Regular Meeting #1787
UNI Faculty Senate
Jan. 23, 2017 (**3:30-4:25 p.m.**)
Scholar Space (Room 301), Rod Library
SUMMARY MINUTES

1. Courtesy Announcements

No members of the press present.

Interim Provost Bass thanked Faculty Senate members during her last Senate meeting noting that Provost Wohlpart will return to **the next meeting, February 27**. She shared news that the campus-wide Student Learning Outcomes Committee will start in February and include: Co-chairs Scott **Peters** & Jeff **Funderburk**; Susan **Roberts-Dobie** (COE/LACC) John **Ophus** (CHAS) Lisa **Jepsen**, Avery **Johnson** (student perspective) Kristin **Moser**, institutional research. It will report back to Senate later this spring.

Faculty Chair **Kidd** reminded member of the **UNI at the Capitol Day on February 13**. It was decided that no Faculty Senate meeting will be held that day.

Faculty Senate Chair **Gould** and Vice-Chair **Walter** shared information about the use of a Consent Agenda for routine Senate business, and their desire to use Senate time to discuss stimulating topics of academic interest such as tenure, and firearms on campus and in addition to curricular issues.

2. Consideration of Docketed Items

1317/1208 Revisions to Curriculum Handbook - Fall 2016

** Passed. (**O'Kane/Cooley**)

https://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/revisions-curriculum-handbook-fall-2016

3. Adjournment (**Pike/Zeitz**)

NEXT MEETING: Monday, <u>February 27</u>, 2017 at 3:30 p.m. Scholar Space (LIB 301)

Full transcript of 30 pages with 0 addendum follows.

FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI Faculty Senate Meeting #1786
January 23, 2017 (**3:30 – 4:25 p.m.**)
Scholar Space (Room 301), Rod Library

Present: Senators Ann **Bradfield**, John **Burnight**, Russ **Campbell**, Seong-in **Choi**, Kerri **Clopton**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Lou **Fenech**, Chair Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tom **Hesse**, Ramona **McNeal**, Steve **O'Kane**, Amy **Petersen**, Joel **Pike**, Jeremy **Schraffenberger**, Gloria **Stafford**, Secretary Jesse **Swan**, Vice-Chair Michael **Walter**, Leigh **Zeitz**. Also: Interim Provost Brenda **Bass**, Associate Provosts Nancy **Cobb** and Kavita **Dhanwada**, Faculty Chair Tim **Kidd,** NISG Representative Avery **Johnson**.

Not Present: Bill **Koch**.

Guest: Chad **Christopher**.

Gould: Okay, I'm going to call this meeting to order. Good afternoon. I hope you're all doing well on this lovely Monday. I'll start our meeting off with a call for press identification. No press are present so I am going to move on to comments from Interim Provost **Bass**.

Bass: Good afternoon. I wanted to give you an update and then say thank you for working with me so well. This will be my last Senate meeting in the Provost role so I want to say that I've appreciated working with all of you—some of you more extensively on certain pieces of Senate business. But it's been a pleasure. An update though, before I slide out of the office and Jim (**Wohlpart**) slides back in: The campus-wide Student Learning Outcomes Committee has been constituted and they'll be meeting for the first time later this week. I took input from a lot of different folks on campus as well as listened carefully to the feedback I got from this group, and so I'll let you know who is on it. It is going to be co-chaired by

Scott **Peters** who is representing CSBS and Jeff **Funderburk** who is representing the Humanities and Arts side of CHAS, and also both of these individuals have a lot of experience with assessment and the Assessment Council. Susan **Roberts-Dobie** will be representing the College of Education as well as the LACC. John **Ophus** will be representing CHAS from the sciences side. Lisa **Jepsen** will be representing CBA, and Avery **Johnson**—our own Avery, he'll be there to provide a student perspective, as well as someone who sits in with this body as well as the LACC. And then Kristin **Moser** will be on it, as she is in Institutional Research because she's our campus-wide HLC point-person, and so she's a good resource in terms of HLC requirements, as well as measurement that's already going on, on campus. Questions about that? They'll be commencing, we'll be officially giving them their charge later this week, but they've already been told that it will be important to get feedback from relevant constituencies on campus and they'll be reporting back to this body a little bit later this spring. So if no questions, I will again say thank you for working with me over this time, and I'll turn it back over. [Applause]

Gould: We will miss you very much. Next, comments from Faculty Chair **Kidd**.

Kidd: Nothing. I'm glad the ice is gone, and I'm getting set up for UNI day at the Capitol. It's going to be next month. I'll be asking for you to represent UNI at the State Legislature February 13.

