Call to Order and Minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:31. A motion to approve the minutes was approved with one no vote and three abstentions.

Chair’s Report:
- The University Faculty Meeting will be held on September 20th at 3:00. Provost Wiencek will be presiding for President Staben. He will introduce new faculty members, acknowledge faculty promotions and make remarks to the faculty.
- Early warning grades are due on Tuesday, September 19th. These grades help with retention of at-risk students.
- Faculty members should be sure to complete the survey on Classification of Instructional Program Codes (CIP Codes). Each faculty member received the survey in an email from Provost Wiencek on September 14th. CIP Codes will be used as part of the determination of market compensation. The survey provides the opportunity for individual faculty members to provide feedback on which CIP code best describes them. The survey must be completed by September 25th.
- Vice President of Finance Brian Foisy and Executive Director of Human Resources Wes Matthews will be hosting a meeting on the staff market compensation process on October 6th.
- The Faculty Compensation Taskforce is reconvening on Friday, September 22nd. Provost Wiencek will present his feedback on the faculty market compensation approach. The taskforce will discuss how to fine-tune the approach and how to implement the model for faculty.

A senator asked whether faculty can and/or should attend the staff compensation meeting on October 6th. The chair and the provost indicated that the web interface for staff will be presented and explained at the meeting. Some of the conversation may focus on the process for assigning Standard Occupational Codes (SOC Codes) to individual staff positions and whether staff voices were heard in that process. In addition, the provost indicated that there are also some alignment issues that may be discussed. For example, how will the university handle market compensation for positions that are similar from college to college, but currently make different amounts in each college? Faculty attendance at the meeting is a way of showing support to our staff colleagues, although issues at the meeting will not directly affect faculty.

Provost’s Report: The provost called senators’ attention to the memo about the Great Colleges Survey that went out on Tuesday, September 19th. The results have been available for a while and have been shared to some extent previously. Because of the need to move forward on program prioritization and on market compensation, the share link had not been broadly communicated to the entire university community until Tuesday. The results are not much different than last year. One of the areas of concern is the teaching environment on campus. The university is working on how to support good teaching. The new Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning is part of that effort.
The provost is also working on a memo about how to implement the current program prioritization reallocation among academic units. He encouraged emails from senators who would like to have input on this reallocation process.

A senator asked whether clinical faculty colleagues will be left out of the market compensation process. The provost responded that no faculty member will be “left out.” Every faculty member will be assigned a CIP code. The source of the confusion is that a sample compensation spreadsheet was circulated that did not include any clinical faculty. Chair Hrdlicka, who co-chairs the Faculty Compensation Taskforce, explained that the taskforce is aware of the confusion. During its deliberations, it had to limit the scope of the data it examined and, as a result, focused on non-clinical faculty. The national databases that will be used to determine each faculty members’ market include data for clinical faculty. The taskforce is expanding the scope of its analysis. The provost thanked the senator for raising this issue so that we can improve our communication to include all faculty.

Another senator asked several questions about CIP Codes:

1) How was the approved list of CIP Codes determined;
2) Can a faculty member use CIP Codes from college or departments other than their own, if those codes better describe the faculty member’s work; and
3) Because the CIP Codes appear to be tied to majors and not directly to programs – how is research reflected in the CIP Code choice process?

The provost responded that the university reports what our faculty actually do to both the State Board of Education (SBOE) and to the National Center for Education Statistics. If a department is hiring a faculty member it relies on the CIP Codes which are closely aligned with what an institution would pay faculty in a particular program. Thus, faculty members are limited to the CIP Codes associated with the majors in the faculty member’s department. The provost hopes that what most faculty do is highly correlated to the department in which they work. The senator followed up by commenting that faculty do more than deliver majors. An individual faculty member’s research may not be directly related to the majors within their home department. The Provost responded that deans and chairs will have flexibility to set salaries within a range. Our current process is focused on setting the median for each range. But, we have to accord chairs the latitude to recognize the work of each faculty member. The dean and chair recommendations will be reviewed by the provost. He plans to have conversations at different levels of the salary process. The provost also indicated that while faculty may select specific six digit CIP codes to describe themselves as part of the Qualtrics survey (discussed by Chair Hrdlicka earlier in the meeting), the university is likely to use four digit CIP Codes for our market compensation process. He explained further that the salary information for many of the six digit codes is not statistically significant.\(^1\) The provost pointed out that all of our faculty are “off market.” The university needs to move forward with market compensation to begin addressing our low salaries and start making decisions. The discussion about how to implement market compensation is going to continue beyond this first mid-year salary adjustment, and we can evolve as we go along. The chair elaborated on Provost Wiencek’s comments. He pointed out that if a faculty member was to leave the university, consideration must be given to how the university would fill the open position. If a biology professor leaves, in all likelihood the department will need a biologist even though the new faculty member might teach or do research as part of WWAMI. The provost commented that from his experience the merit based raises more than compensated for where his discipline was categorized. He stressed that we must take a small step and make progress. If momentum is achieved, we can consider significant revisions to the process such as re-evaluating whether to use a peer group consisting of R1 institutions rather than the currently suggested peer group of R1, R2 & R3 institutions.

