

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Tuesday, October 19, 2010**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Senate Chamber, Old Capitol**

**MINUTES**

Senators Present: V. Allareddy, D. Anderson, M. Billett, D. Black, D. Bonthius, A. Campbell, J. Canady, S. Clark, J. Cox, E. Ernst, M. Fang, S. Gardner, T. Gross, M. Hill, D. Jeske, M. Johnson, B. Levy, S. Levy, V. Magnotta, B. McMurray, J. Menninger, J. Murph, J. Pendergast, G. Penny, B. Rakel, L. Robertson, K. Sanders, J. Schoen, C. Scott-Conner, C. Sponsler, S. Staggs, T. Stalter, H. Stecopoulos, K. Tachau, R. Valentine, W. Vispoel, L. Wang, E. Wasserman, S. Wilson, K. Wolfe.

Officers Present: E. Dove, R. Fumerton, J. Garfinkel.

Officers Excused: D. Drake.

Senators Excused: N. Andreasen, M. Finkelstein, W. Haynes, C. Kletzing, E. Lawrence, T. Mangum, P. Mobily, J. Reist, S. Schultz, J. Wilcox, J. Wood.

Senators Absent: E. Anderson, J. Bertolatus, C. Bohannan, H. Butcher, W. Coryell, L. Fielding, E. Gidal, B. Gollnick, D. Katz, L. Kirsch, J. Kline, K. Kreder, S. Kurtz, R. Mutel, J. Niebyl, N. Nisly, J. Polumbaum, T. Schnell, P. Snyder, T. Vaughn, R. Wachtel, J. Wadsworth, J. Wemmie, N. Zavazava.

Guests: P. Berkson (Department of Public Safety), J. Carlson (Office of the President), J. Caton (Human Resources), E. Gillan (Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee), M. Hale (Office of the Chief Information Officer), L. Larson (University Relations), C. Peek-Asa (College of Public Health), T. Rice (Office of the Provost), R. Sayre (Emeritus Faculty Council), A. Sullivan (*Daily Iowan*), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate)

I. Call to Order – President Dove called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.  
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultySenate.10.19.10.pdf>. He welcomed Interim Provost Barry Butler to the meeting.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Robertson seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (September 14, 2010) – Professor Menninger moved and Professor Billett seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Committee Replacements (Richard Fumerton, Chair, Committee on Committees)
  - Donald Black (Psychiatry) to fill the unexpired term of Donna Hammond (Pharmacology) on the Faculty Council, 2010-11
  - Veeratrishul Allareddy (Oral Pathology, Radiology and Medicine) to fill the unexpired term of Khalid Kader (Biomedical Engineering) on the Faculty Senate, 2010-11
  - John Canady (Otolaryngology) to fill the unexpired term of Siroos Shirazi (Surgery) on the Presidential Committee on Athletics, 2010-12
  - Linda Louko (Communication Sciences & Disorders) to fill the unexpired term of Thomas Aprile (Art & Art History) on the Lecture Committee, 2010-13

Professor Wilson moved and Professor Robertson seconded that the replacements be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

### III. New Business

- *University Threat Assessment Team (Corinne Peek-Asa, Jane Caton, Peter Berkson)*

Professor Peek-Asa, faculty advisor to the Threat Assessment Team, explained that many universities are forming threat assessment teams in response to recent shootings on campuses, but that the UI Team is unique in that it includes among its members law enforcement officers as well as mental health specialists, providing for a proactive focus. Also, the team members have cultivated extensive networks throughout the university, including in Student Services and Human Resources. She stressed that faculty can play an important role in identifying threats because they interact with a wide variety of students and staff. Professor Peek-Asa praised the Threat Assessment Team as an “amazing resource” for the university.

Jane Caton, Human Resources, and Peter Berkson, Public Safety, gave a Powerpoint presentation regarding the Threat Assessment Team. Ms. Caton explained that threat assessment is a process of identifying, investigating, and assessing situations of concern and then responding to and managing those situations. She added that the threat assessment process has been used successfully nationwide to prevent campus, school, and workplace shootings. It is evidence-based and legally defensible, as well as low-cost and effective. Lieutenant Berkson indicated that the UI Threat Assessment Team (TAT) was established at the direction of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa in 2008. The goal of the TAT is to provide early identification and intervention. He added that the team’s goal is not punitive in nature; team members seek to provide help early on to those involved in a situation of concern. Although team members follow a set of guidelines for dealing with potential threats, each situation is unique and the team may use a range of tactics to respond to it.