Gould: Vice Chair **Walter** and I will both be making comments today. While the responsibility of Faculty Senate primarily focuses on educational policy and curriculum, it's also the faculty's duty to consider all matters that come before it from a point of view of the welfare of the entire University and the State. Now,

more than ever we need to be proactive on discussing interesting matters that could have a potential impact on everyone from faculty to students to education in general at the national level and at the state level. So, Vice-Chair **Walter** and I will be bringing forth a proposal to change the procedures, so that routine matters like approving the minutes, approving emeritus requests, scheduling consultative sessions, what have you---can be approved through a consent agenda, so that we can have more time to discuss issues like diversity and inclusion, guns on campus, the bill to abolish tenure, and what have you. I will let Vice-Chair **Walter** chime in.

Walter: We've been teaming up on this, being encouraged by various administrators to make this body a little bit more interesting. Sorry. It gets around that sometimes this can be a little bit boring in here, and we would like to discuss things that are philosophically if not academically interesting for all of us. And I think looking at the tenure bill that I understand probably won't even come out of committee, but the fact that this comes up means that the general tax-paying public doesn't understand what tenure is. I think we have nods. Most people don't really realize how important that is to the academy and to teaching and learning generally. The diversity and inclusion statements are now posted on the Senate page and we've been working on the verbiage in that, and so to have extended discussions in here about those items I think are a whole lot more important and interesting than just bickering about procedure. We do have to operate under Roberts Rules of Order, but I think we can dedicate or free up more time to work on things that are a little bit more engaging.

Gould: Thank you Vice-Chair **Walter**. Any questions or comments?

Swan: Of course this is the first I've heard of this. You can schedule any kind of meetings you want as the Chair, and not always have regular meetings. The regular meetings are outlined in the Constitution and the By-Laws. Why are you thinking that it's important to have in regular meetings of the Faculty Senate, which is supposed to be devoted mostly to curriculum, and other important matters, freed up when you have infinite amounts of time to have other kinds of meetings that you want?

Gould: I'm just thinking instead of docketing every single thing, especially routine things individually, if we can do it as a consent agenda, and if there's something that's a concern or what have you, we can pull that out. But that would save us some time on docketing everything individually.

Walter: Also to follow up, I don't know where this expression, "infinite amounts of time" comes from. That makes no sense at all. We already have enough meetings, mostly to get through our business. Sometimes we run a little past five; sometimes we run a little short. So that tells me that we are inherently kind of flexible, and if we can take our regular meetings and make them more interesting, or attempt that---see how that works, I think it's justified.

Swan: You can have the meeting time, and just not a regular Senate meeting. You can have any other kind of meeting you want in the regular Senate meeting time and talk about anything you want or do other things; have deliberative sessions with the whole faculty, et cetera. I don't know why you can't already do that. Secondly, this body last year, or the year before, deliberated upon some of these specific proposals such as for example, the emeritus status. I remember you

[refers to **Walter**] speaking against making emeritus status routine; just being able to expedite it. Now, of course one can change one's views. But we did it, the whole committee looked at it, discussed the pros and cons. Everyone decided then not to make that kind of thing routine, and to remind ourselves that we have other ways of having meetings other than regular Senate meetings. Again, this is the first that this has been mentioned, and I'm just having these initial responses.

Gould: That's why I'm bringing it up in my comments.

Pike: Honestly, I like the idea. My experience with a consent agenda is that any item can be pulled from the consent agenda at the request of any member that wants further discussion. And assuming no member...that those items that don't get pulled for additional discussion per individual request can be dealt with quickly, and then we can move on. I guess I'm not sure why that would be an issue. If we can put those kind of things in a consent agenda, they get pulled for further discussion, or they can just be dealt with and then we have more time.

Gould: So we'll be exploring this.

Walter: Operationally, I think we bundle some things for quick passage if there's no objection, and we split off other items for lengthy discussion, or whatever kind of discussion. Is that fairly clear? Has everyone got that? The word consensus actually means something else, but in here is there a particular majority that we have to have to pass it?

Gould: In general, or to pass changing the procedures?

Walter: To pass an item; to pass bundled items.

Gould: Not that I've found. I haven't had time to look into it too deeply. With that, I will move on to the only item on the docket for today. Docket Number 1208, Revisions to the Curriculum Handbook from the Fall of 2016. I am going to hand the keyboard and the floor over to Associate Provost **Dhanwada** and she can talk us through these.

