

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, September 24, 2013
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

- Senators Present: F. Abboud, J. Adrain, S. Ali, D. Anderson, I. Barbuzza, H. Bartlett, C. Benson, J. Brown, T. Burstain, D. Caplan, K. Chandran, J. Colgan, S. Daack-Hirsch, D. Dawson, F. Durham, E. Epping, E. Ernst, R. Ettinger, N. Fethke, C. Fox, K. Gerken, C. Getz, E. Gillan, K. Glenn, T. Havens, K. Kieran, J. Kolker, N. Langguth, G. Lee, K. Markon, J. McNamara, A. Merino, P. Muhly, D. Murry, J. Murry, F. Nothwehr, J. Paulsen, J. Pendergast, E. Prussing, R. Rocha, A. Rodriguez-Rodriguez, Y. Sato, W. Schmidt, S. Seibert, J. Solow, L. Storrs, B. Thompson, T. Treat, M. Voigt, E. Wasserman, S. White, D. Wilder, R. Williams, T. Yahr.
- Officers Present: D. Cunning, E. Dove, E. Lawrence, A. Thomas.
- Senators Excused: N. Grosland, Z. Jin, A. Lee, K. Light-McGroary, L. Ponto, S. Richardson, S. Schultz, M. Young, E. Ziegler.
- Senators Absent: T. Anthony, L. Ayres, S. Baker, D. Black, C. Bohannon, P. Brophy, J. Buatti, S. Gardner, F. Gerr, B. Hoskins, A. Kwitek, G. Lal, G. Penny, D. Segaloff.
- Guests: S. Campo (Council on Teaching), B. Gillig (ECGPS), T. Hein (Payroll Tax), D. Lee (International Programs), S. Johnson (Office of the Ombudsperson), C. Joyce (Office of the Ombudsperson), T. Peifer (Office of the Controller), T. Rice (Office of the Provost), D. Seidl (*Daily Iowan*), K. Valde (UISG), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

- I. Call to Order – President Lawrence called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultySenate.09.24.13.pdf>.
- II. Approvals
- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Muhly seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
 - B. Faculty Senate Minutes (April 30, 2013) – Professor Abboud moved and Professor Solow seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
 - C. Committee Appointments (Alexandra Thomas, Chair, Committee on Committees)
 - Nathan Fethke (Occupational & Environmental Health) to fill the unexpired term of Nandita Basu (Civil & Environmental Engineering), on the Faculty Senate, 2013-15

- Glenn Penny (History) to replace Jennifer Sessions (History) on the Faculty Senate, 2013-14
- David Drake (Dows Institute) to the Judicial Commission, 2013-16
- Patricia Zebrowski (Communication Sciences & Disorders) to the Judicial Commission, 2013-16
- Timothy Havens (Communication Studies) to the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee, 2013-16
- Steven Hitlin (Sociology) to the University Safety and Security Charter Committee, 2013-15
- Christine McCarthy (Educational Policy & Leadership Studies) to the Human Rights Charter Committee, 2013-16
- Tong Li (Mathematics) to the Financial Aid Advisory Charter Committee, 2013-16

Professor Treat moved and Professor Solow seconded that the appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- D. Membership of the Committee to Review the Office of the Provost (Erika Lawrence) – President Lawrence explained that the Operations Manual requires that the offices of central academic officials be reviewed periodically. A self-study has been posted, http://provost.uiowa.edu/files/provost.uiowa.edu/files/Self_Study_2013.pdf. President Lawrence announced the names of the internal members of the review committee: Richard Fumerton (College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, co-chair), Victoria Sharp (Carver College of Medicine, co-chair), Susan Assouline (College of Education), Jonathan Carlson (College of Law), Jon Garfinkel (Tippie College of Business), and Jane Pendergast (College of Public Health). A seventh, external member of the committee remains to be determined and will be voted on at the next meeting. Professor Treat moved and Professor Muhly seconded that the internal membership of the Committee to Review the Office of the Provost be approved. The motion carried with one abstention.

III. New Business

- *Katherine Valde, UISG President and Ben Gillig, ECGPS President*

President Gillig, of the Executive Council of Graduate and Professional Students, commented that the two presidents wished to give the Senate an update on their recent activities, especially in the realm of legislative advocacy. In July, the student leadership groups met with Governor Branstad and Lt. Governor Kim Reynolds on topics of concern to students, including a tuition freeze for undergraduate students and workforce and economic development issues of particular concern to graduate and professional students. President Valde, of the University of Iowa Student Government, indicated that in August the leadership groups visited eleven Iowa cities over three days, meeting with legislators, local leaders and members of the Education Appropriations subcommittees, conveying their concerns about the tuition freeze and job creation to those groups, as well. The undergraduate students are now engaged in a thank-you campaign, writing letters of thanks to legislators for this year's tuition freeze and expressing hope that next year will see a similar freeze. Letters to the editors of local newspapers are also being written on this theme.

