

**THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA**  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Tuesday, November 27, 2007**  
**3:30-5:15 pm**  
**Senate Chamber, Old Capitol**

**MINUTES**

Present: D. Asprey; D. Balderston; J. Beckman; L. Boyle; G. Buettner; C. Catney; M. Cohen; J. Cox; E. Dove; D. Drake; S. Fagen; J. Fieselmann; D. Filios; R. Herman; G. Hope; G. Jogerst; B. Justman; M. Maktabi; T. Mangum; F. Mitros; S. Moorehead; A. Morris; N. Nisly; M. Noonan; F. Nothwehr; B. Plapp; D. Redlawsk; L. Richman; C. Ringen; K. Schuh; L. Snetselaar; M. VanBeek; S. Vincent; R. Wachtel; R. Williams; M. Wilson Kimber; S. Wolfe; J. Woodhead.

Absent: L. Ayres; G. Bergus; J. Bertolatus; G. Bulechek; J. Carlson; S. Collins; K. Culp; G. El-Khoury; C. Helms; T. Kresowik; S. Lagos Lavenz; J. Leddy; T. Lowe; S. Lutgendorf; D. MacFarlane; R. Martin; L. Robertson; G. Russell; J. Sa-Aadu; B. Schutte; T. Scruggs; W. Sharp; N. Street; S. Stromquist; C. Thomas; W. Vispoel; C. Woodman.

Excused: D. D'Alessandro; M. Donovan; V. Grassian; C. Green; C. Kletzing; Y. Li; A. Poremba; K. Southard; A. Sullivan; B. Thompson; J. Tomkovicz; T. Ton-That.

**Officers**

Present: S. Kurtz (Past President); S. McGuire (Secretary); M. O'Hara (Vice President); and V. Sharp (President).

Guests: T. Charleston (University Library Charter Committee); C. Drum (University Relations); M. LeMay-Lewis (Hancher Auditorium Committee); L. Lopes (Provost's Office); B. Morelli (Press Citizen); C. Porter (Ombuds); T. Rocklin (Provost's Office); R. Sayre (Emeritus Faculty Council); M. Vetter-Smith (University of Missouri); and L. Zaper (Faculty Senate).

**I. Call to Order** – President Sharp called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.

**II. Approvals**

- a. Meeting Agenda. President Sharp noted revisions to the agenda: Following the approvals, the first three items will be the Smoking Policy, the Proposed Change to the *Ops Manual* Tenure Extension Policy, and the Adjunct Promotion Policy. Also, we are omitting the agenda item, University Webpage Upgrade, as Josh Kaine felt that he had received sufficient input when he appeared before the Faculty Council on November 13. Professor Cohen moved and Professor Dove seconded that the meeting agenda be approved as amended. The motion was unanimously approved.
- b. Faculty Senate Minutes (October 23, 2007). Professor Cohen moved and Vice President O'Hara seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

### **III. Old Business**

#### *Smoking Policy (Associate Provost Susan Johnson)*

Associate Provost Susan Johnson explained that Susan Buckley (Human Resources), Joni Troester (Organizational Effectiveness), and herself had been asked by the University President to coordinate a campus discussion regarding the recommendation that the campus should go smoke-free in the near future. Since that time, input has been sought from a wide variety of campus groups. Associate Provost Johnson indicated that she was seeking "an expression of the group's will," whether or not that be in the form of a vote. She noted that Staff Council had voted in favor of the ban on smoking, while UISG had voted against it, in a split vote.

Professor Richman moved and Vice President O'Hara seconded that the Faculty Senate support a university-wide ban on smoking. The motion was unanimously approved.

Associate Provost Johnson stated that her team had also been asked when the ban should take effect. The team will recommend an implementation date of July 1, 2009, or at least not earlier than 12 months after adoption. In response to a question regarding why the implementation date would occur so far in the future, she explained that national experts recommend waiting 12 to 18 months before implementation of a smoking ban, in order to resolve various issues, such as identifying campus boundaries. This is particularly crucial on our campus, as the campus and city are so intertwined. An extensive education effort must also be mounted. Student recruitment information, for example, should include this policy. Extensive signage must also be posted. It was noted that an unintended consequence of the smoking ban at the hospital is all the litter that has accumulated on the outskirts of the no-smoking range. Would additional trash receptacles be placed just outside the no-smoking boundaries, and will areas designated for smoking be created? These issues still need to be worked out. The final recommendation has not yet been formulated; that will happen in the next week or two, and then the recommendation will be given to President Mason, who will make her decision in December or January. A senator questioned how the ban will be enforced. Associate Provost Johnson explained that there will be an extensive education effort. Habitual offenders will be subject to discipline according to policies in place for violations of university rules.

