

Regular Meeting #1789
UNI Faculty Senate
Feb. 27, 2017 (3:30-4:49 p.m.)
Scholar Space (Room 301), Rod Library
SUMMARY MINUTES

1. **Press Identification:** No members of the press were present.
2. **Consultative Session** with President Mark **Nook** (3:30-4:31) (See pages 2-32)
3. **Courtesy Announcements**

Provost Wohlpart commented on the challenges and connectedness of local, State, and national issues facing UNI and four-year institutions, and encourages faculty to engage in defining scaffolded, intentional, and development student learning outcomes. He added that an early collaborative draft of the Faculty Handbook should be completed by June 2017. (See pages 32-39)

4. **Minutes for Approval:** January 9 & 23, 2017 (Hesse/Walter)

5. **Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing**

**** (O’Kane/Zeitz) 1320** Emeritus Request for Mary Elizabeth **Boes**, Social Work and Fred **Abraham**, Economics. <https://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-mary-elizabeth-boes-social-work-and-fred>

6. **Adjournment**

**** (Campbell/ acclamation)**

NEXT MEETING: (Note: Changed Location)

Monday, March 27, 2017 at 3:30 p.m.

Curriss Business Building Rooms 1 & 3

Full transcript of 41 pages with 0 addendum follows.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI Faculty Senate Meeting #1789
Feb. 27, 2017 (3:30 – 4:49 p.m.)
Scholar Space (Room 301), Rod Library**

Present: Senators John **Burnight**, Russ **Campbell**, Seong-in **Choi**, Lou **Fenech**, Chair Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Ramona **McNeal**, Steve **O’Kane**, Amy **Petersen**, Joel **Pike**, Jeremy **Schraffenberger**, Nicole **Skaar**, Secretary Jesse **Swan**, Vice-Chair Michael **Walter**, Senator Leigh **Zeitz**. Also: Associate Provosts Nancy **Cobb** and Kavita **Dhanwada**, Provost Jim **Wohlpert**, Faculty Chair Tim **Kidd**, NISG Representatives Avery **Johnson** and Tristan **Bernhard**.

Not Present: Ann **Bradfield**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Gloria **Stafford**.

Guests: UNI President Mark **Nook**, Jeff **Funderburk**.

Gould: Welcome. But one thing I have to do before that is I have to call for press identification. Is there any press here? Okay, seeing no press, I’d like to introduce our new president, Mark **Nook**. He’s going to give you some comments and then we’ll open up and have a conversation and ask questions and express our concerns.

Wohlpert: Wait a minute. You guys have concerns? [Laughter]

Nook: First of all, thank you. It’s great to be with you, and have a chance to talk a little about UNI and where we’re going, where we’ve been---those sorts of things. I’m hoping that most of this time that we have together can be Q & A, and I listen a lot more than I talk. My wife and I couldn’t be more excited to be on campus. We’re seeing a lot of just really great things going on across this campus and with our alumni, as we’ve had an opportunity to meet with them in Des Moines and in Arizona and a couple of other places as well, including the Denver airport while

we were flying out here. What we're hearing a lot about is how special this place is to students, to faculty and staff, and especially from our alumni. When I was in Denver, we were flying out, I guess I was flying out here January 8th for the opening of the legislative session and the governors' address and I ran into a young guy who had on a UNI cap and there were two women standing with him. And it turned out to be three of our students that were coming back from somewhere in Utah. From Reno---so that's Nevada [Laughter]. (I'm an astronomer, not a geographer) So I'm talking with them and I ask them what are their majors. And all three of them were from Muscatine and they were out for the wedding of another student who was from Muscatine as well. One of the young women was an education major and she was just super-excited about the opening of Schindler and it took a lot of pieces: One, she hadn't been in the building yet, so she didn't really know what the building was like yet, but she was really looking forward, number one, to having all of her classes in one building and not roaming around campus and faculty from Education can relate to that very well, as they've had to do the same thing. But, all three of them spoke about how this is such a great place to get an education. That you come in here and people expect you to work hard and get it on your own, but if you can't, and you need some help, there's someone else there, whether it's a faculty member or a staff person to tutor. Whatever it is, someone there to help you figure it out and get you on down the road, and then you help other people. So it really is a sense of community that I heard really from my very first discussions with people about this campus. One of the things that I've been doing is I meet with community members. Not necessarily alums, although many of them are, but also then with alums, and ask a set of questions, and I'd like to have that conversation with you.

One of those questions that I ask an awful lot are: What is it that we're doing right that I need to make sure I don't screw up? The other one is: What are we not doing that we could be doing? How could we add value to what we're already doing? What are the things that we should look at as our next step as we continue to march towards our 150th anniversary in about nine years. One of the things that occurred while we were in Arizona in particular was one of the gentlemen came up to me and said, "Things you're doing well---everything. Don't change a thing. This is a really solid institution. The interactions that we have with faculty and staff; the interactions across campus with other students is what made this place special. Don't change a thing." Now, the person was about my age, so I have a feeling things may have changed since his experience here, and we all know that there are challenges coming at us all the time and every year they change, but the Institution has to change. We know that. But I think that as I've listened to students, as I've listened to faculty, as I've listened to the community members and alums, sort of the overriding thing that everybody's telling me in their own special and sometimes really goofy way, is this sense of community; it's the relationship that faculty have with students, and students have with staff, and that we as employees of this Institution have with each other; is that there's this sense of community here that is described the same way it's described in the small farming community of Holstein where I grew up---where you had each other's backs, where you stood on your own two feet unless you really needed some help, or someone else needed some help. People talk about it that way. So, whatever we do as we go forward, and we have to go forward, that sense of community is something that seems to be really at the heart of everything that is the UNI experience. So I've taking to writing the word 'community' with capital

UNI [CommUNItY], usually in purple. I think that's something that I'm learning as an essential part of the experience here--that you don't hear talked about in the same way from the two flagships. The other thing that has come out as I've met with people around town and in particular around the state, is the business and community services piece. That people don't expect us to--let me just back up a little bit. When you talk about a university and you think about economic development, everybody agrees that all universities and colleges are into the workforce development business, right? We teach people to be good at their careers, their jobs---whatever that is; their professional development is what we're about. But there's also an expectation that there's something else that a university does. And it's easy to see when you start to talk about the Iowa States and the Iowas and the other research ones, that what they do is they drive economic development through their benchtop research, right? They're an active engine of innovation. So do we have an equivalent here? And we have some innovation that goes on. We have some research that goes on, but it certainly isn't what we hire people to do in the first place. It does happen, and we have some really good research going on, but the thing that I think we have going on here---that at least I've seen we have here, that you don't see at flagships and that you don't see at other comprehensives, is what's going on in the business and community services center, touching communities in every single county of this state through the---I'm always going to get it wrong---the innovative leadership program; but I don't know it anymore. Do you have it Jim? (**Wohlpart**) The one that does all the business plans and things for communities?