Noting that undergraduate students, for good reason, often get the lion's share of attention in state politics, President Gillig added that graduate and professional students can share in the

effort to bring students' concerns to legislators. For example, many students wish to remain in Iowa upon graduation, but are uncertain of their job prospects here. The state has now begun compiling information about employment opportunities, particularly in the teaching field, in a central location. Students will also implement an "adopt-a-legislator" program, communicating on a frequent basis with a hometown legislator. The College of Pharmacy building and its inadequacy for current teaching and research needs remains a priority for ECGPS. The governor and Lt. governor are expected to visit campus in the near future and will be taken on a tour of this facility, in the hope that this might spur on the efforts to renovate or replace the building.

President Lawrence praised Presidents Valde and Gillig as outstanding examples of the passion, commitment, and quality of our undergraduate and graduate students.

- *Past Presidents for 2013-14 (Erika Lawrence)*

President Lawrence reminded the group that Professor Linda Snetselaar, the 2012-13 Faculty Senate President, was supposed to serve as Past President during this academic year, but last summer accepted a half-time interim position as Associate Provost for Outreach and Engagement. It would not be appropriate for Professor Snetselaar to serve as a Faculty Senate officer while holding an administrative position, so she had resigned. Because there is no specific guidance in the Faculty Senate constitution regarding how to handle the resignation of the past president, the other Senate officers asked the two most recent past presidents, Professors Edwin Dove and Richard Fumerton, to share this position, Professor Dove in the fall and Professor Fumerton in the spring. The Faculty Council approved this solution in an email vote in July.

- *Changes to Gift Taxation Policy (Terri Hein, Director, UI Payroll Tax and Tom Peifer, University Tax Manager)*

Terri Hein, Director of UI Payroll Tax, explained that recently she and her colleagues had been asked to examine the university's reward and recognition policy because of attention this policy was receiving from the internal auditors; the Board of Regents, State of Iowa; and some legislators. A review committee was formed and soon after the members began their work, they determined that the policy needed to be more compliance-oriented and clearly defined. For example, rewards for performance will now be required to be processed through the university's human resources transaction system, along with all other compensation for services. This allows for the appropriate people (Human Resources, Office of the Provost) to approve the transaction. Departments have frequently presented gift certificates as performance awards; the policy will now prohibit this practice, because gift cards move through a separate budgetary channel and therefore do not receive the appropriate approvals. Among other updates, the policy also now defines recognition for length of service and retirement and the policy has been brought into compliance with Internal Revenue Service regulations.

Professor Pendergast commented that in her college, awards are presented annually to outstanding faculty and staff members in a range of areas (teaching, community service, etc.). These awards may provide up to \$1,000 to the employee. Occasionally, staff recipients are merit employees. Professor Pendergast asked if the policy now prohibits cash awards to such employees. Ms. Hein responded that this is a "murky" issue, because merit staff are covered by

bargaining contracts, which define salaries. However, awards in the form of gift certificates in small amounts may be permitted. Otherwise, such issues are referred to Human Resources administrators. Professor Pendergast observed that these awards, which an employee may receive only once in a lifetime, are presented to those who have gone above and beyond the requirements for their job. She stressed that those who excel should be recognized. Since a monetary award is a gift, with no strings attached, why would it be considered to have a connection to salary and the bargaining agreement? Ms. Hein responded that employees have a connection to the university by virtue of their employment status; everything they do at the university is related to that status. Professor Pendergast asked if the limit on monetary rewards was a reverse incentive to exceptional performance. Ms. Hein responded that there were other, non-monetary, ways to recognize exceptional performance.

Professor Pendergast then pointed out another aspect of the policy concerning merit staff, "Treats or a fruit basket may be presented to the employee if they are shared with the entire department." This did not seem to meet the definition of a gift, in her opinion. Professor Solow suggested that the issue of gifts could be addressed in the annual contract bargaining process. Ms. Hein indicated that she would convey these concerns to Human Resources administration. President Lawrence suggested that Ms. Hein contact her after speaking to Human Resources administrators to follow up on the concerns expressed by senators. Ms. Hein added that most of the restrictions found in the policy are bound by Internal Revenue Service regulations, which require the university to report all money given to employees. Other restrictions are bound by the university's structure and methods of paying employees. Extra compensation payments are reviewed by the Board of Regents. Other senators expressed concern about singling out individual employees for substantial awards; this would seem detrimental to a sense of community. And, there is the danger of substituting awards or bonuses for promotions or raises. Ms. Hein stressed the importance and impact of simple, informal comments of thanks to employees, recognizing that they have done a good job. A senator asked if there was information available regarding how often bonuses were given in place of raises. Ms. Hein responded that she was not aware of bonuses given in place of raises. She did indicate that about 1300 gift cards were purchased last year. In response to a question she indicated that the policy does not prohibit employees from pooling their own money to purchase a gift for a colleague, as long as this money is not then deposited into a university account in order to pay for the gift. A question then arose concerning students who are also university employees receiving small gifts for achievement in the classroom. Ms. Hein responded that in the past all such gifts were reported, but now it is primarily an issue of the impact on the student's financial aid, if any. Tom Peifer, University Tax Manager, reminded the group that the de minimus value of non-cash awards is \$100; any gift below \$100 does not need to be reported.