Dhanwada: Thank you. As you know, we are in an annual cycle. I think I say this every time, and so it allows us actually to take a look at this handbook as we go through UCC and GCCC and think about what are the procedures. Are there any roadblocks? Are there things slowing us down? What are some of the issues that we see, and should they be changed and should they be put in the handbook? So, that has now become a process that we've been doing for the last two years. So we did put it, and I did want to walk you through. Many of these are more clarifications. But I will point out the ones that we actually put in for some of the reasons for the one-year cycle. So, this you'll see: We'll come to the end to Appendix A, where there's a lot of highlighting. It's because they've changed their names, so some of this is just to reflect that. This is our general curriculum review process diagram. The highlighting is again to show the months where now if we want something that we've been talking about at UCC to actually go into effect the next curriculum year, we need to bring things much sooner to the Faculty Senate, because we need to complete our internal governance approvals before we can take it out externally, which would be if it's for a new program. The Iowa Coordinating Council or if it's dropping a major---whatever it is, to the Board of Regents. So we can't go outside until we get the internal approval, and if we don't get those early on in the process, then basically we miss our deadline for the external. So that's why some of this stuff is coming and I'll explain a little bit

more. This is just the changes in the months. I'll explain. There's kind of a text where I can go through it. So I'm going to scroll until I see yellow. This is just a name change. Here, we've added this sentence. Basically, one of the things we were finding is when we had our UCC and GCCC meetings, when we needed representatives, because when we're talking about proposals, departments would not send somebody. So this becomes very problematic for us as we're discussing these things in order, and we have time frames that we discuss. And if we don't have representatives, and we have questions, we basically are stuck there. And so then we have to come back. And so we are saying that you really need somebody there, and if you don't have somebody, you're going to go to the end of the line. We're going to move on, and we'll call you back, but if you're not there when we've told you that you need to be there, then basically---go to the end of the line because we just had several things happen.

Swan: Do you want to take questions as you go?

Dhanwada: Yes. That might be better.

Swan: Right here, are you scheduling specific times for the representatives? That seems like that would be legitimate.

Dhanwada: We do.

Swan: It's not just come every time…

Dhanwada: I try to make it a little earlier than later, so that you're actually there early, and so I will say that conversations can go on, and so you're waiting a little bit. We try to get everything…

Swan: …You would be seen in that meeting?

Dhanwada: Yes. The problems were when we didn't have people there, and that's what we were talking about.

Swan: Related to this, when proposals go through, in the consultation process, there are often flags by other areas of campus. Are those people invited at the same time to come and discuss the issues they see in another department's proposal?

Dhanwada: We do say that this is being discussed. Usually we go through a College, and so generally it's associated within a College. If we see on there--- you'll see one of the other things we've added is consultation forms. So that's another thing. We are now requiring consultation forms to be added. So if we see a negative result, we will ask that person to come or say "have you worked this out?" At least we know what's going on. With consultations, yes. That would be an extra form.

Swan: And that's very good. It seems like this committee would be the one to try to resolve those kinds of issues.

Dhanwada: That's correct.

Swan: Good. Thank you.

O'Kane: At the last spot where you had a yellow highlight, you had September highlighted for Faculty Senate?

Dhanwada: September, yes.

O'Kane: I just want to check because does that in fact mean we have the entire month?

Dhanwada: You do. I mean because we generally try to get this going through September. I have November here. I prefer not to go into November, because if we have four or five things that we need to discuss, like last time when we had the proposals, it goes longer so I'd like to bring them up earlier than later, because then we can have that discussion.

O'Kane: So November is actually dropping off of that?

Dhanwada: Off of? Yes. I left it on there because I should probably change that to October. That should be changed to September/October. Not November. November is very late.

O'Kane: It seems like we had quite a bit of pressure in September.

Dhanwada: Yes, and I'll talk...I'll show you a big highlighted text when I talk about timelines. I'll just go through that with you.

Swan: Can I follow up on that? I remember problems when it was for the previous year, and it really did seem like it was being slipped in, in the last minutes and that's when the Faculty Senate and elsewhere got upset.

O'Kane: It did.

Dhanwada: Yes, and that was our first year. We had 13 proposals that had to go for external review, and we were very late. The catalog didn't get published until June because things were not going because we didn't go through it. But, we also

had lots of things. I totally understand, and sometimes that happens. This time I was trying to go we had three new programs, and those were basically all we had and so I wanted to try to introduce them and talk about them early, so that you can have that discussion, and even having the discussion we don't miss our deadlines. That's my impetus for trying to discuss. Again, I will show you that big piece of text that I put in. Lots of highlights. I just kind of scroll through and this just outlines the functions of the different levels as we go through curriculum, departments, and the deans and so forth, and the college curriculum committees, the Senates, and the University Curriculum Committee. We added "that have University-wide impact" to say that this is something that at that University level, we're talking that will affect across the University. So we just wanted to be a little bit more clarifying in that statement, and that's what was added.