Threat Assessment Team members are drawn from law enforcement, human resources, student services, legal counsel, and counseling services. Other individuals are brought onto the team as necessary on an *ad hoc* basis. The team serves as a central reporting site from all sectors

on campus regarding a situation of concern. Lessons learned from past violent incidents indicate that others are often aware of a violent individual's intentions but that this knowledge remains isolated, or "in silos." The Threat Assessment Team seeks to draw all sectors of the campus together to report situations of concern.

Lieutenant Berkson explained that threat assessment is based on a study called the Safe School Initiative, one of the findings of which indicated that there is usually some "leakage" by perpetrators of their intention to commit violent acts. Other conclusions of the study were that most attackers do not threaten targets directly beforehand and that no accurate profile can be drawn of students who have committed targeted school violence. Lieutenant Berkson went on to describe the steps of the process leading to targeted violence, beginning with a grievance and continuing with violent ideation and planning an attack and culminating with the attack itself. Ms. Caton added that the Threat Assessment Team has been involved in about 400 cases since 2008. Direct intervention was made in well over half of those cases, which varied widely from suicidal ideation to domestic violence to homicidal threats.

Impediments to reporting a situation of concern can involve not wanting to become a target and rationalizing that the situation is "probably nothing," but can also include worries about violating FERPA and HIPAA privacy laws. FERPA, however, Ms. Caton explained, applies to educational records, not to direct personal experience with an individual. FERPA, as well as HIPAA, allow for disclosures to avert danger. Lieutenant Berkson and Ms. Caton concluded their presentation by urging faculty members to report situations of concern to the Threat Assessment Team.

Professor Tachau praised the holistic nature of the team's approach to threats and asked if the team looked only at individuals of concern, rather than at groups of people working together to achieve a specific goal. Lieutenant Berkson responded that the team would investigate any threat of violence. Professor Valentine expressed concern about reporting a threat to administrators but then having this threat ignored at higher levels. Ms. Caton said that faculty members should feel free to contact the team in addition to reporting the threat to administrators. The team responds to calls regarding concerns within 24 hours.

- *Web Accessibility Project (Mark Hale, ITS)*

Dr. Hale explained that he works in the office of the Chief Information Officer, who has undertaken a joint project with the Vice President for Strategic Communication to make the university's web-based services accessible to persons with disabilities. The core concepts of web accessibility call for web content to be perceivable, operable, understandable, and robust. To be perceivable, a website must be accessible to the visually-impaired. This is achieved through the mediation of an assistive technology called a screen reader, which reads the text attached to the website content to the visually-impaired person. Images, forms, and PDF's can all be made into perceivable web objects. The university is undertaking this project now because technological improvements have made expanded accessibility possible. Recognizing that access to the web is now almost as important as access to buildings, the Department of Justice will soon modify Americans with Disabilities Act rules to require greater web accessibility. In anticipation of these new requirements, the university is moving ahead with improvements to the UI web.

Dr. Hale described the web accessibility project's four components: policy, governance, better web publishing tools, and web publishing support. Regarding policy, internationally accepted guidelines for web accessibility have now emerged and the university will generally adopt those guidelines to apply to all university web-based services, programs, and activities. July of 2011 has been projected as the target date for completion of the project. Oversight of the project will be performed jointly by the offices of the Chief Information Officer and the Vice President for Strategic Communications, with the former focusing on technical aspects and the latter on content. A technical advisory committee with members pulled from the campus web community has been formed. The university is in the process of updating its web platforms (servers, software and other tools for publishing web content). Regarding web publishing support, there is a search underway to hire a web accessibility specialist, while plans are also being made to provide training and resources as necessary to the university community. Dr. Hale added that the scope of the work to be done is still being determined, although a major problem that has been identified is the proliferation of non-accessible PDF documents. He stressed that creating accessible PDF's is not difficult; Adobe, Word and other common programs have this capacity. Users simply need to be trained how to do it. Videos also present a significant problem. He urged faculty members to take advantage of any applicable training that is offered to them.