Several Voices: The Institute for Decision Making.

Nook: Thank you. The Institute for Decision Making. I'm going to write that one down and maybe I'll remember. But, the Tall Grass Prairie Center as well, and as you go through that whole list of advanced manufacturing---it's all about driving out things that we do here to impact the economy and more importantly, the social and cultural fabric of the State. One of the things that I've been interested in, and I want to make sure we always think about is, because people always ask about is, "How does UNI impact the economic impact of the State?" We talk a little bit about that, but we talk more about developing the quality of life. So it just isn't about making sure our students know how to go out and get a job, and do that job very well, but they're also going to engage in their communities, and they're going to be the ones that step forward and volunteer. They are going to be the ones that get engaged in things away from work as well. It's equally important for us to ask the community, "What do you need from UNI?" That we don't let them just focus on the economic piece of business growth, but that we talk about growing the cultural and social fabric of the place where we live, and the place where we live happens to be the entire state, because we are the State's only comprehensive university. So it's really important, I believe for comprehensives to be those 'stewards of place' as AASCU calls it. More importantly, "What's it like to live here?" and what's our role in making this a better place to live? And you don't have to look too far from this campus to see it in places like the Gallagher-Bluedorn and Bengston Auditorium and McLeod and the UNI-Dome. All of those are important spaces for the things that happen there. The way our students engage with the way our community engages with UNI. The way our community engages with itself. They are a part of the social and cultural fabric of the State, especially of the Cedar Valley. But I think it stretches much

beyond that because people come here for a lot of things. I was just over in the UNI-Dome meeting with Athletics leadership team and they were setting up for the Ag Show. So there were great big nitrogen containers sitting in there, and they were bringing in the full lockdown tables, and there was an Ag show going on and I know, one of my friends from Holstein is going to be there showing his Limousin cattle, or at least talking about it. Hopefully, there's none of them on that track, but he'll be there selling that in that aspect as well. The reach is really large, and it is part of the cultural and social fabric. So those are just some pretty random thoughts about the first 27 days that I've been in the office. I really would like to go back to these two questions and maybe any others that you'd like. I'd be happy to answers any questions you have, but sort of start to engage in where can UNI go? What are some things that are really important that should I understand about UNI and know as I continue to meet with people across this campus, the leadership team, people outside of Iowa. Things that I can get them to understand that they may be overlooking. I occasionally get to meet with legislators and the governor. They have some education that's needed, and so stories will help there. But then get at these questions of where can we take this University? What are some things that we can grow? What are some things we need to be careful with, because they really are the essence of UNI and what it means to be a Panther? Let me just open it up. I'll answer questions. I like to take my President's hat off a lot. It's difficult sometimes, but I'm an old faculty member, and I like to just engage in conversation. Sometimes I will talk about things that I don't necessarily think are right, but they help me understand the thinking space that we're in. So just don't hold me to some of these things. I'll tell you if I really believe it. Alright? So, the floor is open. I'd be happy to entertain

questions or thought.

Skaar: I'm Nikki **Skaar**. I'm in my sixth year here at UNI, so I was just up for tenure this year and just got my letter. Congratulations. [Applause] One of the things that I've noticed, and I'm an alumnus, too. I got my master's degree here. Now that I'm here and I'm in College of Education, and I'm a school psychologist by training and I teach in the School Psych program, and one of the things I've noticed with regard to the statehouse, is that often times I see them going to Iowa and Iowa State for expertise, and not necessarily to UNI. We have lots of great expertise here. We have amazing faculty and people---really, really smart people. I don't know if that's a historical thing. I'm an Iowan so I know the history of the three universities in growing up just south of here. How do we as a great university with lots of really smart people who are also community engaged---I think that we have that step up from maybe some of the faculty at Iowa State and Iowa---that we also see the community.

Nook: Right.

Skaar: So for us in education, we're out in schools on a regular basis. That's where I was today, and so I see what's out in the schools, but I also have that hat of an academic. How do we shop our wares at the statehouse to get us more involved with policy making? That we're at the table having conversations with legislators and policy makers? I can send my letters and all of that stuff, but how do we have more face-to-face, and not just with our Cedar Valley people, but with the State as a whole? I think that's one thing that we could do better, because we have such great, I think, opportunities to say things that maybe the other two don't.

Nook: I think you're absolutely right. There's a couple of ways to kind of get at that. One is the role that people like myself play and Mary **Braun** plays, as people who can walk into the statehouse and get an audience with people to let them know what's going on here; ask them what they're working on, and try to find what issues they've got, and then come back and say, "Look, we've got somebody that knows that stuff. Let's get them involved." Right? I think the other is making them aware of what is going on at BCS. (Business & Community Services) And I realize this is one example, but they've got such a broad swath of academic disciplines that they work with, and they touch so much of the State, that just about every legislator's district; every legislator's district has been touched by them, right? They don't know it exists. I found that out already. We've got some line item budgets in there, but they don't know what they do. It's been kind of eye-opening to start to talk to them, and I think positioning that work that we all do, and it's easy to talk about it, because it's labeled BCS, right? But that we all do in working with communities, schools, businesses, industry, social support networks---you name it. Having them think of us in that hands-on applications of knowledge, is the thing that will get them to think about it, right? And to see that aspect of what we do equal to that research component that Iowa and Iowa State have. So I'm trying to drive that message to them. A few of them didn't realize it, that I've talked to already, including the House majority leader. Those are just things that we've got to educate them all the time, because some of them are only there for two years and then they're gone and then you've got another set. You've got to just keep on the message. I think one of the things that helps is getting more and more of what we do into the media as well, and more and more of them are on social media. So the more that departments can simply get a

department Facebook site, Twitter account—whatever it is and get some of that stuff out, and then get these people to follow it. We can all help. Mary (**Braun**) in particular can help the legislators to follow it, especially if we're working in their district.

Wohlpart: I guess what I would ask is If you all see something that's coming up and you want to be involved, please send us an email and let us know that because we do have the contacts and we could make calls and make suggestions.

Nook: Absolutely.

O'Kane: Welcome.

Nook: Thank you.

O'Kane: I'm Steve **O'Kane**. I'm in Biology and I've been here long enough to where I recall a time when our officers did not even carry guns. You had mentioned this feeling of community, and how important it is, and I think you hit the nail right on the head. That is really one of our absolutely top attributes. And I remember back then, the place felt a little bit--- a little bit more like Mayberry, where the sheriff didn't even have a gun and Barney had one bullet, and it was in his pocket. [Laughter]

Nook: Right.