O'Kane: This isn't what's known as the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee?

Dhanwada: Because UCC actually goes over everything—also the Graduate curriculum.

O'Kane: Number Three.

Dhanwada: And here we've got Graduate levels too as it goes on. There's GCCC. We do both, but really the fine tooth, the fine-looking at it is with the GCCC. A lot of the issues that do come up at that level are…if there are issues, it's stopped at that level. We never see it, but then those things that actually pass, go through Graduate Council, and then it comes through Faculty Senate.

Swan: Doesn't UCC really only concern itself with anything Graduate when it's cross-listed?

Dhanwada: We do. And that's what this…

Swan: Not dissertation requirements or anything like that? That's GCCC?

Dhanwada: GCCC is more of the curricular type of thing. If it's thesis dissertation requirements and so forth, the Graduate Council is looking at those kind of requirements and levels.

Swan: And they have the credentials to decide about that, whereas people on the UCC might not. So they're not supposed to be making those decisions.

Dhanwada: We really do look at the 3,000 - 5,000, and that's what we put a little bit more to clarify here. Here's the Office of the Provost and Vice President. So here's a little bit of the changes that we have because of this year turnaround and the need to go a little bit faster. Talking with the Board representative, the Academic Officer, Diana **Gonzalez**, I had to get all this straight, because there are things that are changing, and so basically what we have, if we have a new program per se, and say, "Oh, we want to offer a new program," like we did, what we have to do is we have to get it approved by the Iowa Coordinating Council, which are representatives of all of the higher education institutions in the state of Iowa. So we have to put this out there. It's a list serve, so anybody can comment. It has to be on that list serve for 20 days. If somebody comments, we have to respond, and it has to stay on the list serve for 30 days---business days. We have that as something that we are required to do. After it goes through ICCPHSE (Iowa Coordinating Council for Post High School Education), then we can send it forward to the Board of Regents. It's not really the Board of Regents; it has to go to the

Council of Provosts. Following approval by ICCPHSE, then that goes to the Board of Regents who then puts it on the Council of Provosts' agenda. These meetings are not all in one; they're multiple. So then, once it's on the Council of Provosts' agenda, it's discussed there, and if approved, it can then be moved to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee. This name---it was just a name change. It used to be Education and Student Affairs, so we decided to change the name there. So then it goes to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee. There we talk about it---the Provosts talk about the programs. It then has to be approved by that committee, and then it goes to full Board, where it basically has to be approved. So there's multiple steps in trying to get something through. Last year I was panicked because they wanted to uncouple the Academic Student Affairs Committee and the full Board meeting. If they did that, then I would have had to wait longer before getting approval. But, my understanding is that they're not going to do that and so basically we've always had the Academic Student Affairs Committee.

Bass: But did you see that they, the Board of Regents will be waiting until the following Board of Regents meeting before they act on anything that comes out of the committees?

Dhanwada: Yes. It's still split, so it's still a problem. Basically what we had had was If it got approved in ASAC, then it could go immediately the next day to the full Board, and it could be approved, so we would be like, "Yay—one shot." But now it's so…

Bass: It's what they said.

O'Kane: Who's 'they'? The Board of Regents?

Bass: The Chair of the Board of Regents said it in the press.

Dhanwada: Oh. I didn't see that.

O'Kane: So maybe we can ask him to change his mind.

Walter: Is that official record or was it just in the press?

Bass: My understanding is that it took place in a meeting. I was simply reading about it in the press. I don't mean to imply that the Board of Regents aren't following protocol.

Walter: I just wondered how valid the comment was.

Bass: What they said was, since not all the Regents attend each of the committee meetings, it's typically the Regents that are on those committees that attend, that they want to allow enough time for all of the Regents to read the minutes from the meeting and be able to comment or follow up with discussion before they vote on it.

Dhanwada: Okay. That just adds to it.

Kidd: You have to have this on their list serve, so many months in advance, I thought? Or did they change that?

Dhanwada: It's not months. This is a little different. So if we want a new program, what we want to do is they have a list---the Board of Regents has something called a Program Planning List. So we have to get that on six months in advance. That's for a new…hopefully, I am on the ball and I tell these people, "If you're thinking about it…I ask the deans every April and say, "Do you have any new

programs that you've talked about, because we need to put it on the list?" So then what they can do is if they are talking about it, we put it on the list and they'll start talking about it, put it through curriculum the following February to Leapfrog and so forth. So it won't be…It will be on the program for six months, and on that list for six months. ICCPHSE is a little bit different. It's on there. We've met it. It's gone through Leapfrog and the College Senates have approved it. It has not yet gone through UCC, but we're getting all the paperwork ready so once it gets through we can try to send it over to ICCPHSE and get that going.

