faculty members includes career ladders and promotional increases for adjuncts 50% or more; those that are working 50% or more, and Renewable Term Faculty. So now, Renewable Term Instructors will be able to be promoted to Renewable Term Associate Instructors, and receive a promotional bonus of \$3,000. Renewable Term Senior Instructors would receive a promotion of \$3,700. Adjunct Instructors can be promoted to Adjunct Associate Instructors. They would receive \$100 more per credit hour, and if they’re promoted to Adjunct Senior Instructor, \$225 per credit hour.

Vallentine: More Accomplishments/Results: Post-tenure Review with Performance Rewards and Improvement Plans: There are two types of reviews, Summary and Comprehensive Reviews. And Barbara (**Cutter**) you sort of took care of this paragraph with your opening comments that really explains the writing that's in there, talking about the importance of our faculty and tenure and self-reflection. It's really, really important that we think about it, especially when we go into post-tenure review after six years: What have I been doing well? What have I really accomplished? Where do I need to grow? How do I need to change? Things like that. Ultimately the goal of Post-tenure Review is to engage in professional development over the length of faculty careers, not a re-evaluation of the tenure decision. Academic freedom is paramount, and that's guided by the AAUP minimum standards which we heard about earlier. Faculty will undergo Post-tenure Review every six years, or after receiving three "Needs Improvement" designations during annual reviews within the six-year period, whichever comes first. Annual Review Process is the foundation of post-tenure review. That's not any different than our history here. It's always been about Annual Reviews, so that's still a very, very important part of the Post-tenure Review process. If during three or more years of reviews, the faculty member is found in their annual evaluations to Meet Expectations, or Exceed Expectations in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, a Summary Review—that's why I capitalized it, is conducted by the department head. It's submitted to the dean, an evaluation file. The faculty member may submit a written response to that Summary Review. So the materials required from faculty members: You will write a one to two-page summary of that six-year period; a one to two-page summary. You'll have your

Annual Review letters that you've received all along during those six years. You'll do that lovely Faculty Activity Report, FARS, at the end of year that you know well, and then your curriculum vitae will always be a part of that process.

Vallentine: So this explains a little bit more. If a faculty member receives a "Needs Improvement" designation in one or more review areas—those are listed there according to your portfolio—in three annual reviews, not necessarily consecutively or in the same review area, during the post-tenure review period, a Comprehensive Review—so that's in capitals as well, shall be separately conducted by the departmental PAC and the department head. So this is where we will get your colleagues, your peers, involved if a faculty member would need to have a Comprehensive Review. This is a little more extensive. The materials required would be a two to three-page summary from the faculty member, reflecting on performance over the review period and indicating how deficiencies have been or will be addressed. Those for the review period shall also be discussed. You'll have Annual Review letters, Faculty Activity Reports, curriculum vitae, and additional materials if your department requires it in your standards and criteria. So, there's two outcomes here. One, "Meets or Exceeds Expectations," Comprehensive Review results, Post-tenure Review Cycle, Restart. If you receive "Needs Improvement" Comprehensive Review result, there's a Performance Improvement Plan. So by October 15th of the following semester, the faculty member would submit a follow-up report of the results of the Performance Improvement Plan, update progress in the FAR, and the department head would use that information for the next two subsequent reviews to assess the Performance Improvement Plan, and a follow-up progress report for progress.

Vallentine: This is the good part: Monetary Awards. One-time cash bonuses for full professors receiving Outstanding Performance Reviews during post-tenure review. You will notice these all receive Summary Reviews. And then you can see the various ratings on the first one: “Exceeds” in teaching or librarianship for the librarians, and “Meets Expectations” in the two other areas. You would receive a bonus of \$250. This is in addition to your normal Merit Pay that you receive annually. The second one, “Summary Review” is a \$500 award: That’s where you “Exceed Expectations” in teaching or librarianship, plus “Exceeds Expectations” in one other evaluation area, and “Meets Expectations” in another, so you would receive \$500. The third one, the bar is high on that one. You would receive “Exceeds Expectations” in all three areas, and you would receive \$1,000. That’s a one-time cash bonus. The other accomplishments/results that you’ll find in this Chapter, Non-standard Teaching and Overload Pay. There’s better consistency across colleges and departments. What we found is some departments, they were receiving a whole lot of non-standard perks, and other departments were not at all. So we tried to really standardize that across the campus, and you can see what those activities are. I’m not going to read all those, but it’s your life. You’ve done all of those. We’ve also included a Syllabus Template to meet Higher Learning Commission Standards for reaccreditation. That’s in the Appendix C. Most of those items you already place in your syllabus, but there are some new things relating to student learning outcomes or course learning outcomes. And then we have instruction modes, which is all the types of on-line, blended-type courses defined, and the definition of a credit hour—that’s really by federal law that that’s there in Appendix D. We’re going to have questions and discussion

