

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Tuesday, December 7, 2010**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Senate Chamber, Old Capitol**

**MINUTES**

- Senators Present: V. Allareddy, C. Bohannon, D. Bonthius, J. Canady, S. Clark, M. Fang, L. Fielding, B. Gollnick, M. Hill, D. Jeske, D. Katz, K. Kreder, B. Levy, S. Levy, V. Magnotta, B. McMurray, J. Menninger, J. Murph, N. Nisly, J. Pendergast, G. Penny, B. Rakel, J. Reist, L. Robertson, J. Schoen, C. Sponsler, H. Stecopoulos, K. Tachau, R. Valentine, T. Vaughn, W. Vispoel, S. Vos, L. Wang, E. Wasserman, J. Wilcox, S. Wilson, K. Wolfe, J. Wood.
- Officers Present: E. Dove, D. Drake, R. Fumerton, J. Garfinkel.
- Senators Excused: N. Andreasen, M. Billett, A. Campbell, M. Finkelstein, W. Haynes, C. Kletzing, R. Kuthy, E. Lawrence, J. Niebyl, J. Polumbaum, S. Schultz, C. Scott-Conner.
- Senators Absent: D. Anderson, E. Anderson, J. Bertolatus, D. Black, H. Butcher, W. Coryell, J. Cox, E. Ernst, S. Gardner, E. Gidal, T. Gross, M. Johnson, L. Kirsch, J. Kline, S. Kurtz, P. Mobily, R. Mutel, K. Sanders, T. Schnell, P. Snyder, T. Stalter, R. Wachtel, J. Wadsworth, J. Wemmie, N. Zavazava.
- Guests: S. Assouline (Belin-Blank Center), J. Carlson (Office of the President), R. Friedrich (Emeritus Faculty Council), S. Hansen (Office of the Vice President for Student Services), B. Ingram (Office of the Provost), S. Johnson (Office of the Ombudsperson), C. Joyce (Office of the Ombudsperson), L. Larson (University Relations), T. Rice (Office of the Provost), A. Sullivan (*Daily Iowan*), S. Tonelli (College of Nursing), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate)

- I. Call to Order – President Dove called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.  
[http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultySenate.12.07.10\\_000.pdf](http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultySenate.12.07.10_000.pdf).  
He reminded senators to state their names and departments prior to speaking and to sign the meeting attendance sheet.
- II. Approvals
- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Menninger moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (October 19, 2010) – Professor Pendergast, referring to the presenter of the web accessibility agenda item, commented that since Mark Hale is not a professor at UI, he should not be called “Professor Hale” in the minutes. “Dr. Hale” was suggested as an alternative. This change will be made to the final version of the minutes. Professor Schoen moved and Professor Robertson seconded that the minutes be approved as amended. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Committee Replacements (Richard Fumerton, Chair, Committee on Committees)
  - Raymond Kuthy (Preventive and Community Dentistry) to fill the unexpired term of Samir Bishara (Orthodontics) on the Faculty Senate, 2010-11 Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Clark seconded that the replacement be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Faculty Senate Elections Vacancy Tally (Richard Fumerton) – Vice President Fumerton noted that there are 33 open Senate positions and 8 open Council positions. The election cycle will begin with nominations on Friday, January 28. He urged senators to encourage their colleagues to participate. Professor Barcey Levy moved and Professor Schoen seconded that the vacancy tally be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

### III. New Business

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

Ms. Joyce briefly explained that the Office of the Ombudsperson provides informal conflict resolution to the campus. The Office is confidential and neutral. She then referred the group to the last, summary page of the *Office of the Ombudsperson 2009-2010 Annual Report*. She indicated that the Office had received 517 visitors from July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010, an increase of 6% over the same time period the previous year. She noted that the term “visitors” is used by the ombudsperson professional association because it does not denote any advocacy. The Office sees just over 1% of the population of the entire university, a figure consistent with the experiences of organizational ombudspersons around the country. The percentages of types of visitors have remained constant, with faculty representing 17.2% of visitors, staff 48.0%, and students 30.0%. Parents, alumni, patients and various others represented 4.8% of visitors. Professor Johnson pointed out that faculty are the most represented group of visitors, in proportion to their presence on campus.