O'Kane: And there was a bit of a shake-up. There were changes in how people perceived the community. Are we really the sort of people that need other people with guns walking around? I guess we've grown past that. But as you know, there's a bill in the legislature that would legalize concealed weapons on campus.

I'm very concerned that that will be another yet another kind of major shift in how we feel about others. I'm wondering if you can address what's going on with that? What you guys are speaking to the legislature? If it passes, what sorts of things do we need to be talking about?

Nook: Yes. We have been talking with the legislature about it. The Board of Regents has come out opposed to it, which took them a little while, but they are opposed, and I'm happy to see that out there. I was meeting with legislators the beginning of last week, and even when I met with the Republican legislators--- especially when you meet with the Republicans, right? Because they're the ones that are really going to decide this, to drive that message home that this is a really bad idea, and talk about several things: One of them is the experience I had in Montana. Montana brought up a similar bill in the last legislative session. They only meet once every other year, which is really a sane way to run government. [Laughter] They meet for 90 days every other year. I told them they need to turn that around: Meet for 2 days every 90 years, and I'll be real happy. [Laughter] But what Montana did is the bill came up, and the person that stopped it was the Speaker of the House who was also the Republican Party chair, and he said, "This isn't our business. The constitution gives the operation of the universities to Board of Regents. Let them run their universities," and it stopped. I was talking to several key Republican legislators including the Majority Leader in the House about just that. That there are issues here. One: You need to let the Regents do their job, or you're walking all over your state constitution, and you are a party that says you love the constitution, right? So respect it. But then, two, some of the issues with having guns on our campus. The one that sort of seemed to speak to them, and I was a little bit surprised, is that if there is an incident on campus,

like a Virginia Tech, when the S.W.A.T. team comes in, how do you identify the good from the bad? What I was worried about was they would say, “If you had guns on campus---concealed weapons on campus at Virginia Tech, it never would have gone as far as it had because someone would have taken him out.” I think they all know they don’t really have evidence for that. The other thing I was reminding them about, and this gets delicate, is that you’re always on our back about the level of sexual assault on our campus, and the level of mental health and helping us deal with that. You want to throw guns into that mix? I just ask them that. Those are the sorts of things, kinds of conversations that we’re trying to have. There is a huge Second Amendment movement kind of going across this country, but there’s also this other piece of “Gee, what’s going on on campus?” and “Are they really safe places?” I’m not sure this makes them safer. I’m not clear where this will go. I think it was very helpful that the Board came out and said, “This is a really bad idea.” I just at the moment don’t know whether it will come through the funnel this week or not. A lot of things get thrown out this week.

O’Kane: If it does get passed? We’re going to have some kind of...

Nook: We’re going to have to think about things. One of the things that we’ve done in two different states to kind of slow some of this up. A lot of the conversation that these other states—one is Wisconsin, the other is Montana, was that so many students are in shooting sports, whether that’s hunting or whether it’s skeet, trap; those sorts of things. In Montana, just going out and shooting at whatever they can find—literally. It’s target practice on bottles laying on the ground. It happens a lot. What we did in both of those cases was create an

on-campus armory, so that students weren't storing these guns in their cars, and weren't trying to bring them into residence halls or anything like that. We gave them a place where they could safely keep their weapons on campus without having to have them keep them in cars or in a residence hall or sneak them into a residence hall, which was against Board policy. I don't know if that's the right thing to do here or not. I haven't heard that this is a conversation around access to their fire arms for the hunting season, or shooting sports or things of that sort, so I'm not convinced yet that it's something we need to look into. And with this many students, it could be really expensive to put an armory together that would be big enough to handle it. But, it was a way to slow them down.

Campbell: I was going to follow-up on Nicole's (**Skaar**) comment or question. Your response was I believe the Graduate College maintains an index of faculty expertise, and the Library is working on getting it up there, and faculty are not always that responsive to getting up-to-date information. Your suggestion was if we see an issue we want to comment on, we should contact you. You will forward it. It's better to have an accurate index of expertise so our lobbyists down in Des Moines who may see something long before it comes into the paper, and says "Here's a person who can attack it." Or they can contact this person and say, "You want to attack it?" So you could have thrown the onus back at us saying, "Make sure those databases are up to date so we can contact you for your expertise." Because although you hire good faculty, you don't always know what the expertise is, or I've been here for 34 years and my expertise may not be where it was 34 years ago.

Nook: Mine certainly shifted. [Laughter] It's a good point. If you've got—

especially as you hear things happening, and you've got something to add to that conversation on a state level, by all means, let Jim (**Wohlpart**) and I in particular know, and we'll try to find ways to get you worked into that.

Campbell: But also make sure that our general expertise the faculty feed into the efforts either of the Graduate College and or the library so we know what expertise we have here.

Nook: Yes.

Zeitz: Hi. I'm Leigh **Zeitz**. I'm in Instructional Technology in the College of Education. One of the things I think is we need to become more global. And this doesn't mean we need to send more students out, because that isn't how we do things. It's too expensive. I think what we really need to do, is we need to look at global collaboration. Global collaboration in research. Global collaboration in the classroom. It's a whole different perspective, but it just becomes part of the way in which we do things. Where if I've got six groups, three of them might be in Korea, three of them might be here. And we look at doing things synchronously and asynchronously, connecting. I know one of the things, if we look at what the Educational Leadership program is doing, they have programs all over the world and I've taught in those classes. In fact, I had one class that I taught on Tuesdays. I taught it at six in the morning and I taught it at ten. At six in the morning I was teaching in Korea and Fiji and strange places like Texas. All of those different places. And then at ten o'clock I was doing Cairo and I was doing Germany and these kinds of connections are the things that our students and the kids of today are experiencing. And that's something we need to have as the way we do things in class. And it is, once again I want to point out, it isn't shipping anybody to

another place. And it isn't just when we talk about having an international perspective, it isn't about well we're going to pay attention to what's happening in other countries, it's actually working with other people and getting that connection.

Nook: Yes. Great example of that is the recent example is the symphony concert that occurred when Rebecca **Burkhardt** brought in—it was actually two Chinese composers and a Chinese guest conductor, but it all happened because in 2013 she was over there doing the exact same thing in Chengdu, Sichuan, China. Those sorts of cultural exchanges are great but I think what you're hitting on is something that is really important. What are the possibilities of actually doing this with technology instead of having to bring students from another country here? We still want to do that—I'm not lessening that, but what's the possibility of co-teaching these, right?

Zeitz: Absolutely.

Nook: As technology improves it becomes easier and easier to do, as we build out TEAL rooms. Do you talk about TEAL rooms here? Or do you have another name for them?