#### **IV. New Business**

##### *Proposed change to Ops Manual Tenure Extension Policy (Lynn Richman)*

Professor Richman, Chair of the Faculty Policy and Compensation Committee (FPCC), referred the Council to the attachment, an excerpt from section 10.1 (Tenure and Non-Tenure Appointments) of the *Operations Manual*. This policy has already been approved, but it was brought to the attention of the FPCC that the language in subsection (4)(e)(i) was somewhat unclear regarding the timing of the request to decline the extension. The FPCC reviewed this section of the policy and offers the following edit to clarify the policy: in the sentence “The faculty member may decline any automatic extension for which the faculty member is eligible by written notification to the faculty member’s DEO at any time prior to the academic year in which the promotion review *is* scheduled,” the word *is* will be changed to ***was originally***. Professor Richman noted that preparations for a tenure review may begin up to one year ahead of time, and he described a scenario in which a faculty member might not decline the extension in time for a department to prepare adequately for the tenure review.

Associate Provost Susan Johnson stressed that this edit does not alter the intention of the policy.

Professor Drake moved and Professor Ringen seconded that the edit to the Tenure Extension Policy be adopted. The motion was unanimously approved.

##### *Adjunct Promotion Policy (Michael O’Hara)*

Vice President O’Hara directed the group’s attention to the handout entitled *DRAFT GUIDELINES: Promotion process for Adjunct Faculty Members*. He noted that a large number of adjunct faculty were employed at the university. They are appointed at various levels, with each college developing its own set of policies regarding promotion of these individuals. This policy seeks to provide systematic guidance regarding the promotion process, and to strike a balance between gathering the relevant information, and not putting an excessive burden on the individuals and colleges involved. There is an expectation that each adjunct faculty member has a portfolio reflecting activity described in his/her appointment letter. This would be the basis of evaluation. There would be some sort of evaluation of that person’s performance in his/her role (teaching evaluations, observations of clinical work) and a personal statement describing accomplishments. This information would be reviewed at the departmental level by tenure-track and clinical-track faculty who are at the level above the individual. There would be a vote by the departmental consulting group. The department head would write a letter to the dean and the dean would write a letter to the provost regarding the recommendation. The individual would have the opportunity to correct errors of fact. It would be done in the same time frame as the regular promotions. This policy has already been approved by the Faculty Policy and Compensation Committee and by the Faculty Council.

Professor Ringen commented that this policy marks a departure from policy that she understood to be in place. She noted that in her experience, adjunct and tenure-track faculty were held to the same expectations regarding teaching, research, and service, so this meant that adjunct faculty could not be promoted. Vice President O’Hara responded

that this practice had not seemed appropriate, as only full time tenure-track faculty could fulfill those expectations. Therefore this separate process has been created. Adjunct faculty have a particular role to play, and they should be evaluated on the basis of sustained performance in this role. A senator asked if a clock was involved. Can it take many years to be promoted? Vice President O'Hara responded that colleges would be given much latitude to make their own judgments. Adjunct faculty provide important services to the university. Recognizing their accomplishments and positive activities is worthwhile.

Professor Ringen questioned whether colleges were obligated to follow this policy. Associate Provost Susan Johnson commented that she was not sure exactly how this policy was presented to the deans; further discussion is necessary. Vice President O'Hara commented that the policy does make a clear statement regarding our expectations as a community, and this policy may have the effect of shaping the views of colleges. Professor Maktabi questioned how adjunct faculty who do not teach would be evaluated. It was clarified through discussion that some adjunct faculty are engaged in research activity only; these people are primarily located off-campus. Item two of the dossier contents listed in the policy as currently stated would therefore not apply to these individuals. It was suggested that the phrase "(if applicable)" be added to item 2. Items 3 and 4 already contain sufficient language to cover adjunct faculty who do not teach. It was noted that although this is a good policy which should be supported, there will be some workload associated with it. Vice President O'Hara stated that each college will decide how to implement the policy. Professor Ringen expressed concern that if all colleges did not subscribe to the policy, it would falsely raise expectations. Vice President O'Hara responded that colleges must be responsible for communicating their own policies.