here in a second. I do want to mention that there is grandfathering language in Appendix E. I've already been getting a lot of emails about this. You can imagine if you're a probationary faculty member right now, you'd be really concerned: What is changed? What do I have to change? When do I have to change? That is all in Appendix B. And Probationary Reviews, they have ability to use the old system and the new system. And then Post-tenure Reviews, and Promotions for Adjuncts and Renewable Term Faculty would begin in 2022. So, my colleagues are around here and around here, and we'll open it up to any questions you have.

O'Kane: I'm trying to think back to what it was. The Merit formula, 60% teaching, 25% research, 15%...

Vallentine: If that's your portfolio. If you're on the standard portfolio.

O'Kane: That's a standard portfolio. What if a person like Amy (**Petersen**) perhaps—there's no way she did only 15% this year, and what that means is it might take away from research. I don't know if I've made that clear. If one really goes out of their way to provide service, something's got to give.

Vallentine: So, there is a process in place that you can request a differentiated portfolio for any given year, and this would have been a perfect example for Amy (**Petersen**). Not to use you as an example. That that would be the case.

Petersen: The position.

Wohlpart: And remember Steve (**O'Kane**) that position gets a course release, so that's how you would change the formula. Right?

O’Kane: Oh. Yes. Right.

Froyum: So Steve (**O’Kane**), your service proportion then would account for being one course short. So, for example if you had a course release to do service, your teaching would be 40%. Your service would be 35%, and your scholarship would be 25%.

O’Kane: We’re talking about Amy’s (**Petersen**) position. Somebody on the Handbook Committee, General Ed Committee, and Faculty Senate?

Froyum: We specifically wrote it so it would adjust to your specific portfolio.

O’Kane: On a yearly basis, right?

Froyum: Yup.

O’Kane: Okay.

Petersen: And as defined within your department’s standards and criteria, which might vary potentially.

Zeit: These are set organizations. In other words, it’s set ratios. You can either take A, B, C, or D. It isn’t something you’re going to negotiate? You said it was what, 60% service or like that. So it wouldn’t be something like I could come up and say, “I think I need 65% instead of 60%.”

Froyum: No, it’s based on your portfolio, so if you’re doing extra service, you could request a—you know there’s a process to get a course reassignment that

would go through the approval process, and then that portfolio would be actually documented for you, so your Merit would be adjusted based on that portfolio.

Zeitz: I see.

Petersen: That's from Chapter 4, which was approved last year.

DeSoto: I was wondering, and I'm just not clear about this—how much of this is within the department level, and how much of it goes up from the department level? Like, the Comprehensive Review, like if people have several zeroes, and then the department meets and they say it's okay. It stops there right within the department? Is that the way it works?

Vallentine: No. The department PAC from the Comprehensive one and the department head are involved in those reviews.

DeSoto: That's what I'm asking. It doesn't go anywhere else? It goes to just the department?

Vallentine: And the dean. The dean is also informed.

DeSoto: If the department head and the PAC say okay, it still goes to the dean?

Vallentine: The recommendation does, sure.

DeSoto: And then, let's say you wanted to appeal your bonus. You say, "I should be outstanding in all of these things," who decides the bonus?

Vallentine: You'd have to talk to your department head.

DeSoto: It's the department head.

Vallentine: Yeah. And your formula. It's your Annual Review letter that's going to determine that.

DeSoto: And then the request for a different portfolio, is that also at the department level that that's decided if that's approved or not?

Vallentine: And the dean level.

DeSoto: And the dean level. It would automatically go to the dean to decide or does it default to department? I'm just not clear. I'm just asking for information.