Professor Tachau suggested that Dr. Hale contact the School of Art and Art History to make a presentation. Dr. Hale acknowledged that some disciplines present greater obstacles than others to making their material accessible. Professor McMurray asked what kind of support would be provided to departments, which often maintain their own websites. Dr. Hale responded that training would be provided for those who create web content. Professor Pendergast asked if departments would be charged for updates to their websites. Dr. Hale said that updated platforms are being provided at no cost, but departments may incur costs for software and services.

- *Post-Tenure Review Policy (Ed Dove)*

President Dove opened the discussion of the revised post-tenure review policy by showing a Powerpoint presentation that provided the context and background of the policy revision. His opening slide described the research/teaching university, which generates and disseminates new knowledge, as among our national strengths and core competencies. The research/teaching university's required freedom of inquiry and freedom to communicate the results of that inquiry result in its ability to attract, develop, and unleash the creative talents of both faculty and students. Academic freedom is essential to the research/teaching university, as it is critical to exploration and creativity, provides opportunity for risk-taking, allows for rigorous classroom teaching and facilitates long-range planning of academic work. Tenure guarantees the right to academic freedom by protecting teachers and researchers as they explore controversial issues or dissent from prevailing opinion. A rigorous post-tenure review policy ensures that faculty members fulfill their professional obligations to the university and the citizens of Iowa.

President Dove noted that the current version of the post-tenure review policy calls for a *peer* review of tenured *full* professors, and indicates that such a review *should* be done periodically and *should* address quality of teaching, scholarship, and service. Reasons for revising the policy at this time include a long-standing recognized need to do so, based on the existence in some colleges of two types of reviews (cursory and detailed) and the unclear

purpose of the review (formative or punitive?). In January of 2009, the Faculty Council voted to examine the post-tenure review. Responsibility for this task was eventually delegated to the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee. An initial draft revision was approved by the Faculty Council in April Of 2010, but pulled from the agenda of the following Faculty Senate meeting by then President David Drake due to faculty concerns about the revision. President Dove continued, noting another reason to revise the policy is that it is not practiced consistently across colleges. He stressed, however, that no college is out of compliance with the policy since the peer review is not required. Collegiate practices range from peer reviewing every five years to not peer reviewing at all. He added, too, that all faculty are reviewed annually by their unit head.

President Dove stated that a final reason for revising the post-tenure review policy is to protect tenure and academic freedom from further erosion. He showed a chart illustrating the increase in part time faculty members in relation to full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty nationally over the past 32 years. He also mentioned that there is a national debate surrounding the value of tenure; one aspect of this debate claims that tenure does not ensure that professional vitality is maintained throughout the career. The revised post-tenure review policy provides for assessment of post-tenure productivity. President Dove reviewed the results of an investigation into the post-tenure review policies of about 20 UI peer institutions. There are a range of practices, but most have mandatory periodic formative peer review.

Over the summer, the Faculty Senate Officers took up the task of revising the post-tenure review policy. They created an initial draft, following conversations with various faculty members and the executive committee of the AAUP. This initial draft was sent to the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee (FPCC), which continued to revise the draft until it was approved last month for submission to the Faculty Council for consideration. The Council subsequently voted unanimously to send the policy to the Faculty Senate for consideration. President Dove proposed that the Senate discuss the policy today, but hold off on voting to approve it until the next meeting on December 7. He plans to present the policy to the Council of Deans shortly. President Dove reminded the group that he gave a brief report on the current policy to the Board of Regents, State of Iowa at the Regents' September meeting. A more complete report on the revised policy will be expected at the Regents' April meeting.