- *Office of the Ombudsperson Annual Report (Susan Johnson and Cynthia Joyce, University Ombudspersons)*

Professor Susan Johnson, Faculty Ombudsperson, indicated that she and Cynthia Joyce, Staff Ombudsperson, would provide an overview of the Office's activities this past year. Professor Johnson noted that the number of visitors to the Office had increased by 23% over the number from last year. This was an increase of 114 visitors. The distribution of types of visitors (faculty, staff, student) has remained the same, however. Last year, the Office saw 1% of the campus, while this year the Office saw 1.3% of the campus. There continues to be an

overrepresentation of ethnic and racial minorities and women, relative to their numbers on campus, among visitors to the Office. Ms. Joyce explained that visitors' concerns are coded by type in an effort to identify patterns of complaints. As in previous years, this year the main concern of all visitor groups was with relationships up or down the hierarchy, i.e., evaluative relationships (faculty member v. DEO, DEO v. administrator, etc.). Among faculty visitors, 55% had concerns about evaluative relationships, while 17% had concerns about peers. The remaining concerns were scattered among a variety of issues. The number of complaints regarding discrimination and harassment has remained stable over the last several years, while the number of complaints regarding disrespectful behavior, once a source of increasing concern to the Office, has also leveled off.

Professor Johnson then indicated that each year the report identifies trends that are cause for concern. One concern this year was the relatively large increase in visitors to the Office. The Office has not been able to determine a reason for this increase, especially since the increase occurred in all categories of visitors. The Ombudspersons suggested that the increase may be attributable to the greater outreach efforts of the Office; more people are visiting the Office because more people are aware of the services that the Office offers. Another issue relates to the changing demographics of the UI student body. There has been an increase in the number of international students, especially Asian students, enrolled in the university. Ms. Joyce indicated that there was also an increase in the number of Asian students visiting the Office last year, particularly Asian undergraduate students accused of academic misconduct. Other offices on campus have concerns about this issue, which is being addressed through a variety of efforts. Professor Johnson concluded the presentation by urging that supervisors contact the Office when they are in need of resources to help deal with difficult situations. The Office is always available to provide such consultations. Professor Johnson also noted the "Top Ten Reasons Why People Don't Consult the Ombuds Office."

Professor Treat asked whether it was known yet if the efforts to address the increase in reports of alleged academic misconduct by Asian students have been successful. Ms. Joyce responded that it was too early to say. Doug Lee, Assistant Provost for International Programs, commented that his office has created an eight-week online course for new international undergraduate students covering academic issues such as plagiarism. His office is also developing an extension to this course in which International Studies students serve as peer leaders mentoring international students regarding academic and cultural issues. Professor Durham suggested that the Office contact the Office of the General Counsel to determine if the Office's efforts in the area of conflict resolution have resulted in a decrease in the number of cases coming to the General Counsel. The Ombudspersons responded that this correlation would be difficult to track. Secretary Cunning asked if other university ombudspersons had seen a rise in the number of visitors to their offices. Ms. Joyce responded that such data was not readily available at this time.

- *Transition to Online Course Evaluations (Shelly Campo, Chair, Council on Teaching)*
President Lawrence indicated that she intends to form an ad hoc committee to consider issues regarding the implementation of an online evaluation system campuswide. She would like to have nominations, including self-nominations, from senators from each college for faculty

members to serve on this ad hoc committee. Committee membership will be announced at the next Senate meeting. The committee will most likely meet a handful of times during this academic year.

Professor Shelly Campo, Chair of the Council on Teaching, explained that last summer she had been asked to join a committee to make some recommendations regarding online course evaluations. The committee had been put together by Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Beth Ingram and Director of the Evaluation and Examination Service Joyce Moore. The University of Iowa is lagging somewhat behind its peers in not offering an online evaluation option consistently across campus (only a few colleges currently offer this option to students). Traditional paper evaluations are extremely labor-intensive and time-consuming to process. They also require the use of a vast amount of paper, hindering the university in its attempts to become a more sustainable campus. And, online evaluations can be more economical, depending on how they are implemented. The committee has been hearing presentations from outside online evaluation vendors, while also considering the development of an in-house online evaluation system. The latter option has come to be seen as unlikely. The committee plans to make a recommendation to the administration next month regarding a vendor, with an online evaluation system to be piloted on a limited basis in the spring. The system would be more widely available on campus in the fall.