Kidd: That's for majors obviously. Is that for minors also or certificates?

Dhanwada: No. No minors. No certificates. Just new majors. But, there are other things besides new programs. So certain changes such as new programs, dropped or suspended programs, department or program changes. So for example, KAHHS went through a name change, so that would be something. If you change a major name change, it has to go through there. If it's a department name change, Earth and Environmental Science changed their name. If you drop a program, a major, you've got to go through the Board. Not a minor or certificate, but those things. They all have to go through, and they have to all be put on the Council of Provosts' agenda and all of this. So they all have to be approved by Faculty Senate before I can take it forward to the Board of Regents. So again, I come back to---I'm trying to---and why do we want to do that? Why did we go to the annual cycle? It's because we want to try to get it into the next curriculum cycle. And if we miss the Board of Regents deadlines, we're not going to be able to incorporate it, and we have to wait another year. So that's the reasoning behind it. That's the thing. That's what my explanation is, and I put that in there. Any questions about

it?

Swan: I don't have a question, but I would just say that the benefit of going to the year cycle is that if you do miss it, you wait <u>only</u> a year, instead of having to wait two years. I say that because I think it makes things worse than they were, if we think of it the other way, that "no, I've got to wait a year." Because we really were trying to make it so that you never had to wait <u>two years</u>. And that's what happened.

Dhanwada: I'll give you an example that happened the year that—two years ago when we had six new programs. I think it was in the College of Business, the Supply Chain Management. This was going from an emphasis to a major, because they had so many students that were so interested in it. We were going up in to April, May, June, and so it was like "No, you cannot." Because you cannot advertise. You cannot say "We have a new major." You cannot do anything. So what happens is that you lose recruiting, and you lose that time. So, for certain things like dropped majors, that's not a big deal. But when you're trying to think about introducing a new major, and trying to recruit for that, we do want to get that. And so the year would make a difference.

Swan: Yes. It would make a difference, but it wouldn't be **two** years that you're waiting, so that's a benefit.

Dhanwada: That's true. I agree with you there. This is my attempt to be…I've got color coding here. This is a paint update every year. I'm not going to go through all of this because it's pretty much the same. I just changed the years, so I'm not going to go through that. I do have three catalog cycles, and what we should be

doing. I do have that, and I've updated it. That's what that is. All the purple is for 1920 actually. This is our circular diagram of the chart that I just showed you; a little bit easier to follow. I thought we corrected it, but this is not grammatically correct. We just try to make it as clear as possible, and so we'll go back and redo some of that stuff. We added it in red because I couldn't get highlighting on this no matter how hard I tried. So, that's why it's in red here. We're just kind of going through. What I would like to do, I asked Chair **Gould** if I could have a consultative session with you all to talk about this process, and to talk about how we're actually going through it. This fall I did talk to each of the Colleges, and had the Senate Chairs and all of those that are involved in curriculum to go through this and talk about what's available on the Provost's website in terms of curriculum resources and so forth. So I would like to, if I could, do that presentation. So, a little bit later, so I'm not going to spend the time right now---I could if you'd like me to---to talk about that process and how we go through it. This talks about that whole process. Let's see. Other changes? Here we changed names of the consultation forms because they were very, very confusing. Not just the consultation forms, but all of the forms and we renamed them. We just needed to update it in here, so that's what that is. Going back to what Senator **Swan** was talking about in terms of consultation, so one of the big issues that we had was that departments weren't attaching their consultation to their proposals. So when we would discuss at UCC or GCCC, "What is this? Is it Approved? They should really have a consultation? Why don't they have it? What's going on?" So we would be—my office would be searching, calling, and trying to get consultations before the meeting. It was very stressful. I don't know if I got all of them, right? And so what we really are going to do this year, this February 15th when Leapfrog