\(^1\) Please note, readers of these minutes may obtain a fuller understanding of CIP Codes here:
Another senator commented that our instructional programs have evolved over the years and some of the assigned CIP Codes could be outdated. She asked whether there is a way that we can update CIP Codes. The provost will follow up to see what is required to do such updates.

A senator followed up on the Great Colleges Survey by asking whether the university planned to release the report on the 2016 survey results prepared by the President’s Council on Diversity and Inclusion (Council). The provost indicated that originally the university intended to release a memo combining the Council’s report and the results of the 2017 survey establishing a specific cascaded strategic plan to address the report and new results. Outside interest in the results of the 2017 survey led the university to release those results without the accompanying report and cascaded strategic plan. The Provost will work with Yolanda Bisbee, Executive Director of the Office of Equity and Diversity to get the Council’s report out and announce cascaded planning processes. He will be looking to a small group to develop the cascaded plan. Issues are likely to be salaries, teaching environment, and creating a respectful culture. He also pointed out that one of the president’s upcoming leadership breakfasts will focus on how to address micro-aggression in the workplace.

**Green Dot/Office of Violence Against Women Campus Grant Program.** Lysa Salsbury and Beckah MillerMcPhee made a presentation to Senate regarding implementation of a large grant received by the Women’s Center to address violence on campus. They are approaching the end of year one of the grant - the planning year; and, are moving into year two - the implementation year. Their goals are to:

1. engage the entire campus in violence prevention efforts,
2. reduce sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking on campus, and
3. provide effective and timely intervention.

The grant will focus specifically on ensuring that their services are accessible to multi-cultural students, LGBTQ students and international students. As indicated, they have just finished the strategic plan for the grant implementation. As part of that process, they created a team of 45 representatives from across campus, including faculty representatives Liz Brandt and Erin Chapman.

One part of the grant implementation is to develop an effective bystander intervention program that is evidence based. In response, the Green Dot program has been implemented on campus. This year the Women’s Center is developing an overview of Green Dot training specifically for faculty and staff. They are also focusing on implementing Green Dot at the university’s educational centers outside Moscow. Regarding implementation at locations off the Moscow campus, they are working on both online training and travelling to the centers to provide face-to-face training and support.

They need faculty help. Faculty are encouraged to attend a Green Dot overview or ask for a Green Dot overview at their unit’s faculty meeting. Green Dot trainers will work around schedules and tailor the overview to the needs of the unit. The overview includes information about the training students are receiving as part of the program, but also covers how faculty can respond to situations involving the possibility of violence.

In addition to the information sessions, there are other opportunities to support the program. Faculty are invited to participate in the full Green Dot training. Faculty can also help support a culture on campus that is focused on ending interpersonal violence by including a statement such as the following in their syllabi or on their course pages:

“I support Green Dot and violence prevention efforts across campus. My classroom and office are safe places. Please know you will be supported and heard if you have experienced any form of violence. Also, know you are not alone:
Any communication can go a long way to getting the message out and providing access to services.

A senator pointed out that participating in Green Dot training can trigger difficult reactions in people who have experienced sexual assault. Such individuals cannot opt out of the mandatory ASUI Green Dot training without revealing they have been victimized. He asked whether changes can be made in the training to address this issue. MillerMcPhee pointed out that the training is evidence-based and, therefore, cannot be changed. She stated that they recommend that Green Dot training be voluntary to avoid this issue. She also pointed out that the training is more effective if individuals participate voluntarily.

A senator also asked if the Green Dot trainers have reached out to Intra-fraternity Council (IFC) and Pan-Hellenic about training. MillerMcPhee responded that they have reached out and that Greek houses are responding and organizing training. The senator followed up by asking whether an incentive could be developed to increase participation. MillerMcPhee responded that she would follow up on this with the senator.