In describing primary visitor concerns, Ms. Joyce explained that for all groups of faculty, staff and students, supervisory relationships comprised the largest percentage of concerns (for faculty, supervisors would include DEO’s and other administrators). For faculty the next two largest areas of concern were career progression and peer relationships. Regarding visitor demographics, 19% of visitors were racial/ethnic minorities and 61% were female. These two percentages are higher than the percentages of these groups as a whole on campus. Forty-five visitors had concerns about discrimination and harassment, including concerns relating to sexual misconduct/harassment and disabilities.

Ms. Joyce commented that the rise in visitor complaints involving disrespectful behavior (from 17% last year to 22% this year) was of concern to the Office. This rise is consistent across

groups of visitors and follows a national trend reported by universities and other types of workplaces. Ms. Joyce added that the Office had begun tracking reports of bullying and indicated that 10% of visitors to the Office had some concerns about bullying. In response to a question, Professor Johnson clarified that 22% of Office visitors – not 22% of the campus community – had expressed concern about disrespectful behavior. Professor Pendergast asked why there is a nationwide increase in workplace disrespectful behavior. Ms. Joyce, citing a recently-published book on the topic, listed the following possible reasons for the rise: stress, overwork, understaffing, change in pace, little expectation of longtime employment in one organization, and generational differences. In response to a question, Ms. Joyce explained that about two-thirds of the disrespectful behavior cases reported to the Office involved a supervisor's disrespectful behavior towards a subordinate. In response to another question, Ms. Joyce confirmed that visitor complaints are classified solely by the primary complaint.

A professor asked whether the Ombudspersons believed they were successful in assisting visitors resolve their situations. Professor Johnson noted evaluation data of the Office contained in the report; there was a 43% response rate to post-visit evaluations and 77% of those responses were positive. She added that it was difficult to quantify whether the Office has been successful, as the Office is not always informed of resolutions of complaints.

Ms. Joyce continued the presentation by indicating that each year the report highlights specific concerns. This year's concerns include cross-cultural challenges, feedback, email, and social media. Regarding cross-cultural challenges, she noted that differences in communication styles (a more indirect, typically "Midwestern" style vs. a more direct style) could be a cause for conflict. For faculty, feedback relates to annual reviews and the confusion that can arise when feedback is misinterpreted or surprisingly (to the person reviewed) negative. Email has been a cause of concern because individuals will sometimes use hostile or rude language in email messages that they would not use in person, while individuals may use social media to present co-workers in an unfavorable light. Professor Johnson then concluded the presentation by indicating that the Office held a series of workshops on conflict management and other topics.

- *Alcohol Harm Reduction Plan (Susan Assouline, Chair, Alcohol Harm Reduction Committee and Sarah Hansen, Director, Assessment and Strategic Initiatives, Office of the Vice President for Student Services)*

President Dove explained that the 26-member Alcohol Harm Reduction Committee was convened last year to generate a plan to increase student success by improving student health and safety through the reduction of harmful drinking behaviors. This plan has now been created. President Dove indicated that he was not seeking faculty endorsement of the plan, but simply wanted to provide faculty with an opportunity to review it.