Zeitz: Everything we need to do to do that kind of thing is found in Zoom. Our whole master's program is online, and in some cases our students are here in Iowa and in some cases they're around the nation.

Nook: Do we have any classrooms where there are students in the classroom and students on the wire in another country or at least in another part of the state?

Zeit: We did that back in the ICN. We don't have anything. I don't have any experience with that. I mean, what we have is we have a situation where we have connection with people no matter where they are. At one point actually, we had a project going with—a plan for a normal university in China. Unfortunately, it's not going to come through, but the process that we actually had set up was that they were going to come over here, and interestingly enough, I was going to be when we were doing our online classes, we don't do it asynchronously only. We meet for an hour and a half every week in a synchronous manner using Zoom, so we get to know each other. It turns out that when an international student comes over here, they can only take one class online per semester, because what's the sense of coming over here if you're taking your classes online? But it turns out that if they're sitting in the same room as the professor, and you're all online looking at each other through video conferencing system, that's considered being in class.

Nook: Yes.

Zeit: Face to face, and so we were actually going to be running it so that they would be in a lab with me face-to face, while all the lowans would be distance education. Those are some of the options. But I think it's really important to get that perspective. It's a difficult to thing to do. It's difficult to think that way and also then how to organize things. I think global collaboration would be an important thing for us to venture forth with.

Nook: Yes. We had a structure where we had a master's degree that was taught at two different institutions within a state. Then the requirement for licensure in this field went from a master's degree to an applied doctorate, and neither of the institutions believed they had the resources to take it to a doctoral program, but

combined they did. And so they created a shared program. Now, the two institutions were 100 miles apart, but they did this all through ITV. So UW-Stevens Point teaches half the classes to all of the students, and UW-Madison teaches half the classes to all of the students. But all the time, half the students are on the wire, right? So in Stevens Point, you have an instructor and you have a cohort of six to nine. In Madison you have a cohort of six to nine, and these students when they see their professor, these students are viewing it, but it's all synchronous. All synchronous, right? Each institution has to run their own cadaver labs. This happens to be a doctorate in audiology, so cadavers on the wire don't work very well, though the instruction can. There isn't any reason that has to be Madison and Stevens Point, that it couldn't be UNI and Beijing or Shanghai or Chengdu, right? Except the time, and making sure everything works. But it was all synchronous and the technology has gotten even better. I like setting up rooms where each student actually has not just a microphone, but a camera. And they can hook their computer up and work in pods of five or six. There might be six of these pods around a room and in another place—pick a spot in the world, there's another set of six pods and one instructor that may or may not be in either one of those rooms. But you can pop back and forth, and you're essentially one big room anymore. The only thing you can't do is go over and shake someone's hand. But every other interaction you can have. Those aren't all that expensive to set up and some companies actually like to donate the technology.

Zeit: Frankly, I can do it with this. Our laptops are good enough to get something connected like that.

Nook: You need a little bit more than that, especially when you start doing group

activities, but it doesn't take a lot more. Especially you want to teach these team building skills too as well.

Zeitz: Sure. Thank you.

Nook: Great. Thanks.

Gould: Other questions comments, concerns?

Koch: I'm Bill Koch. I'm an adjunct here. I teach writing and I'm an alumni graduated in '75, so I like to compare what was going on when I was an undergraduate with what goes on with undergraduates today and I try to shake up their world. One of the things I see is that we're not as counter-cultural as we were like in the early 70's. And we're maybe a little too outer-directed and not enough inner-directed to have the students examine the things that usually are—you know, could be part of the Liberal Arts core. We did some changing of the Liberal Arts core a few years ago and Harry Brod said, "Well, it's okay," but he doesn't see this as being visionary enough, which I picked up on. That's really something that could be something different for UNI—the LAC program. So that's what I would like to see go on in the coming years that would really be a distinctive contribution to the soul of Iowa, let's say, or the soul of the nation, since we're right pretty much in the Heartland. I would really like to see that kind of thing discussed and massaged into some kind of really visionary yet very practical curriculum.

Nook: Yes. To what extent do students talk about "getting their Liberal Arts core out of the way"?

Koch: A lot.

Nook: To what extent do faculty tell students to “get parts of their Liberal Arts core out of the way”?

Kidd: It’s significant.

Nook: So I think we’ve got a problem. When faculty start to talk about the Liberal Arts courses as something to get out of the way, you’ve probably lost your Liberal Arts core already? I don’t know that, but I have heard it from time to time. But I think you’re right. The Liberal Arts core, the Gen Ed is a curriculum piece that always ought to be on the conversation table, because it is the thing that every student walks away with and we need to ask ourselves what are those learning outcomes that we want every student, regardless of their major, to have when they leave here? And we can turn to the LEAP outcomes. Liberal education, as promised by the AACSB, the LEAP initiative outcomes, as sort of a basis to start, if we want to do that, and Jim (**Wohlpart**) and I have talked about it a little bit. I think this institution probably is ripe to do that, one because, it’s hard to really assess what we’re doing right now until we get some really good learning outcomes. I’ve been involved in general education and general education revisions for a long time. We went through them at St. Cloud State when we had to go from quarters to semesters, and we decided we’d rewrite as we did that. And we sort of did, but then we did end up redoing it. And then at Stevens Point we decided to do a ground-up rewrite of Gen Ed, because we’d gotten to the point where everybody talked about it as “just something to get out of the way.” The other problem was that depending on your major, and depending on whether or not you were a B.A. or a B.S., your Gen Ed was somewhere between 35 and 65 credits. But it depended on whether you chose B.A. or B.S. and which major you

chose. All of a sudden it doesn't sound like a common sort of curriculum and a common set of outcomes. And so it became pretty easy for us to do. We started from scratch. I was the provost at the time. The faculty did it and said, "Let's write a mission statement for why we have Gen Ed. Let's write a set of learning outcomes—big ones, for what we want everybody to walk away with, and some little ones underneath that." And then they came up with a kind of model they wanted to use under that. And then they started putting courses back in it. It really kind of changed the dynamic on campus. As they were writing it then, it was really easy to write the assessment that went with each of those, because the learning outcomes—how are you going to assess them? It's always a good conversation to have.

Pike: Just a follow up comment that something we as a faculty, when you tell students "You need to get this out of the way," so you can acquire the skills you're going to need to learn and approach the remaining classes. A simple addition might be useful.