opens, we are basically saying, attaching consultations is a mandatory field. You do have to put it. Even if it says, "We don't care," or "We don't mind what you're doing," We still want it because we didn't know if they didn't care, or if they didn't get it. Because we had a situation where before there was no consultation sent, and they cared. So that was a big problem. So again, it's hard to catch why a consultation is not there. So right now what we are doing is we've looked at Leapfrog. We've looked at the forms. We've updated all of those forms. So basically what you're doing is we've got hard copy forms. Leapfrog only opens once a year, February 15th and the reason for that is the old catalog cannot be removed until it is published. So that's why we can't remove it until February 15th. So then we publish the catalog, and so then we put the new catalog in. We're able to do that. So we can't open it. There's only one time you can upload. You can't upload now, when you're talking about curriculum and discussing it. You have to actually do it on the Word forms that we have. So what we've done is we've gone and made it exactly as what you would upload into Leapfrog. So, if you can complete all those forms, you're going to copy and paste it to Leapfrog. So, at this point we're saying, "You've got to have this consultation. Who are you getting? What are you doing? Make sure you have them, because you're going to upload it into Leapfrog." So, we want to make sure all departments understand that they are going to...and that's what I have told them when I've met with them in the Fall.

Swan: So the consultations---I remember getting consultations, and it would say, "You have to do this by a certain date, and if you don't then it's understood that you have no problem." But you're saying that means nothing.

Dhanwada: Right. Because some people weren't getting them.

Swan: Weren't getting them to begin with? I just assumed that the system was keeping track of what was sent and what wasn't sent.

Dhanwada: Unfortunately, Leapfrog doesn't have the capacity.

Swan: It sound like it doesn't have anything, because that's what you would want.

Dhanwada: I can't say anything about Leapfrog, because it came before I was there. So, yes. It does not have the ability to send a consultation form to where you want to send it to, unfortunately. And that's why we've got to do the whole… That's why completed consultations **must** be attached to the proposal, even if the party has no objections: So that we know that they've received it. They understand, and they're actually telling us, "No. We have no problem."

Swan: There's a way for the proposer to say this was sent on such-and-such date. Period. No response. They have a way of doing that.

Dhanwada: We do. and what I, with the consultation form, there are people. I say, "You have to be nags." The department heads are the ones that send the consultation forms to other department heads, and that then goes to their curriculum committees, or whatever, and then it goes back. So it's through the department heads. To all the department heads, I say, "You have to be a nag. You have to know what's in your curriculum, and you need to go and get consultations from those people."

Gould: Can consultations be uploaded in Leapfrog?

Dhanwada: Yes, documents can be uploaded. Now, the other thing that I said

was, "Okay, if they have no objections, and you're nagging them and they say, "I don't know where your consultation form is, I have no objections. Here's my email stating I have no objections." I said, "I'm fine. Send that email---upload that." It's again, it's not because I want that form. We just need to know that everybody's okay with what is going on, and we had too many questions.

I don't think we really made too many changes here, as you can see. We will get to…These are just form names. Okay, and so I have invited Chad **Christopher** here because he is the Secondary Ed coordinator for Educator Prep. They have changed their name, and they've also created…so this is a lot of the name changes and so forth. And so Chad (**Christopher**) had incorporated a number of these changes. So they have created a UNI Licensure Council. I'm going to let Chad (**Christopher**) talk about that, because there's a lot of yellow here, and I'd rather let him talk about it than me.

Christopher: Last summer the Provost created a position for Educator Preparation that encompasses the whole campus. Before, the graduate programs that led to licensure had operated separately than the undergraduate programs. So with the creation of Vicky **Robinson**'s position out of the Provost Office, and using the State's language of educator preparation, the position was created. And so Educator Preparation is not just the undergraduate programs, but it encompasses the graduate programs for principalship and speech pathology, and school counseling, and school library services and school psychology. So for them to get an idea of "What do we do with our curriculum?" because it has to be approved by the State, to make any kind of changes to what they're doing. What the yellow is creating: They have their own Council, Graduate Council for licensure. So any of

the programs that have graduate licensures, they have their own council. So what they'll do is submit the form through Vicky (**Robinson**) and we just check it and make sure it meets the State's requirements. They have to use that same thing. Instead of going through the undergraduate program, which the undergraduate curriculum group doesn't necessarily know anything about the graduate curriculum, there was no sense of doing that. So we have just added that whole yellow part. So they have a separate process as opposed to the undergraduate program. The undergraduate programs will still go through curriculum committee and be voted on by the undergraduate senates; the Graduate Council programs will go through Vicky (**Robinson)**. She will check it against the State, and then approve it or give some feedback that way.

Dhanwada: Those are the changes that were incorporated in this whole section. So that is pretty much it. We really didn't get into the rest of it. This was the kind of the major thing because it was the creation of this licensure council.

Swan: I don't know if I misheard, or didn't hear part of it: So the graduate part, I guess that's the last part that you were just discussing, it goes to the graduate faculty, doesn't it?

Dhanwada: Yes. This is just the licensure requirement. It still goes through the curriculum process.