Professor Assouline distributed copies of the plan and thanked President Dove for the opportunity to appear before the Senate. She introduced Sarah Hansen, Director for Assessment and Strategic Initiatives in the Office of the Vice President for Student Services. She explained that the committee was charged by Vice President for Student Services Tom Rocklin with gathering information in support of activities initiated by his office. The focus of the committee was on identifying measures that the university could take to reduce harm caused by excessive

alcohol consumption. She drew the group's attention to the metrics for success listed in the plan. These metrics include reducing the percentage of students engaging in high-risk drinking within a two-week period from 70% to 55%; reducing the average number of drinks per occasion from about 7 ½ to 4; reducing the percentage of students drinking 10 or more days per month from 34% to 20%, and reducing the number of alcohol-related emergency room visits. The plan includes activities which will move the university toward reaching these goals. Professor Assouline indicated that part of the committee's work had included reaching out to various units and constituents on campus to solicit their support for the plan. Among the units that Professor Assouline, then-co-chair Professor Victoria Sharp, and Ms. Hansen met with were Student Health (regarding screenings and interventions), Recreational Services (regarding late-night programming), and the Provost's Office (regarding Friday classes). Professor Assouline concluded her presentation by indicating that the purpose of today's presentation was to distribute the Alcohol Harm Reduction Plan to faculty. She added that committee members could be available in the future to update the Senate on progress on the plan.

Referring to an item under the metrics for success, Professor Menninger asked for clarification of the phrase, percent of students drinking *10 or more days per month*. Ms. Hansen explained that this would include having any amount of alcoholic drinks on a particular day. Professor Menninger asked whether the baseline figure given for the UI, 34%, seemed low. Ms. Hansen responded that, on the contrary, the national average is in the teens. She agreed with Professor Menninger that consumption of alcohol per day was culture-dependent, but pointed out that the target population for measurement consisted of all college students in the United States. Professor Wilson asked whether Goal 1, Attract more low-risk drinkers/abstainers and fewer high-risk drinkers to UI, was attainable. Professor Assouline responded that Admissions was already working on this, but that while this is a goal of the plan, the main focus is on changing the drinking culture on campus. Ms. Hansen added that students learn about universities through word-of-mouth also, not just through admissions offices, and that an institution's reputation can play a role in the type of student it attracts. She noted that research has indicated that an institution attracts a broader profile of students when it clearly communicates that non-alcoholic evening activities are promoted and alcohol-related regulations are strictly enforced. Lower-risk drinkers prefer to be in an environment where they do not feel pressure to drink; strict enforcement appears to foster such an environment. Professor Assouline commented that one proposed tactic of this goal is providing the larger feeder high schools with information about high-risk drinking.

Professor Stecopoulos asked how the high-risk drinking rate at UI (70% of students engaged in high-risk drinking in the past two weeks) compares with that at other Big Ten schools. Ms. Hansen responded that the rates at UI are high compared even with those schools. The rate at several institutions, such as the University of Wisconsin, approaches the UI rate, but most of the others have rates under 60%. Professor Assouline stressed how important it is for the UI community to be informed of the unusually high numbers surrounding high-risk drinking on this campus; acquisition of this knowledge is essential to changing the drinking culture here. A professor expressed concern at the lack of physicians and other health professionals on the committee. Professor Assouline noted that until recently Professor Victoria Sharp of the Carver College of Medicine had co-chaired the committee with her. President Dove responded that the

committee had had access to physicians and other health professionals while gathering information for the plan. Another professor asked if representatives from the Greek system had been involved in the formulation of the plan and whether the university had any authority over the Greek system. Ms. Hansen responded that staff members and other Greek system representatives were drawing up a plan of their own that will be presented to Vice President Rocklin and that the university does have some authority to intervene in local Greek system affairs.

Professor Murph asked if there was a relationship between the number of establishments serving alcohol and the rate of high-risk drinking. Professor Assouline responded that there is a clear relationship between access and drinking. Professor Murph further asked if the committee interfaced with the community, as high-risk drinking is a community problem, as well; Professor Assouline answered that most contact with the community occurred through Vice President Rocklin. Professor Tachau commented that images on the UI website do not primarily focus on academics; rather, they show athletic events or students having fun. Also, regarding an increase in Friday classes, she noted that students do not sign up for Friday classes in large numbers and then departments close those sections. This is a nationwide trend. Professor Assouline commented that the real issue was getting students more engaged in academic activity, no matter what the mechanisms. President Dove thanked Professor Assouline and Ms. Hansen for their presentation.