Professor Drake moved and Professor Ringen seconded that the Adjunct Promotion Policy be accepted as amended. The motion was unanimously approved.

## **V. Update on Provost Search (Michael O'Hara)**

Vice President O'Hara stated that a communication from CLAS Executive Associate Dean Raúl Curto and himself (search committee co-chairs) had gone out yesterday requesting nominations. Please be sure nominees meet the required qualifications. Nominees should have extensive administrative experience (this qualification is lacking in some of the nominations received so far). Thank you for the nominations already received. Please talk this up among your colleagues. The search committee plans to maintain a brisk pace, and to identify the candidate pool by the end of December. We hope to narrow the pool down in January, with the search concluding around spring break. A link to the search committee's website, <http://www.uiowa.edu/provostsearch/>, is located directly on the UI homepage. Please feel free to communicate with any member of the search committee

Professor Cox asked about the requirement for extensive administrative experience – would someone who had served as departmental chair for many years be eligible, or is the administrative experience expected at a higher level? Vice President O'Hara responded that, although the committee would not necessarily rule out a departmental

chair, such a person would probably not rise to the top of the pool. The search committee is generally looking for someone who has served as a dean or vice president, or has been in a provost's office. Most of our former provosts have had significant administrative experience.

#### **VI. New Business (continued)**

*Proposed changes to the Ops Manual for the Charge of the University Libraries Charter Committee (Thomas Charlton, former chair)*

Professor Charlton explained that the University Libraries Charter Committee had responded to a request from the Faculty Senate to review and update, if necessary, its charge. Therefore, the rationale behind the proposed changes to the charge is to bring the wording into line with current practice; for example, one of these changes reflects how the main library and branch libraries now interact. Professor Charlton also noted that, in response to the question raised in the Faculty Senate letter regarding the appropriateness of the committee's current structure, a recommendation was made to add a faculty representative from the Arts to the committee. This structural change would still need to be approved. He drew the group's attention to the handout, a letter dated October 20, 2006, in which the changes were described.

Professor Drake moved and Professor Dove seconded that the changes to the charge of the University Libraries Charter Committee be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

Past President Kurtz noted that all changes to the charges of the charter committees must be approved not only by Faculty Senate, but also by Staff Council and UISG.

*Proposed changes to the Ops Manual for the Charge of the Hancher Auditorium Charter Committee (Margaret LeMay-Lewis, co-chair)*

Co-chair LeMay-Lewis stated that the Hancher Auditorium Charter Committee had reviewed their charge in order to bring it in line with current committee practice. The most substantial change is the addition of a fourth charge that reflects a focus on community outreach that had not existed in the past. As part of this new focus, the committee surveyed students on their perceptions of the Auditorium, and followed up on this survey by holding a reception just for students. This year the committee plans to create a Hancher website page for students. Also the committee would like to work with Ronald McDonald House or a similar entity to explore ways for families of extended-care UIHC patients to attend performances at the Auditorium.

Past President Kurtz noted that these changes must also be approved by Staff Council and UISG.

Professor Mangum moved and Professor Dove seconded that the changes to the charge of the Hancher Auditorium Charter Committee be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

- *Office of the Ombudsperson Annual Report (Cynthia Joyce and Craig Porter)*  
Ombudspersons Cynthia Joyce and Craig Porter referred the group to the summary page of the attachment, the office's 2006-2007 annual report, and stated that they would highlight faculty issues from the various statistics listed there. Ms. Joyce reported that there were a total of 280 visitors to the Office in 2006-2007; 20% of these visitors were faculty, a slight increase from the previous year. Primary faculty concerns included job conflicts (56%), such as problems with colleagues, DEO's, or other administrators. Twenty-four percent of faculty issues were related to salary, tenure, or promotion; 12% were related to academic issues, teaching or scholarship; and 8% were related to benefits and retirement.

Professor Porter highlighted one out of the nine bulleted items in the *Trends* section of the summary. The percent of faculty concerns about job conflicts has more than doubled over the last three years, with increases from 26% to 38% to 56%.

Ms. Joyce commented that each year, the Office highlights particular concerns. For 2006-2007, these concerns include disrespectful behavior, including disrespectful faculty behavior toward students because of their religious and political views, and bullying, which is hard to detect and tied to power. Bullies typically do not exhibit this behavior to people in positions above them in the hierarchy, only to people below them. The report also highlights the vulnerability of various groups on campus; junior faculty are among these vulnerable groups.