Nook: Yes, but that simple addition is going to be lost right after I hear, "I've got to get it out of the way." I'm pretty much going to get it out of the way, right? I think we've got to be careful with our language. Right? One of the things that I get—and my President's hat is out the door a long time ago. One of the things I've seen on campuses, and I'm as guilty of it as anybody, is we get caught up talking to students the way that we talk to each other. Right? And we make all these assumptions about what is known and not known about our curriculum, and so we start talking to students in the same way, giving them advice, "You need to take this Gen Ed class so that you learn to speak to each other." Well, I think we

need a deeper conversation with students about some of the whys about these pieces. “What is it you really want to walk away from? We hope you walk away from by engaging in this curriculum,” and make it very clear. But you’re right. If we add that tag on, it helps. But too often we don’t add that tag on. And too often you hear the first part and the second part doesn’t really catch either.

Wohlpart: Another piece I would add very quickly is that we have not defined what those skills are as a community, so that we can articulate them to students and why they matter and how they build into the rest of the curriculum. We have work to do.

Campbell: I was just going to say that getting the Liberal Arts core out of the way so you can take other courses is not really reality for the math teaching major. We have either zero or one free elective when you count, including the professional sequence, and it’s a matter of okay, you’re required to take these courses this semester, the other course has to be a Liberal Arts core course if you’re going to get out of here in four years. Of course, if you want a minor, it’s going to take you four and a half years, but it’s not really getting it out of the way, but just that you have to take it every time you have a gap in your schedule.

Nook: Even—I’d love to have the students comment on this. Even that language is somewhat problematic, right? When we say, “You have to take this,” without going in and saying, “We want you to take a philosophy course,” or a course where you’re going to engage these kinds of ideas, and “Here’s the courses we say are available to you, and it will work out best in your schedule here.” I default to that too. I was a physics and engineering advisor, right? Very little wiggle room

in there, and they had to have their Gen Eds spread out through the whole four years because no one can take five physics classes in the same semester and survive. One student. But I'd get in that same trap, right? You've got this open spot. Stick a Gen Ed in there. What did I just tell that student about the value of that course? There is none to it, right? "You just have to do it. It's a requirement, get it done." It's some of those advising things that get us trapped. As a President, they're not mine to really worry about, but they are things that I see on all campuses. I haven't been here long enough to know if they're here or not, but they are very common when you start to talk about Liberal Arts cores and Gen Ed cores and those sorts of things to have people devalue them inadvertently by the language they use around the courses, instead of around the concepts and the ideas that we want students to take away from them.

Bernhard: I was going to add that I do think that there's definitely like a culture especially in the undergrad community of "Getting it out of the way," mentality. I think that's built on something that you all probably don't see. That's something that people are working on in high school. Most students are actively trying to get those LACs out of the way in their junior and senior year of high school, because they've already learned that sentiment of "Getting the core classes out of the way," from a very early age. So that's a culture that persists not just at UNI but throughout all of education I think.

Wohlpert: I love that you said that. There was a comment recently by one of our legislators that the first two years of college are really a waste of time because students are just redoing what you did in high school. And if that's the sentiment, we have a lot of work to do. We have a lot of work to do, and that's on us. Not

anybody else. We haven't demonstrated the difference.

Koch: I was going to mention that part of that too is that because of the economics they take Gen Ed courses in high school partly because of economics. And then I try to tell students that Gen Ed is adult education, and your major is your specialization. And maybe that would help out with, you have to be in your adult years which I don't think it's when you're sixteen. It's borderline. Seventeen? Eighteen? Yeah, that's when you get into college. So and the other thing, if you want some wording, since I teach writing I have to come up with some wording here. Instead of saying "Get it out of the way," how about, "Getting it into your system." But that economics part is a huge factor which is something college should be analyzing. What is the economic structure? How can we be visionary counter-cultural? Although I don't mean to be revolutionary.

Wohlpart: Yes, you do.

Koch: Revolutionary but adult though. Radical? Just get to the roots of things? The core?

Pike: One other quick comment. I think there's a cost to that mentality of "Get it out of the way," and so I teach mostly seniors, and it's a shock to them that I actually expect them to have retained prerequisite class knowledge. And again I think that's the cost of "I gotta get these prereqs out of the way. I gotta get these things out of the way," that it comes as a surprise that I actually expect them to have retained some things. And to the extent that we can work on that, I think our students will benefit.

Zeit: One of the things we're doing with the TESI program, it's the Teacher

Education Strategic Initiatives Program, and I'm one of the heads of the curriculum group. One of the things we're looking at is we're looking at reorganizing the way in which it's actually set up. And we're looking at--you talk about, well you're supposed to remember the things from the previous classes and things like that. The problem that we run into is that when our teachers go out and they teach, we talk about cross-curricular reading and all this sort of thing, and we teach that in our reading class, and then later on they've got the writing class. Each one is very siloed. So we're looking at taking courses and perhaps combining them. So we have three teachers teaching three courses over a period of nine hours, and by the way, these numbers—we don't have anything solidified, we're just playing with it. But imagine if you had a cohort of students and a cohort of teachers, and we had a math, a reading and a technology teacher who would all be working together in the same group and we'd be meeting four days a week. The students would come to us four days a week. We'd all be working together. We'd meet two or three times a week to make sure that we're doing is we're correlating. It's actually working together. I think that's something we really need to work in our programs. It isn't just teaching, but it's the idea that it's more. If we want to get to a point where we don't want to "Get it out of the way," we want to make it part of the fabric, then it needs to be something where we have a system that generates that and nurtures it.

Nook: In some cases, what you're talking about isn't too much different than Learning Communities when they're set up.

Zeitz: That's exactly right.

Nook: A successful one that I didn't teach in but was set up while I was the Dean

of Undergraduate Studies, between a sociologist and an English professor on the Sociology of Food. They were really team teaching it. They taught it in such a way that they would announce a week ahead of time who was teaching at nine o'clock on Monday, Wednesday and Friday and who was teaching at Tuesday and Thursday at 10:30 because they could alternate back and forth. They set their classes up, their course schedules up so that they could both be at any of these lectures, and the content started to flow together. So it was never seen as separate. That takes a lot of work on the faculty's part, especially the first time through, to get that level of "lack of structure," built into it to pull the discipline out and just leave the gooey content.

Zeitz: If I may say, it's probably even more structured. It's a level of integration perhaps.

Kidd: Hi. Sorry I keep missing you when you're on campus.

Nook: It's good to see you again.

Kidd: So just a completely different topic, because there's not too much time. I wanted to ask about one of the aspects of student engagement. So one of the things I think we do very well here at UNI is engage students outside the classroom in many different activities.

Nook: Correct.