- *Faculty Senate Voting Population (Ed Dove)*

President Dove drew the group's attention to the handout indicating the collegiate voting populations for the 2011 Faculty Senate elections along with the numbers of tenured/tenure-track and clinical-track faculty, per college, currently serving in the Faculty Senate. Professor Tachau expressed surprise at the high numbers of clinical-track faculty in several colleges, including the College of Pharmacy and the Carver College of Medicine. She recalled the discussions that had taken place in the Faculty Senate regarding the implementation of the clinical track; those discussions had suggested collegiate quotas of clinical-track faculty of 10%-20%. Some colleges have clearly surpassed that limit and she questioned whether faculty of those colleges had voted to increase their quota of clinical-track faculty. If so, she requested documentation of those decisions and their rationale. She concluded by noting that high numbers of clinical-track faculty change significantly the nature of the faculty at the university. President Dove responded that the original limit was 20% and had subsequently been raised to 40% although he did not have information on when that occurred. At this time it appears that only one college consistently remains above its limit of clinical-track faculty. The Interim Provost has been made aware of this situation. Faculty Senate, however, continues to observe a 20% collegiate limit on clinical-track faculty.

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

President Dove reminded the group that the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee had approved a draft of the Post-Tenure Review Policy on September 10. The Faculty Council endorsed this draft of the policy on October 5. The Faculty Senate had a first reading of the draft policy on October 19 and offered some suggestions for improvement. The following day the Council of Deans also reviewed the draft policy and offered suggestions. President Dove then met with several deans to further address questions and concerns. On November 16 the Faculty Council re-endorsed a slightly revised version of the policy. Now, this version of the policy has come before the Faculty Senate for a vote.

President Dove then reviewed substantive changes to the policy since the October 19 Faculty Senate meeting. Directing the group to the marked-up version of the draft policy, he pointed out several changes that were made at the suggestions of the Senate: on line 38, the words “tenured” and “will” were removed; on line 61, the phrase “in the same college as the faculty member undergoing review” was added; on line 71, the sentence “Faculty members of the college will approve the plan by vote” was added; on line 79, the phrase “the Dean, on advice of the peer review committee and in consultation with the DEO, if one exists” was added; and, on line 83, the phrase “The peer review committee and” was deleted, leaving only the Dean as the individual to initiate discussions with the faculty member about an improvement plan. On line 89, the sentence “The DEO and/or Dean may monitor progress through the annual review and give feedback to the faculty member” was added following discussion with the Council of Deans. The Senate had also questioned the five-year span between reviews and the Faculty Council subsequently endorsed this edit on November 16. Two additional edits were made at the suggestion of Professor Carlson. These edits were the substitution of the phrase “that there are grounds for grievance” for “that the review process has been unfair” in line 95 and the deletion of the word “interesting” to describe “research programs” in line 101. The deletion of the parenthetical phrase “(whether success has been met in publishing such work or not)” was suggested by both the Senate and the Council of Deans. In line 103, the Carver College of Medicine considered the word “substantial” too vague and suggested putting in a specific time period. President Dove stated that he favored the word “substantial,” however, and suggested that individual colleges be allowed to determine an appropriate time period.

Professor Tachau questioned the change made to line 95 (regarding grounds for grievance), wondering if this wording might narrow the faculty member’s ability to identify an unfairness if the incident is not specifically listed as one of the grounds for grievance in the Operations Manual. Professor Carlson, who had suggested this revision, responded that that had indeed been his intention, adding that the grounds for grievance are very narrowly defined. Leaving the original wording in the policy could create an ambiguity. Professor Tachau spoke in favor of this ambiguity, commenting that salary could be an area of perceived unfairness, although the grievance policy does not envision grieving over salary. Professor Carlson responded that in that case it would be necessary to amend the grievance policy, as salary is not one of the four grounds currently allowed for grievance. The Post-Tenure Review Policy’s original language would create an “illusory right.” Vice President Fumerton commented that the language of the policy does not preclude a faculty member from complaining via other venues, e.g., directly to a DEO or dean.