Vallentine: I imagine the dean would make that final decision.

Mattingly: Is it still true—I think it's still true—that the beginning point for that would be an actual discussion that you have with your department head at the beginning of the year. Or, I don't remember when that's scheduled now, and if you need a non-standard work load—if I needed an extra 10% service to account for something I'm doing, then that would be negotiated with the department head and approved by the dean?

DeSoto: Mostly within the department, it sounds like.

Petersen: It starts in the department. There are also I guess you could call them touchpoints, where you're meeting with your department head around your goals, so that would serve as a catalyst for having such a discussion I would assume. Let me go, Senator **Zeitz**, Senator **Skaar**, and Chair **Cutter**.

Zeitz: You were talking about how you have a special model for service. If you had one class which was a class that you don't have to teach. In Curriculum & Instruction, each coordinator has one course release, and so they have five classes that they teach over two semesters, and then they have service and things like that. Does that mean that automatically because they're a coordinator that they will have this different structure as far as how their stuff will be calculated?

Vallentine: That's correct.

Zeitz: Thank you.

Skaar: I'm just going to—I brought this up last time, and I want to bring that to our conversation again, especially now that I know more about the Merit calculation. So, my point for those of you who weren't here last time is I'm concerned about a rubric and a formula that hasn't been tested, and then we're going to make Merit decisions on that without it really being tested. So, we're measuring something and we don't know if it's a reliable measure; a valid measure, so my assessment-self gets a little anxious about making high-stakes decisions, and I think many of us feel like a Merit Pay-sort-of decision and an evaluation sort-of decision is a high-stakes decision for faculty. So when I thought that the 1,2,3,4-designation on our rubrics were more subjective and qualitative sort of like, and that number wasn't being used as a number. But as soon as we use it as number, and now it's being used in a calculation, that changes it. It's not suddenly a nominal thing anymore. Now we're using it as an integral number, but it's a subjective number. It's a rating, so it's really—we're changing its designation essentially by putting it into this Merit formula, saying that a "4" is a 4 to a 3 is the same as a 3 to a 2, and a 2 to a 1, and a 1 to a zero. We're saying it's interval-level

measurement, for those of you who know statistics, and it's not. It's a little more subjective than that. It's really nominal or ordinal, if we want to get into the nitty-gritty of measurement. And so as we move forward with this, and I know this an iterative process, and I appreciate the process, and all the work you guys have done with this. It's really quite amazing, but this still does concern me that we're not taking into consideration the measurement side of this. That we're going to be using this stuff for decision-making when we don't know if there's reliability and validity in these numbers. And so as we move forward, I just want us to have that conversation, and to be thoughtful about when we move into this next year, what do those numbers mean? Do they mean what we think they mean, especially as we're using them at the interval level instead of the more nominal and ordinal level? Sorry to be lingo-ey. Hopefully, that makes sense to most people.

Hawbaker: I just want to agree with everything that Senator **Skaar** just said, and I think that we're kind of taking a leap of faith here, because what I tell myself is "It's flawed." It could be flawed. I'm sure it is, but that it is much better from the non-system that we had before, that had no clear criteria, or very little. But I think that we need to collect good data on how these ratings are assigned, and I'm a little concerned because we have asked for—we have submitted an information request in advance to see at the college level in Post-tenure review, how many 1's are given? How many 2's are given? 3's are given? 4's are given? Zeroes are given—so that we can make those kinds of comparisons across the University. And to see, 'Does this system work how we thought it was going to?' Like when we said 95-98% of our faculty are doing a great job, it's only those 2% that really

Need Improvement. You know if we find that wow—somehow 50% of our faculty Need Improvement, that's not how we thought this system was supposed to work. If we're getting that kind of an outcome in one department or one college, that's important information that we need as an institution. And we were told that that kind of summary report is not going to be gathered, and so we cannot ask for it. So, I want to make very clear that that is a really critical part of how we measure this system, and that we have to use good data to make decisions about how to improve the system because we know it will need improvement, and that the only thing that is better than a flawed system is no system.

Petersen: Senator **DeSoto**, and then we'll try to wrap up this conversation.