President Dove then turned to a discussion of the changes made to the policy. The review will be a *post-tenure* review, not just a *peer* review and it will be required of *all tenured* faculty, not just *tenured full* professors. The revised policy is divided into three sections. The first section indicates that an annual review of all tenured faculty members will be conducted by the unit heads. No changes to the current annual review procedures are contemplated by the post-tenure review policy. The second section describes a formative and developmental required five-year peer review of all tenured faculty. The third section describes procedures to be followed if the five-year peer review reveals performance below expected levels for a significant period of time. In such cases, the dean or DEO and the peer committee may begin discussion with the faculty member regarding creation of a plan to address deficiencies in performance stated in the review. Should the faculty member not agree to the plan, arguments can be submitted to the provost by either party. Administrators would still have recourse to the current unfitness policy if a faculty member does nothing to improve performance. Faculty members, on the other hand, can seek redress of grievance within the Faculty Dispute Procedures. President Dove concluded his presentation by proposing that discussion of the policy occur today, with a vote to be taken at the next Faculty Senate meeting following consideration of feedback from the Council of Deans. He then opened the floor for discussion.

Initial conversation revolved around the definition of “peers” and the number of individuals on the peer review committee. President Dove clarified that normally peers would be faculty members of similar or higher rank from within the department of the person being reviewed. In the case of small departments, peers may need to be sought from other departments within the university. Professor Tachau suggested that this be explicitly stated in the policy. Regarding the number of peers on the committee, President Dove referred the group to the paragraph (lines 66-71) that indicates that each college must develop its own plan for peer review. The size of the review committee is one of the guidelines that each college develops for itself. Noting that this same paragraph indicates that the dean and provost (but not the faculty) will approve the plans, Professor Pendergast questioned the apparent lack of buy-in from a college’s entire faculty. She noted that when the College of Public Health was formed, faculty members voted on issues related to peer review, tenure, promotion, etc., therefore ensuring faculty approval. Vice President Fumerton responded that the expectation had been that deans would not implement a plan without extensive consultation throughout the college. Most colleges already do have a basic peer review policy in place. However, he acknowledged that perhaps a statement should be inserted to the effect that faculty should vote on the peer review plan. Professor Tachau suggested that the language regarding faculty votes in the research-track policy be modified for insertion here.

Professor Menninger raised the issue of the proper term for the annual process by which DEO’s determine salary increases. He commented that “monitoring” is a more appropriate term, as “review” implies a depth of process that only peers would carry out. He also objected to the notion that the DEO is in a position to “identify possible areas of improvement,” as stated by the policy. Vice President Fumerton responded that the term “monitoring” would understate the role of the DEO in the annual process and that he preferred the term “review.” He added that it is likely that few DEO’s try to carry out the review by themselves; many consult with other faculty. Some departments have even implemented elaborate formulas to be used in the review process. Faculty have the option to respond to their annual reviews. He also stressed that the term “annual review” would be more convincing to constituents outside the university. Professor Jeske added that DEO’s in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences are instructed to rank their faculty within tiers, further evidence that DEO’s are called upon to make serious judgments. Professor Menninger pointed out that the policy does not contain a mechanism for evaluating how DEO’s carry out the annual process of determining salary increases; the peer review process, in contrast, must be approved by the dean. Professor Tachau commented that the term “review” sends a strong message that tenured faculty are held to rigorous standards of performance throughout their careers. Professor Menninger stressed that a distinction must be made between these two processes. Peers do an extensive, in-depth review of their colleagues’ work. The DEO’s annual exercise cannot be considered comparable. A suggestion was made to use the term “assessment” for the DEO’s process. President Dove reminded the group that the annual review is described in detail in the Operations Manual. Vice President Fumerton suggested that this portion of the Operations Manual be cross-referenced in the policy; this may allay any concerns about the lack of detail in this section of the post-tenure review policy.

Professor Wasserman drew attention to the first sentence in section 10.7.2 *Annual review of tenured faculty*: “All tenured faculty members will undergo an annual review of their progress in areas of teaching, research, and service,” and commented that *all faculty members*, not just *all tenured faculty members*, undergo an annual review; the impression that could be drawn from this statement that only tenured faculty members undergo an annual review would be misleading. Suggesting that the sentence in question be turned into an acknowledgement of current practice, Professor Tachau suggested that the word *will* be removed, along with the word *tenured*. Professor Pendergast advised that it be confirmed that all faculty (research-track,

clinical-track, etc.) do indeed undergo an annual review before this change is made to the wording.