Past President Kurtz expressed some concern regarding the percentages presented. Ms. Joyce acknowledged that the report is based on very small numbers of incidents, and that anecdotal evidence therefore acquires increased importance.

#### *Student Success Team Message Project (Vice Provost Tom Rocklin)*

Vice Provost Rocklin explained that for the last year and a half the Student Success Team (SST) has been studying the factors that contribute to undergraduate student success at the university. The "Message Project" has grown out of this effort. Other universities with a high rate of student success send a cohesive message to students about expectations. Research done two years ago found that our institution does not send such a message to students. The messages that our students do receive originate instead from the student culture. The SST is attempting to develop a message to send to our students and then to make the message real for students. About 2400 responses were received to a survey the SST sent to the university community last summer asking what we should tell students about what it means to be a student at the University of Iowa. The responses were distilled into the five points indicated on the handout *The Message Project*: Academic Excellence, Involvement, Responsibility, Diversity, and Community. A sixth point, focusing on athletics, did emerge from the survey, but this point is already well-enunciated. In formulating these five points, the SST decided to phrase them as imperatives, making a clear statement that they pertain to *all* students. Vice Provost Rocklin requested that senators share this document with colleagues, and he welcomed feedback.

Several senators indicated dissatisfaction with the phrase “Academic Excellence,” which seems to emphasize improved rankings for the university rather than concern for student learning. Alternatives such as “Learn a Lot,” “Embrace Ideas,” and “Get a Great Education” were suggested. Some said that the language under this point did not sufficiently emphasize critical thinking; others thought that the language was appropriate. Professor Nisly commented that grades are one measure of academic progress, but could there be other measures? Vice Provost Rocklin referred to the National Survey of Student Engagement as another measurement tool. Professor Maktabi questioned whether we can assess the success of the Message in contributing to student success. Vice Provost Rocklin responded that we will be able to track this in some degree, although we will not be able to completely isolate and measure the impact of this effort. In a sense, this is about shaping a culture. Professor Maktabi asked whether any bureaucracy will be created to implement this initiative. No, but Elizabeth Whitt, the Director for Student Success Initiatives in the Provost’s Office, will oversee this effort. Vice Provost Rocklin explained that, although the SST is seeking to create a document encompassing the expanded version of the Message, the substance of the Message will be disseminated in a variety of forms and contexts. Secretary Steve McGuire cautioned against sloganeering, and stressed that student input should be considered. Past President Kurtz questioned what stage of development the Message Project was in. Vice Provost Rocklin responded that the SST would continue to collect comments through the end of the semester and then revise the draft. Past President Kurtz asked if he were seeking a motion from the Senate. Vice Provost Rocklin said he had not planned to ask for one, but would welcome one if it were made.

Professor Cox moved and Professor Mangum seconded that the Senate endorse the concept of developing a message that communicates institutional expectations for the students who attend the University of Iowa. The motion was unanimously approved.

Professor Cox stated that the Message should stress that the University of Iowa is a public institution, and therefore one of its roles is not just producing educated individuals but educated citizens.

*Voluntary System of Accountability (Interim Provost Lola Lopes and Vice Provost Tom Rocklin)*

As a preface to Interim Provost Lola Lopes’ and Vice Provost Tom Rocklin’s remarks, President Sharp informed the Senate that the president of the University of Vermont, Daniel Fogel, had made a presentation at the CIC Annual Faculty Governance meeting, held earlier in the month in Iowa City, regarding the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA).

Interim Provost Lopes explained that the University of Iowa will be part of a pilot project for the VSA. The VSA program was established jointly by two major higher education associations, The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULG) and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), because of a sense that universities need to be pro-active when it comes to accountability. Interim Provost Lopes reminded the Senate that the Spelling Commission had

recommended that higher education institutions be evaluated in ways similar to those adopted for the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) program. The VSA is a voluntary program establishing a system for universities to provide the public with standardized information regarding the quality of education received at their institutions. President Mason was aware of and interested in this program before her arrival at The University of Iowa. Interim Provost Lopes referred the group to the attachment (pages from a sample website illustrating a template universities could use to report their information).