Christopher: For anything undergraduate for teacher preparation, it goes through a separate curriculum process.

Swan: Okay.

Dhanwada: It goes through them additionally. It goes through the senate and then it goes through teacher preparation for the undergraduate program. So now with the graduate, it goes through senate, and it also goes through this licensure thing, and then goes through the GCCC. Whereas the undergraduate would come directly to …

Christopher: Everything has to have a consultation form.

Dhanwada: It's the same. It's just an extra step.

Swan: I just didn't hear the graduate faculty part.

Choi: Is this applicable only for graduate programs that pursue licensure?

Bass: Educator preparation licensure.

Choi: This is different from graduate programs?

Christopher: Correct.

Dhanwada: Not counseling or those kinds of things.

Gould: Any other questions or comments?

Kidd: So, going back to the calendar: It sounds like, we don't usually have a Senate meeting on the first day of class because it's always horrible, but it does make sense for docketing purposes…that's the issue, right? So it sounds like it's going to be hard to have things docketed by the last meeting in April.

Dhanwada: the thing is, I don't know if I could do it that way because we haven't gone through the UCC, so my question to you is I think this time what we did---it worked because we had it docketed at the second meeting. We didn't meet the first one, but I asked that we talk about it, and I asked that we bring it to the head

of the order, so that's the reason why I wanted to move it to the head of the docket…

Gould:… at the second meeting.

Dhanwada: At the second meeting, because I couldn't docket it at the first one so that we could actually discuss it, so that…

Swan: You can discuss matters if the chair allows it. That makes sense to me that the Chair should allow it, so you know whether or not you should docket it. You could discuss but for whatever reason you didn't. You waited until the second meeting to discuss it. But you should discuss at the calendar stage.

Dhanwada: Okay.

Swan: That makes the docket stage very easy. It just gets passed.

Pike: Would that then mean discussing things before?

Dhanwada: Yes. That's what I was just going to say because Senate meets on Monday, and UCC meets on Wednesday. We meet the first week, and we go through our things, so they're preparing the week before.

Swan: So this body…

Dhanwada: We didn't docket it, because it passed through the UCC and you docketed it at the second meeting, and I asked that we talk about it at that meeting. Yes. That's what I had asked for, but there was…So again, I just want to tell you where I'm coming from, and to explain why I am asking for that. Those are my…unless there are other questions, I'm happy to answer.

Walter: Would it be possible to basically docket this in April, and then post something that is perhaps a draft of various salient points, so people could actually see it? It would give us the entire summer. Probably no one would look at it, but I would and anything that would buy us more time.

Dhanwada: I'm hesitant to docket something in April because I really don't even know what it is because deans have to go through it. We have to look at it, so it's really no point in April to docket it. My request would be that If I can at least…UCCC meets Wednesday

Bass: Of the first week of class.

Dhanwada: Yes, of the first week of class. So if I could get that on the calendar, see then, I was asking because I needed to get it on and you all need more time and so that was my... I don't know how to do that, and so that's why I asked that it be discussed that day. But all of the information I think we had posted immediately. I think I tried to get it on there Thursday, right after my meeting. I got it up there.

Walter: So it was up there nearly two weeks?

Dhanwada: I tried. It wasn't quite two weeks, but I tired. It was as close as I could. That's why I wanted to discuss it.

Gould: Thank you.

Swan: This is on the floor. It's on the docket to approve these handbook changes, so we could just go to a vote if there's no further discussion.

Gould: That's what I was going to clarify with her. Correct.

Kidd: Is this… How do we docket this first thing? Is it going to be okay? It sounds like we're going to have something docketed and discussed the same day.

Dhanwada: Can I suggest something? I don't know if we need to decide it right now. When I go through my process with you all, maybe you guys can help me figure that out, as I go through my curriculum step-by-step thing. Is that a possibility that we can talk about how that fits?

Kidd: That sounds good.

Dhanwada: Right now, if you can approve these changes, then I can put it on our website and say, "This is approved. Follow this." I'd like to get that going, so if that would work. I'm happy because you're absolutely right. I need to figure out something that we can have these changes incorporated.

Pike: Do we need a motion to approve?

Swan: It's in the docket to be approved, so when we vote when we're done discussing, then we vote and we vote 'yes' and then it's approved, or we vote 'no' and we reject it.

Gould: Right. Anymore discussion, comments, questions? Can I have a motion to approve?

Swan: We're just voting now. The discussion's done. It's in the docket. We have the person who put it in the docket, put it in the docket to approve it.

Gould: Okay. So, all if favor, say 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstain, 'aye.' Motion

passes.

Dhanwada: Thank you.