Professor Barcey Levy asked for clarification of the parenthetical statement in lines 97-98, “(whether success has been met in publishing such work or not).” President Dove and Vice President Fumerton explained that this phrase was meant to cover those faculty members who have chosen to pursue research in a direction that is currently unpopular or little-known and who have therefore not been able to publish much of their work. This situation would be in complete contrast to that of a faculty member who has ceased to do any research at all. The special cases procedures would not be appropriate for the former, but would be for the latter. Professor Pendergast appreciated the intent of the phrase, but commented that the wording was specific to only certain disciplines. She suggested that the phrase be omitted or altered to take into account the different definitions of “success” in a wide variety of disciplines (“whether success has been met by the measurable standards of the discipline”). Other wording options were offered. During the ensuing discussion, some senators felt that the phrase should be omitted entirely. Professor McMurray noted that the purpose of the phrase was to explain why there might be a lack of new bullet points on a faculty member’s CV. Professor Billett cautioned that the phrase might be taken to imply that a faculty member’s lack of research success was tolerated by the university. Professors Cox and Menninger commented that a faculty member might have good reasons for a break in publishing, such as the need to learn a new language to conduct further research or work in progress on a lengthy monograph. It was eventually decided that the Faculty Senate officers would find an appropriate phrase.

Professor Menninger drew the group’s attention to the paragraph beginning on line 77 (under the *Special Cases Procedures*). He advocated for having improvement plans crafted by the faculty member reviewed along with the review committee members, commenting that faculty peers, not administrators, are the appropriate people to evaluate in-depth the teaching and research of a faculty member. President Dove suggested, instead, that the paragraph begin “If, after receiving the results of the five-year peer review, *the Dean, on the advice of the peer review committee and in consultation with the DEO, concludes...*” Vice President Fumerton noted that following the submission of the peer review report, someone must initiate communication with the faculty member reviewed. It may be awkward for the peer review committee and the faculty member reviewed to come face-to-face. The dean or the DEO may be the best intermediary for communicating a plan for improvement. Professor Menninger agreed but reiterated that the improvement plan should be created by the reviewers and the reviewee. A suggestion was made that such details could be worked out in the collegiate plans. Professors Pendergast and Wasserman advocated for greater consistency for the role of the DEO in the review process, while recognizing that not all colleges have DEO’s. President Dove clarified that in the special cases procedures, it is the dean who runs the process, in consultation with both the DEO and the peer review committee. Professor Schoen stressed that the dean’s role in the process be clearly spelled out, including the need for consultation with the DEO and peer review committee.

Professor Barcey Levy commented that five years (the time period between peer reviews) seems like a long time to allow a faculty member (reviewed under the *Special Cases Procedures*) to show improvement. President Dove and Vice President Fumerton responded that a substantial block of time should be allotted to a faculty member who must re-start a lapsed research program. President Dove added that deans can also seek other methods to more quickly deal with faculty members who exhibit unacceptable performance. Professor Cox reminded the group that the goal of the post-tenure review policy is developmental; the policy is

intended to assist those who have dropped below average for a period of time. Other policies, such as the unfitness policy, exist to address very poor performance.

President Dove thanked Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee Chair Ed Gillan for his and the committee's extensive work on the post-tenure review policy. Senators gave Professor Gillan and his committee a round of applause.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, November 16, 3:30-5:15 pm in the Seminar Room (2520D), University Capitol Centre.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, December 7, 3:30 – 5:15 pm in the Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The annual Faculty Senate/Iowa City Area Chamber of Commerce reception for local legislators will be held on Tuesday, December 14, 4:30-6:00 pm in the Old Capitol.

President Dove read a brief biography of Professor Samir Bishara, a Faculty Senator who passed away on October 8. Professor Bishara was a faculty member in the College of Dentistry, Department of Orthodontics for over 40 years. Earlier this month, he had received the Faculty Senate's Michael J. Brody Award for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Schoen seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Dove adjourned the meeting at 5:21 pm.