The first part of the VSA template contains information obtained from a national system, the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), where data is reported in a standardized format. The rankings formulated by *U.S. News and World Report* are developed from the same collection of data; however, the magazine also relies heavily on perceptions of colleges and universities solicited from officials at other institutions, even when those officials may know little to nothing about a given college or university. Interim Provost Lopes referred the group to the first page of the attachment, where graduation rate is reported. Our six-year graduation rate is about 65%. Iowa State University and the University of Northern Iowa have similar rates. Regents often ask why the three schools don't do better than this. However, this number only measures the number of students who actually graduate from the institution they originally enrolled in – students who don't graduate from the University of Iowa, for example, often have transferred elsewhere and graduated from their new institution. The data collection system is now more detailed, and shows precisely what happens to students who leave their first institution. Our four-year graduation rate is very good, above 40%. We can add data like this to the template to illustrate our strengths.

Referring the Senate to the second part of the VSA template, Interim Provost Lopes discussed presentation of data on student engagement with the university community. The UI uses the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to measure this activity, which includes experiences such as group and active learning experiences, student satisfaction, internships, individual contact with professors, etc. The survey measures whether students are taking full advantage of the opportunities available to them. Interim Provost Lopes explained that the third component of the VSA could possibly be considered controversial – a standardized test developed to measure student learning outcomes. UI will use an ACT product, the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP). This is not a disciplinary test. It measures student performance at the freshman and senior levels in the areas of critical thinking and written communication ability. Improvement is measured across the course of a student's career here. The UI already puts much effort into both of these areas, and Interim Provost Lopes has no doubt that our students will perform well on this test. The CAAP is a service we would buy, just as we buy the NSSE survey process; testing would take place outside of the classroom. The focus is not on the score received, but on improvement made between the freshman and senior years. There is some concern that the randomly selected students may not take the test seriously. We may provide incentives to them. There is a four-year moratorium on score reporting, allowing institutions to refine their testing process. Someone from ACT will come out soon to brief us on the CAAP.

Vice Provost Rocklin commented that in the first year our testing goal will be modest, for example, we will focus on getting students to take the test seriously. We have data on the correlation between the ACT test and the CAAP. Faculty will be informed of the test



content, and it will be determined if there is a match between course content and the test. Interim Provost Lopes acknowledged that some faculty may be afraid that, because of the NCLB precedent, we will have to “teach to the test” – but in fact there is no way to teach to this test except to emphasize critical thinking and clear writing. It was asked if there will be a Kaplan course for this test. Interim Provost Lopes responded that the curriculum of our introductory Rhetoric course could serve as a textbook for the test. No individual test results will be made available. Different students will take different parts of the test. The sample will be 400-500 people. Thus, there are differences in how this test is used. Professor Cox questioned how the CAAP differs from the GRE. Could the GRE be used in place of the CAAP? The GRE has a math section but the CAAP doesn’t; nor does the CAAP have an analytic section. There is also no verbal or vocabulary portion, but the writing sections are probably similar. The GRE would also not be able to show value added. Examples of CAAP test questions can be found on the ACT website, <http://www.act.org/caap/sample/index.html/>.

Past President Kurtz questioned if the VSA is merely a response to the current climate regarding education in Washington. Administrations change, after all. Independent of politics, is this a good idea? Interim Provost Lopes responded that this is perceived as a necessary idea. Although administrations change, neither national party is inclined to stop calling for accountability in higher education. Despite heavy budget cuts, tuition is perceived as too high. Citizens do not know what it takes to provide a college education. The drive to go to expensive private colleges further feeds the perception that higher education is over-priced and that parents and students must make sure they are getting their money’s worth. The accountability focus is primarily on undergraduate education, as many graduate programs are already evaluated in some way. Vice Provost Rocklin noted that we already do the first part of the VSA evaluation, and we had previously decided to do the second part; it is only the third part (testing) that is new. It was asked if the state could withhold funds from institutions for poor performance, but this was thought unlikely. It was suggested that the first point in the Message, academic excellence, be tied to critical thinking and written communication, the two areas that the CAAP will be measuring progress on. A question was raised regarding the CAAP baseline; but more information is needed about this.

## **VII. Announcements**

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, December 11, 2007, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Penn State Room, 337 IMU
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, February 5, 2008, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol
- The joint Faculty Senate/Iowa City Area Chamber of Commerce reception for Iowa legislators will be held in the State Room of the IMU on Monday, December 10, 4:30-6:00 pm.

**VIII. Adjournment** – President Sharp adjourned the meeting at 5:05 pm.