Professor Bohannon questioned whether a faculty member might grieve on the basis of perceived unfairness, such as penalizing one faculty member under the policy and not another when both have similar low rates of productivity. Professor Carlson commented that it was possible to grieve on the grounds of discrimination (based on race, gender, etc.). President Dove responded that this was a review by peers, rather than DEO’s, making this less likely to happen. Professor McMurray noted, however, that different peer groups might have different standards, so a situation such as this may arise. President Dove commented that the involvement of the DEO and dean should lead to a uniform application of standards. Vice President Fumerton added that the faculty member could include a perception of unfairness in his/her response to the review.

Professor Pendergast commented that in her view, the policy allows for the situation to escalate quickly to the Provost when the faculty member does not agree with the dean and the review committee on the improvement plan, instead of allowing for further negotiations to take place within the department. Vice President Fumerton and Past President Drake pointed out

that the policy allows for much interaction between the faculty member and the dean, DEO and review committee prior to the development of the final version of the improvement plan. It was determined that the phrases “plan proposed” (line 91) and “original plan” (line 93) led to some confusion. After discussion, it was decided to substitute “prepared” for “proposed” in line 91 and to eliminate “original” in line 93.

Professor Bohannon noted that, on line 100, the phrase “and interesting” was deleted and suggested that “ambitious” also be deleted, as it is subjective and vague, as well. Several professors commented that “ambitious” may have different meanings in different disciplines and therefore the vagueness that the word “ambitious” conveys is appropriate. Vice President Fumerton responded that the point of the word was to stress a distinction between a minimum of output versus a larger volume of output. The word “substantive” was suggested as a possible alternative. President Dove pointed out that the later phrase “research programs that they are actively pursuing” may help to reinforce this distinction. Referring to line 67, a professor asked how different the collegiate plans might be from each other. President Dove responded that there would probably be some significant differences, given the wide variety of disciplines involved, but the key point is that the faculty of each college would vote on the plans. Professor Vaughn, referring to line 61, which states that the peer review committee will be “composed of tenured faculty peers in the same college as the faculty member undergoing review,” commented that a faculty member may prefer to have a faculty member from another college but doing similar work also sit on the review committee. He added that those with joint appointments may particularly find themselves in this situation. The dean or DEO could allow for such an addition to the review committee, however, President Dove suggested.

Professor Tachau moved and Professor McMurray seconded that the Post-Tenure Review Policy be approved with the modifications that the word “prepared” be substituted for the word “proposed” in line 91 and that the word “original” be eliminated in line 93. The motion carried unanimously.

IV. From the Floor – Professor Robertson asked for clarification regarding whether a research-track professor could be listed as the leader of a research seminar, as a research-track colleague of his was told that he could not be, although he had been teaching the seminar for several semesters as a research scientist. Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Beth Ingram indicated that this may be a technical issue that could be solved by listing the research-track faculty member as the course instructor, but a tenured/tenure-track faculty member as the course supervisor. Professor Tachau commented that “research seminar” has different meanings in different colleges. President Dove noted that no changes to the research-track policy were contemplated at this time.

President Dove announced that the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee was working on several issues that would shortly come to the Faculty Council and Senate for discussion. Also, a funding workshop for the arts, humanities, and social sciences will take place on Saturday, January 22. The workshop will be sponsored by the Faculty Senate and the Obermann Center for Advanced Studies. Those invited to the workshop will include DEO’s from the departments indicated and Faculty Councilors, along with administrators and a representative from the National Endowment for the Humanities. A white paper will be produced following the workshop. A similar funding workshop for the sciences may be held in the future.

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, January 25, 3:30-5:15 pm in the Seminar Room (2520D), University Capitol Centre.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, February 8, 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.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Schoen seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Dove adjourned the meeting at 4:56 pm.