Kidd: One of the ways we do that is through external funding. People get grants, big and small, throughout the colleges and we use these grants not just to pay for say faculty summer salary, but also a lot of our grads work to get student wages

so they can afford to take part in summer research or lab assistant jobs or outreach things, or people that order supplies. Right? A lot of these are like \$10,000 grants; real small ones. So one thing I've noticed—I've been here 11 years now, is that every year there's been a steady decline in I would say the flexibility, innovation, of the RSP (Research and Sponsored Program) program. I think it's a major concern. This is not just myself talking. But many faculty when I bring this up, come up to me and say, "Yes." The bureaucracy has increased. They don't feel supported. They feel that... literally people told me that they feel that grants are a burden. They don't wish to get them anymore because there is negative connotations.

Nook: These are local grants for our campus?

Kidd: All over.

Nook: All over.

Kidd: All over. External. Everything. Again, people have told me that getting a grant is not seen by the institution is an important thing. That's how they feel. It is, but that's how they feel. So, and a lot of this is budget cuts, I know. The staff at the RSP office has gone down. I was wondering what you feel about the importance of sponsored research.

Nook: Like Tim (**Kidd**), I spent most of my time in a Physics program, right? And if there's a program that has access to external grants, it's the hard sciences. So you'll have to forgive me just a little bit. It's not as applicable in every discipline as it is in physics and chemistry and biology, because we have access to in particular the NSF (National Science Foundation) and maybe NASA and NIH (National

Institutes of Health) in the case of biology, and there have been some really great funding sources there. I have always viewed external grants as sort of the best thing that you can get. It's sort of the superior level of scholarship in some ways, right? I'm not going to do that as President. I realize how ugly that statement can sound to a lot of people if I'm not real careful but as a scientist, when I could get external grants in, and I could leverage those with internal dollars or other external dollars, I can put students to work. Faculty can get more work done. Those generate even more dollars. We had the interesting scenario happen at St. Cloud State when I was chairing there that we had ten faculty members. Four of us were active in grants. We had a million dollars of money at play at any one time. We had enough dollars flowing in to support about 15 undergraduates in research projects, and we had 10 majors, graduating three per year. But the students that can actually get engaged are the juniors or seniors, right? It's hard to get a freshman in some of these projects. So we had engineers flowing into our department to do some of this, and we were still short. Well, we turned to the Foundation and said, "We want to start a Foundation account that will pull in students as freshmen. We'll offer them \$2,000 a year for their freshman and sophomore year, and then we'll guarantee them full employment with enough student dollars to be able to pay all of their tuition while they're a student. We were basically offering them a free ride, but it was only going to cost us the first year or two in scholarship dollars, and the rest came out of external funding. And we were building that up to where we could do that as an endowed scholarship. It was working. I left before it was fully funded, but we crossed the \$10,000 point so we could start to make at least some gifts. It was a way to leverage these external dollars, right? And our Foundation and the people that were donating quickly saw

that this is kind of special to be able to help students do this. Those external dollars and internal research dollars, as long as they're supporting the students development professionally, whether that's in the hard sciences or in the arts or whether it's in business. It doesn't matter--any discipline. Those are the things that get students actively engaged one-on-one with a faculty member, and often times in a group. So what we were doing in physics: I had a little group of students who were taking data with a telescope; there were five students and me. They learned teamwork: Who was observing tonight? Who was going to analyze the data? Who was going to reduce the data? Who was going to start to write the paper? Who wrote this section of the paper? Who was going to serve as our editor for the paper and oversee it? So they learned teamwork and communication skills, and those sorts of things that are really hard to teach sometimes if you're just going through lab work and doing a hundred thousand thermodynamics problems. These are the things that the work of George Kuh has told us are most important in the education of a student: is getting into those high impact practices like undergraduate research. And often times it's almost impossible to fund those without some external funding, whether it's an NSF grant or whether it's some funding from the state that just supports these kinds of things, or its internal in things that we might be able to put together. I don't know enough about how we fund our internal grants. We've often done it in other places off of the indirect costs that come out of the sciences in particular. Though at most institutions of this type, most of the indirects actually come from Student Affairs. They don't come out of the faculty side. It's off of some of the TRIO grants and some of the other support. I think it's important. Research is our activity, right? And it doesn't matter, when I say 'research' I don't mean science

research. I mean the professional activity of faculty, whether we're in Education or we're in Music and the Arts or Business; the Humanities. It doesn't really matter. That's the engagement in our disciplines, and we need to have students engage in that too, so that we develop them professionally. Funds help do that. They help keep them out of McDonalds and in our laboratories and in our theatres and in other places. But the money has really slowed throughout this country. The NSF budget has shrunk. The NIH budget has shrunk. Those sorts of things, so it's harder and harder, and they aren't putting the pressure on NSF and NIH and the others to support undergraduate research the way they were ten years ago.

Kidd: I would disagree with that statement.

Nook: Is it coming up again?

Kidd: The RUI program (Research in Undergraduate Institutions) is actually pretty strong with NSF. No, where I see the problem is just the University itself has reduced resources through the RSP Office in many ways. That would be my opinion. It's definitely my opinion.

Petersen: I could echo that, but I could also take it one step further, because I had a number of grants over the last seven years, and for me, one area that has been problematic is our turnover of our Merit and Secretarial staff has been incredibly significant in the College of Education, and so my secretarial staff no longer has any knowledge of how to maintain the budgets or process the paperwork, and so while I typically have two or three grad students working with me, I consciously decided not to bring any new students on board in December because my

secretary couldn't manage the paperwork unfortunately, and that's sad.

Skaar: And I would say same with the staff over in RSP. Since I've been here, I've had three different people to go to-- to talk about writing grants, and it's like I don't ever know who's there and who's not there anymore. We figure it out, but it's nice to have that consistent person who knows your research program and can be out there looking for grants for you, and that's not quite happening the way it was when I first got here.

Peterson: I will give back money June 30th, unfortunately.

Kidd: This is not an isolated thing. This is definitely something people have concerns over. I know people...it's a big concern among people that are getting external funding. Part of it's just the turnover in the RSP Office. We don't have enough staff there. They do centralized budgeting for everyone. And also, the office doesn't have experience in getting grants. These are not people with any experience in grants. I've said this before. It's a soapbox I get on.

Wohlpart: We discussed this this morning and I was talking about RSP and Mark **(Nook)** said, "What's RSP again?" [Laughter]

Nook: It came up in another thing and I thought it was Randy **Pilkington's** initials and I didn't know what his middle name was, so I had to ask what RSP really was. [Laughter]

Gould: We have time for one more question or comment for President **Nook**, or if you would like to say anything.