Professor Campo stressed that the committee has not considered any policy-related issues regarding online evaluations (this will be the task of the ad hoc committee to be formed by President Lawrence). She listed a number of concerns that warrant discussion. For example, a bank of evaluation results is now available to students, although it is little used. Would a bank of online evaluation results also be available to all students? Would the availability depend on the class size and the response rate? Would evaluations of new faculty members and teaching assistants be available? What kind of policies would be enacted to boost response rates, since response rates for online evaluations tend to be lower than those for paper-based evaluations, at least initially? Part of the reason for this is the method of implementation. Paper-based evaluations are usually administered in one class period towards the end of the semester, while online evaluations may have a one-week window of access and can be done wherever and whenever the student has online access. Extensive faculty input on all of these issues is essential early on in this process.

Professor Murry questioned if faculty should have input regarding whether online evaluations should be implemented at all. Professor Campo responded that it is far too late for this question, but stressed that online evaluations would be one option among several. Professor Murry nevertheless expressed concern that faculty were not consulted earlier on this crucial issue of student evaluation of faculty teaching. Professor Pendergast asked whether the ad hoc committee's recommendations would be brought back to the Faculty Council and Faculty Senate for discussion. Professor Campo answered that she hoped so. Professor Pendergast asked for additional information on the current response rate for paper-based evaluations; Professor Campo thought the campuswide average hovered around 76%. She added that Northwestern University, for example, had recently instituted a standard online evaluation with just six questions. Although the short questionnaire had a high response rate, the level of quality of the

responses is unclear. Professor Campo commented that an issue for the ad hoc committee to discuss would be whether results of course evaluations with extremely low response rates should be released or considered for tenure and promotion decisions, due to the possibly skewed nature of the responses.

Professor Fox observed that an online evaluation platform, even when endorsed by the university, may still resemble a commercial site, leading to students not responding to the questions with the same seriousness that they would in a classroom setting on a paper-based evaluation. This is especially concerning if the evaluation results will be posted online. Professor Campo responded that it is unlikely that all evaluation results will be posted online. She added that Joyce Moore, if she were present, might say that the available data indicate that more thoughtful text responses are given on the online evaluations rather than on the paper-based evaluations. Also, online evaluations could still be administered in class, with students using their personal portable technological devices to complete them. This might enhance the seriousness of the responses. A senator observed that, because the questions used in online formats may differ from the university's paper-based evaluations, it can be difficult to compare results across formats within a department.

Professor Gillan cautioned that the university's evaluation policy should clearly indicate that a paper-based system is still an option, because if colleges realize significant cost savings with an online system, the university may eliminate the paper-based option. Professor Campo commented that most universities continue to offer both formats at this time. Professor Pendergast observed that it is sometimes difficult to obtain quality data cheaply. She suggested that comparisons be made early on between the quality of the responses garnered by paper-based evaluations versus online evaluations. Professor Wilder asked if other universities withhold grades until online evaluations are filled out. Professor Campo commented that this is one strategy that universities have used to increase the response rate. She added that various types of evaluation could be carried out during the course of the semester; evaluation does not only need to happen at the end. Professor Seibert observed that, in his view, there were two general issues for the ad hoc committee to consider, how data is collected and how data is posted.

Past President Dove stressed that the Faculty Senate must play the central role in drafting policy regarding teaching and learning on campus. Professor Murry commented that one task of the ad hoc committee might be to ensure that we are gathering feedback from students in the best way possible for the overall benefit of the university. Professor Campo added that the Council on Teaching will soon be discussing alternative methods for evaluating teaching. Professor Abboud asked if the Council on Teaching knows how colleges and departments actually use the data obtained from course evaluations. Professor Campo responded that the Center for Teaching and the Evaluation and Examination Service may have this information; the Council on Teaching does not. Past President Dove observed that faculty input is essential now, given the speed with which we are approaching implementation. Professor Wilder asked if there might be an ulterior motive for companies to produce online evaluation systems. Professor Campo responded that it seemed to be an issue simply of demand; there does not appear to be a movement toward widespread standardization of collegiate teaching evaluations.

IV. From the Floor – There were no items from the floor.

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 8, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2520D.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, October 22, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Muhly moved and Professor Wilder seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Lawrence adjourned the meeting at 4:43 pm.