A senator asked if students had been considered for the grant committees. MillerMcPhee responded that they welcome student participation and have reached out through ASUI. In response to another question, MillerMcPhee indicated that the grant organizers were collaborating with the International Programs Office to offer Green Dot training to international students. The chair asked whether we are a particularly violent campus. MillerMcPhee responded that the level of violence at our campus is typical of peer institutions. Another senator commented that she was uncomfortable about including the recommended language in her syllabus because she is not an expert at responding to interpersonal violence issues. MillerMcPhee encouraged faculty to adapt the suggested language to fit individual approaches. Letting students know where they can access safe places is crucial. MillerMcPhee also advocated that faculty let students know that we must report information that comes to us regarding interpersonal violence. The chair emphasized the importance of faculty making statements on these issues, recently communicated at the President’s retreat indicates that faculty support and availability is crucial to student success.

Center for Teaching and Learning: Introduction of Brian Smentkowski – the inaugural director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL). Director Smentkowski presented his goals for CETL:

- Collaborate with faculty to design transformative educational experiences that improve the lives and learning of our students through innovative and often collaborative teaching and research.
- Offer expert consultation and programming on diverse teaching and learning strategies customizable to all instructional modalities, learning environments, fields of study, and UI campus locations. Smentkowski stressed that whether online, in the classroom, the field, or abroad, CETL have the expertise and resources to help faculty create significant learning experiences.
- Provide specialized training and leadership in course and curriculum design, learning assessment techniques, peer observation of instruction, mentoring, educational development research, and the scholarship of teaching, learning, and engagement.
- Support robust BBLearn usage, with a focus on how technology can be used to enhance learning in all classes. In addition to BBLearn, CETL will provide further support collaborative inquiry and innovation in teaching and learning through the use of new, emerging, and existing technologies.
- Strive for diversity, inclusion, responsiveness, and transparency in all aspects of our programming.
Smentkowski invited faculty to help the center identify and support what faculty need to succeed as teachers and scholars and to collaborate on shaping the mission of CETL.

A senator asked if CETL might consider offering a workshop on teaching diverse students. Director Smentkowski answered that this type of workshop is what CETL aspires to offer. He is working on becoming more familiar with the university’s needs and culture as part of developing such programming.

A senator asked whether CETL will be working to support TAs to make them effective teachers. Smentkowski has met with Dean McMurray about how CETL can provide support for TAs. He will also be working with Vice Provost Hendricks regarding how to best support TAs.

In response to a question regarding how CETL will foster the development of an “e-campus”, Director Smentkowski indicated that he will be working with new staff in the enrollment management unit on these issues. He believes his role will be to support the learning process through such programs. Provost Wieneck agreed with the senator and Director Smentkowski that the university must do a better marketing e-campus strategy. His vision is that this strategy would include not only traditional marketing, but also identifying appropriate opportunities for expanding online programs to ensure students in such programs are well supported. Another avenue for expanding our footprint in offering high quality programs online is to partner with for-profit firms. The university currently has an RFP out seeking such partners. These for-profit programs tend to focus on certain types of fields and the university must work on both its internal strategies and external partnerships.

A senator commented that he appreciated the breadth of the vision for CETL and appreciated that CETL would work with faculty in individual departments to facilitate engagement in teaching.

A senator asked whether the CETL workshops will be available at a distance and how to sign up for them. Director Smentkowski indicated that the announcements and registration information for the CETL workshops are sent to all faculty. Many of the workshops are available through Zoom. He has begun working with the centers on how to deliver workshops on the distant campuses in person, including the possibility of designating specific days for workshops, and leveraging technology in creative ways.

A senator indicated that CETL should consider sending workshop info to staff who also teach and for whom the workshops would be valuable. Director Smentkowski noted that he uses the term faculty to include anyone who gets in front of a room of students. He would also include faculty members who are not directly instructional. A senator asked if Director Smentkowski anticipates getting involved in discussions about teaching and learning spaces and environments on campus. He is looking forward to such involvement as the space and environment for teaching impacts learning.

The presentation from Vice Provost Jeanne Stevenson will be rescheduled for a future meeting.

A motion to adjourn (Morrison/Kern) was made and the meeting was adjourned at 4:53 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary & Secretary to the Faculty Senate