Nook: Let me talk a little bit about one thing, and it's probably good to do this right at the end, where we have very little time because we don't know where all it will go. As we look at budgets in particular--you had to know it's budgets with that intro, right? We know that we have a \$2 million reallocation to make back to the State and we found out really late Thursday that we have another \$522,500 that we have to reallocate back to the State, and we're working on figuring that out. And that those are going to set the new base for our budget, so we're going to be \$2.5 million down. We are asking the State for a 2% increase and \$2.5 million on top of that as well. We have no idea what we'll get for '18. One of the things we're starting to explore is the creation of a University-wide budget committee for lack of a better name, and we don't really know the name, that might involve faculty, staff—people from across the campus, to not help with the line items, right? I think about how long it takes to learn a university budget, and then think whether or not anybody wants to volunteer for that, but to think more about big picture things and to be big-picture thinking and get together and understand enough about the budget that you could get together and ask questions about “What are the sorts of things that people that actually have to make the cuts should be thinking about?” as they take on the budget. I don't know whether we'll have this set up, or whether the culture is right for one here; whether we'll get it set up in time to handle the '18 budget or not. It would be a culture shift for this campus, I realize, to have such a committee in place. But we're starting to think through the process of how we would set one up; what it might look like; who might be involved; what a charge might be for this kind of committee, but it would be a way to get more people engaged and understanding, at least the budget in a big picture way. The details of thousands

of lines in a budget isn't something we're going to ask others to take on, but sort of big picture stuff. So if you have any thoughts about that, I'd be happy to entertain them. A little more clarity on what's happening, and another group of people on campus that has input on how some of these decisions are made. Again, it would be a recommending body, not a decision-making body. Like I said, we don't know how exactly to construct it or what it's going to look like or how soon we can get it set up. There'd certainly be faculty on if we created one.

Wohlpert: And students.

Nook: And students, yes. Probably an administrator or two.

Gould: Thank you for coming. [Applause]

Nook: Thank you. If you have thoughts on anything about the University, please don't hesitate to shoot me an e-mail, or drop a note off by the office. It's probably best if you include Jennifer **Yarrow** on that. She'll make sure it gets to me, and I know Jim (**Wohlpert**) is exactly the same on that. We both have open doors and open e-mail boxes, so keep piling stuff in there. We'd be happy to help. Thank you and thanks for the invitation. It's great to be here.

Gould: You are welcome to stay for the few things that we have to take care of. Now that we're finished with the Consultative Session, we'll move on to Courtesy Announcements. So Provost **Wohlpert**?

Wohlpert: Sure. I want to acknowledge that these times are not challenging times, they're crazy times. The times we're in just make no sense, at least to me. It feels like things have been completely up-ended and I want to acknowledge that, and I want to talk a little bit about that. Locally, we've had 40 years of

negotiating a Master Contract that's been stripped of us, and so we have a need to create a Faculty Handbook. That's something we must do immediately before June 30. I had a great meeting this afternoon with Gretchen (**Gould**), Tim (**Kidd**) and Joe (**Gorton**) to talk about the process, and I'll send an e-mail out soon. We'll be selecting six faculty six administrators to come together to get a draft handbook and get something in place before the end of the semester we hope. That would be the goal. And then talk about what we would need to do with a document like that, going forward next year. If you have questions or ideas or suggestions, please do share those. At the State level, the legislation, it's not just Chapter 20. It's not just campus carry, but there's a bill that came out today that said that we would have to make available to every student for their major what their salary would be upon graduation.

Zeitz: You're kidding.

Wohlpart: So if you're a philosophy major, and you actually it's demonstrated you make a lot 40 years down the road, 30 years down the road, but when you graduate, you're just in debt. We're in trouble. On a national level, funding is really interesting. I don't know if you saw the news today, but there's a proposed 10% increase to defense spending and every other agency gets cut by 10%. There goes our Pell grants; there goes our Teach grants, which we do one of the best jobs in the nation with the Teach grants. Culturally, there's this incredible questioning of the value of higher education, even though every study demonstrates that if you get a bachelor's degree, you make more money, you have more happiness, you're more engaged in your community. Employer surveys show that what they want is a Liberal Arts degree; a liberal education. That's what

every employer demonstrates when they get surveyed. Among the Governor's Future Ready Iowa Alliance, and the goal of FRIA is to have 70% of Iowans with some kind of post-secondary degree or certification. And the concern that I have about this, and I expressed this to the Lieutenant Governor just last week, is that we're constantly talking about workers—workers, getting them some kind of credential. We don't think more broadly about these people in ways that we need to be thinking about these people, in my opinion. What's coming at us, and I actually made this point to her and I was glad that she wrote this down, is that we need to be preparing people for an innovation economy. This is what's coming at us. Employees who can go out in the workforce and immediately be part of the changes that are going to be part of that workforce, so that they can then be constantly learning and growing, as all of their jobs are going to change and grow instantly upon being out there. And I'm not just talking about if you think about manufacturing jobs, but even in teaching. In ten years, what are teachers are going to be teaching is going to be completely different than what we're teaching them now. How do we prepare them to be part of that leading edge and always able to learn those things? So what this innovation economy requires is a bachelor of arts degree--liberal education; liberal arts education: all the things that we do really, really well. This is our job to make this case. We're going to have to work really, really hard. What I think is that all of these things that I just got done talking about—at the local level, the State level, the national level: They're all threads of one fabric. They're all connected. This is not separate things. And I think if we don't come together in some kind of fashion to control our destiny, I think that we will be in real trouble in 15-20 years. I really, firmly believe that. There is this movement to focus on stackable credentials. Have you

all heard this? So you can go over here and get this credential, which gives you this learning outcome, and over here and over here, and you've got your degree. Boy, I have a real hard time with that. So, we are working. We have a student learning outcome committee, right? Everybody knows about that—University-wide student learning outcomes. I've asked them to think about those learning outcomes in very intentional ways and very developmental ways. So that it's really important that we help our first year students understand what it is they should be learning in the first year that builds in the second year, and then it builds in the third year when they get into their major and in their fourth year. That's our job. But we haven't been doing that job very well. We haven't been doing that job of thinking about that intentional scaffolding or explaining it to our students. We're helping it show up in our syllabi. "Okay, you're now a junior. We know that this is what you learned when you were a sophomore, and we're going to go to a higher level," and you're going to see similar language in the syllabi and things like that. The next step with the student learning outcomes committee will be to focus on General Education. We will have to develop learning outcomes for our General Education program and then think about the redesign of General Education based on those student learning outcomes. Our accrediting commission actually requires that, so if we didn't do that work by 2020-2021 when HLC came, we'd be in trouble. So this is essential work that we must do. But it's awesome to hear that you are all in favor of that work. I'm going to quote you when I get those nasty e-mails. But we also need to be thinking about the piece that we do really well that we've talked about, which is the engaged learning; the applied learning experiences that our students have outside the classroom. We do that at a very high level. But again, we don't do that work in intentional and