Gould: I have a couple of miscellaneous items. One of them is February 13th we have a Senate meeting scheduled. It is also UNI Day at that Capitol. I know several of you may be going, so do we want to have a meeting on February 13th? We will not have a meeting on February 13. The second thing, how do you like meeting in the scholar space? [Voices of approval] Michael (**Walter**) and Kathy & I need to work on arrangements for next year, so we'll try to get this room for as many meetings as we can.

Walter: Hopefully we'll see things posted about the inclusions document and hopefully move on to some substantial things.

Gould: Yes.

Zeitz: With the discussions you were talking about---the other issues that are happening, I'm just wondering, what do we hope to have come from that? I think it's a really good idea that we become more educated about the issues that are out there and things like that.

Gould: Getting ahead of some of the issues coming down the pike, so we can say "We as a faculty support this, or we don't support this. Here's why." We kind of dropped on the tenure bill, but so be it. But getting out there and making a stronger representation of what we support, what we don't support, and letting the community know.

Zeitz: So we're being more proactive than reactive?

Gould: Yes.

Swan: What do you mean, we dropped on the tenure bill?

Walter: My sources indicate it's probably not going to make it out of committee, but it's good to state what that's about.

Hakes: That identical bill has been proposed verbatim. This isn't new. It's been repeatedly proposed in <u>exactly</u> the same form.

Walter: By the same committee?

Hakes: Without a word change. It's just this time that we're nervous.

Dhanwada: Times have changed.

Hakes: I'm just saying the bill is the same. It's the conditions that are different, possibly.

Walter: We have a political environment that probably justifies a little elevated concern. It's good to discuss this, because I'm sure we've all run into people outside of academics that give us grief about having tenure, a guaranteed job. But you know what? I lived like a pauper for twelve years, at the bottom of the economic scale to get here, and so it's not really recompense for that but it's a fair point. I think people generally including taxpayers generally misinterpret what tenure is about; people outside of academics.

Swan: You feel if we talk casually about it; hear more about it, they'll properly interpret what we say?

Walter: Whoever has access to the minutes of this meeting might, or they might

not.

O'Kane: Somebody over there just made a good point: **If** they read the minutes of this meeting. I have noticed in the last year that the press is never here anymore.

Gould: I noticed that too.

O'Kane: So the general public rarely hears what we have to say. My impression is that the *Courier* is so pressed; they have so few people. In fact, I dropped my subscription because there's nothing in the paper. They're not here and they should be here.

Gould: The one reporter is on the list to which the agenda is distributed. Maybe I need to follow up on that.

Pike: That doesn't mean we can't reach out, too.

O'Kane: Absolutely.

Pike: I do think it is incumbent upon us to really explain the tenets of academic freedom. Again you can tailor your arguments to say "Without tenure, you could have liberal deans demanding that you teach a liberal ideology or get fired." That's what you're trying to explain. I think it's useful sometimes to make an argument, and to explain to people who do think, "It's just a lifetime job."

Zeitz: I think more importantly than waiting for people to read our minutes, is that the idea of having these discussions is to help us become more well-informed.

Gould: Yes.

Zeitz: If we're going to be active in these sorts of things, our life is only a couple of hours inside this room per month. The idea is for us to be informed so we can go out and make things happen in the real world. As far as getting people from *Courier* and that sort of thing coming, if we think it's important for them to read our minutes, we don't put them on a list. We send them an individual invite. We say, "Here you go." We phone them. If there's nothing on there that's worthwhile, don't waste your time. But if we have something we want people to know about, then let's contact them.

Campbell: We could send out press releases if we wanted to after meetings.

Gould: Yes. We could do that.

Zeitz: Or better yet, before the meeting, say "Hey, look what we're going to talk about."

Campbell: Or both.

Walter: Not meaning to disparage this meeting, but It does get a little tedious in here some times. But I think the other thing to think about is to let people know on campus that we do discuss important things, and it might be a group to get into. You kind of have to twist arms sometimes to get people to step up to this. I think there should be people knocking down the door to come in here. It is only what---a couple of hours a week; every two weeks, and if you make it known either by press release or campus release, "We're going to talk about this," people will come with stories, and that's when things really get interesting. People will come with stories about tenure, about carrying firearms on campus. I bet you there's people out there with some stories about that. What we need in here is a little bit more intellectual activity about these things to attract people to

come to this body and to volunteer for it. It could only be an improvement.

Gould: Anybody else? Okay. Can I have a motion to adjourn? Moved by Senator **Pike**, seconded by Senator **Zeitz**. All in favor, say 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstain, 'aye.'

Adjournment 4:25