DeSoto: I appreciate all of the comments that I'm hearing. What would be the ramification of say one department within the same college that gave all their faculty 4's, and another department that gave almost all the faculty 2's, as far as the Merit pool distribution?

Petersen: I've think what will likely happen is I've been thinking about it in terms of fluoride. I think we've had a challenge on campus in terms of a Merit System that has been incredibly flawed, and that problem has existed. Developing this Handbook, and attempting to articulate a Merit System that would be more equitable is like fluoride that reveals cavities, right? The cavities are there, but the fluoride brings out those cavities and really illuminates what has always been a challenge. And I think as we move forward, those kinds of analysis among a department head and a dean and the faculty and United Faculty must happen in

order to right the system that has been flawed. I think it will require hard conversations across departments, across colleges, across campus.

Skaar: And I totally agree with that Amy (**Petersen**) I worry that if there aren't processes for continuing to study this, that we put all of our eggs in this basket and then we say, "We fixed it. It's done," and then—and maybe this works. I don't know. But we won't know unless we study that, unless we know. I worry that we will get complacent if there isn't a process for analyzing this data further; that we will just start to assume that a "4" means a "4," and we don't really know what a "4" means.

Petersen: I can't imagine the conversation would not continue. Because imagine how people will receive their letters. Right? As faculty, we will push the conversation. We will demand a process, right?

Skaar: I hope so.

Petersen: I'm guessing. There's a cultural shift happening I think that will require that the process continues.

Nook: There has already been a cultural shift happen, right? We're having this discussion in a shared governance environment, and a few years ago that wouldn't have been on anybody's radar to even think that we could do that, right? So this is a pretty big step in and by itself in that we can ask these questions openly and publicly with the mikes running, is a big shift. The one thing that I see coming out of this that we haven't talked about, that hasn't been on the table, is training for chairs and PACS. Right? To an understanding of what 1,2,3, and 4

means, that we haven't had to do before, right? But now there's a real opportunity to bring the chairs together at the beginning of each year and as new chairs come in and say, "Look, you've got a big thing to do here, and here's what you need to do." And as part of that, "Here's how you avoid the grievances around this." Let's be honest. That's a big part of training them. But "These are the steps you're going to have to take, and these are the criterion you're going to have to have set up in your department." It is a heavy lift. It is a very heavy lift, and it's going to be difficult and its going to be messy for a while, right? It's just going to take some time, and it will take some real hard conversations from time to time, too.

Petersen: Thank you. If you have additional feedback, I realize these materials came to you late over the weekend. The Faculty Handbook Committee is meeting again on Friday morning and afternoon, so please send any additional feedback you might have yet this week.

Zeitz: Are these slides this available anywhere?

Petersen: They are loaded on the website. I'm going to ask if we could have a motion to extend our meeting by 15 minutes. We have a bit of New Business, being the election of Vice-Chair, and then a presentation of certificates for our outgoing Senators.

Wohlpart: Are you doing all that in Executive Session?

Petersen: Yes. I'm going to ask for that to the motion right away, too. Is there a motion to extend by 15 minutes? Thank you, Senator **Burnight**. Is there a second?

Thank you, Senator **Stafford**. All in favor of extending our meeting by 15 minutes, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Thank you, Senator **Strauss**. But, you are getting a certificate.

Mattingly: So don't leave yet.

Petersen: Any abstentions? Then the motion passes. Now, to go ahead and elect our Vice-Chair, I'm going to ask for a motion to move us into Executive Session.

Mattingly: So moved.

Petersen: Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Gould**. All in favor of moving into Executive Session, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions. We will wait for our guests to leave.

Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Sundstedt
Transcriptionist & Administrative Assistant
Faculty Senate
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

Follows is One (1) Addendum:

Email Received from Associate Provost for Faculty John Vallentine on 4/24/2019:

In my presentation to the Faculty Senate yesterday, I inadvertently neglected to mention that Carissa Froyum served as the co-chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC). While I praised each employee in the FEC, including Dr. Froyum for her contributions, I neglected to mention Dr. Froyum's leadership role. The FEC made recommendations to the Faculty Handbook Committee, which is the faculty and administrative committee I was presenting for yesterday. If this addition can be officially entered into the record, I would appreciate it

John F. Vallentine, Ph.D.
Associate Provost for Faculty