developmental ways. And that's the other piece that we need to be thinking about. If we want to make a case for a four-year degree at UNI, we can make that case. We can make that case by being intentional with the learning outcomes and how they scaffold and build and move from first year, second year into the upper level, and with the applied learning experiences. So if you're a philosophy major, what should you be doing in your first year outside of the class? We should be putting a list in front of the students and saying, "If you want to be successful, here's how to do it. Join one of these committees, do one of these activities. By the time you get to your sophomore year, here's what you should be doing." That's on us, but we haven't been talking about that stuff. So that's work that I think we need to do. I do believe or fear that if we're not doing that work, that work will be forced upon us, and it will come to us in ways that we may not necessarily appreciate. So, in these challenging times, I think we have an amazing opportunity to grab hold of our future and work together on that future. There's so many big things that are in front of us. We've got to remember that all those things are actually connected. The student learning outcomes and the Faculty Handbook are not disconnected activities. It's actually about, as President **Nook** said, this amazing community; all of us coming together to do this work together. If we could do that, we will be fine. If we let those external pressures tear us apart and we go at each other, then we will be defined from the outside. That's my fear. Questions or comments about any of that?

Pike: Is there any concern about the United Faculty survey and the percentage of respondents who suggested they would be open to leaving the State of Iowa if that law was passed?

Wohlpart: Oh, Joel (**Pike**). Absolutely. Lots of concern. Absolutely. So what we're going to do is work as quickly as we can to create a handbook collaboratively to show faculty that we can do this together. Absolutely. The fear, and Joe (**Gorton**) points this out all the time. He says, "Excellent. You and President Nook might be awesome collaborators. Everything might be transparent, but how long do presidents last and how long do provosts last? Who comes next?" My response to Joe (**Gorton**) has been, "Let's create some systems and structures and put them in place so it's part of the fabric of who we are and what we do so it's harder to change that once you get a new president. Or, so that a president who is applying for the job looks at this place and says, "That's the kind of place I want to be," because of what's in play. So I'd say that's work that we need to do and I think we need to do that work together.

O'Kane: Could you give me some clarification? I've never worked under a Faculty Handbook. Is that sort of considered an agreement between the faculty and the upper administration--a binding agreement? Is that what it is?

Wohlpart: It's not a binding agreement, because when those elements are taken out of a contract, then those things are owned by the management. So technically, management could write the faculty handbook and hand it to you.

O'Kane: They could, but you're not going to do that, are you?

Wohlpart: We are not. We are going to work collaboratively together.

O'Kane: So in other words, once it's written—how binding is that agreement? Because of what you just said: You and President **Nook** won't be here forever.

Nook: I've worked in three different environments. A statewide union, faculty union in Minnesota State Colleges and Universities. Montana State University that is much like here, and then the Wisconsin system where there was no union at all at UW-Stevens Point. We used a handbook then at Stevens Point, instead of a CBA (Collective Bargaining Agreement). Once you get that written, everybody is sort of by consensus agreeing that you're going to follow these policies. These become policies, right? They're changeable, and sometimes they can be changed by an administrator on a whim. But generally, there's a process in place for approving the changes, right? So if I as the president say I want to change this chapter of the handbook, I can do it and announce it, and then suffer the vote, right? So in almost every case that I've been working with one of these, there are sort of precedents set in that handbook. That this is the way we go about changes in the handbook, and the handbook classifies how you make changes to it. It's not a legally binding agreement like a CBA, but that doesn't mean there aren't some legal precedents set by the way it operates. I think one of the things that we want to make sure are in there are what we currently call grievance procedures, which become appeal procedures. The language changes a little bit, but you still give faculty in particular the opportunity to appeal and have reconsidered a decision by an administrator as it goes up the chain, right? And one of the things that often happens in these, when I look at our CBA and other CBA things and when things go to a grievance officer, a lot of time the final step in the appeal happens to be the president and now those things don't get to my chair.

Wohlpart: They go to an external arbitrator.

Nook: They go to an external arbitrator instead of the president. And in the case

of Montana, they go to ultimately the commissioner of the system, which I don't expect to happen here. They might go to the Board, but not the commission. So, there is some...There is a difference in the way that these operate, but they can be as protective, and in some cases even more protective in a handbook environment, depending on the working relationship that builds them. You get into a very different shared governance place that can be much more consensus-building. And so you start to talk about not negotiating a contract, but working to actually agree on the working conditions and things and what's going to work. Everything's still driven by the budget whether you've got a CBA or a handbook, right?

Wohlpart: So remember that the contract, the master agreement, was negotiated between UF and the Board of Regents. The faculty handbook will be written by both the faculty and the administration on campus. So the question is, can we get the systems and structures in place that provide those protections and procedures?

Walter: Does the Board of Regents have anything to say about the handbook?

Wohlpart: They do not. This does not go to the Board of Regents.

Nook: They only caveat I want to put on that, is they aren't saying they want to see it. They aren't saying they need to approve it. There's nothing in the law that says they need to. They are the Regents. They are the Regents. They could come in and say, "This paragraph, goes in your handbook," right? They can do that.

Wohlpart: Or, "This paragraph gets taken out."

Nook: Or "This paragraph gets taken out." But I never had that experience in

Wisconsin or other places. But, yeah. We'll see.

Pike: Again, I do think that's an important context that you're operating in here, is that there is a pretty significant precedent at this University for administrative over-reach, despite a master contract. And given that that happened under a master contract, with union grievance procedures and so on, I do think you're going to be dealing with a fairly high level of concern with a handbook.

Nook: We just don't have an option right now. Yeah.

Gould: Comments from Faculty Chair **Kidd**?

Kidd: I think we're pretty good, right?

Gould: And I have no comments, so we have two quick items to take care of. We haven't approved the past three sets of minutes for a whole variety of reasons so I'd like to get the minutes from January 9th, January 23rd, and February 13th approved so that we can distribute them to campus. Can I have a motion?

Hesse: Before we go on, if I'm not mistaken, the minutes from the 23rd were never sent out. I never...at 3:17 today they were sent out.

Kidd: We have to wait on the 13th.

Gould: How about January 9th and January 23rd? Is that okay? Senator **Hesse** moved. Vice Chair **Walter** seconded. All in favor of approving the January 9th and January 23rd minutes say "aye." All opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." Motion passes. The only other thing we have is a Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing. We have an emeritus request for Mary Elizabeth **Boes** and Fred **Abraham**. Can I have a motion to docket this emeritus request? So moved by Senator **O'Kane**.

Seconded by Senator **Zeitz**. All in favor say “aye.” All opposed, “nay,” abstain, “aye.” Okay. That will be docketed. And now can I have a motion to adjourn? So moved by Senator **Campbell**. We are adjourned.

Adjournment 4:49 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathy Sundstedt
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate