

**Regular Meeting**  
**UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**03/26/18 (3:30 - 5:00)**  
**Mtg. #1806**  
**SUMMARY MINUTES**

**Courtesy Announcements**

Associate Provost **Pease** indicated that a task force has been put together to look at UNI's policy regarding student probation and suspension. Early April interviews and public forums will be scheduled for candidates considered for the position of Associate Vice President for Research & Innovation and Dean of the Graduate College. (See transcript pages 5-6)

United Faculty Vice-President **Becky Hawbaker** encourages faculty to complete the workload survey, and to attend the April 14 Faculty Appreciation Dinner and the April 2<sup>nd</sup> & 16 meeting of the Faculty Evaluation Committee. UF continues to work on issues related to faculty benefits and retirement, tenure and promotion. They are collecting information on TIAA-CREF and the University Bookstore purchase. The vote to recertify UF will be held in October and requires online preregistration. (See transcript pages 7 - 9)

**Minutes for Approval (Skaar/Stafford) Feb 26, 2018 – Summary & Transcript**

**Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing**

Items 1380 -1389 docketed in regular order (**Smith/Burnight**) Passed.

**1380** Emeritus Request for **Blecha**, Kathryn M., Instructor, Dept. of Teaching. (1267) <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-blecha-kathryn-m-instructor-dept-teaching>

**1381** Emeritus Request for Thomas **Blain**, Instructor, Dept. of Teaching . (1268) <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-thomas-blain-instructor-dept-teaching>

**1382** Emeritus Request for Linda S. **Rosulek**, Student Teaching Coordinator, Dept. of Teaching (1269)

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-linda-s-rosulek-student-teaching>

**1383** A request by Dr. **Gassman** to give an update on the edited Civic Action Plan. (1270)

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/request-dr-gassman-give-update-edited-civic-action-plan>

**1384** Consult on Women's and Gender Studies (WGS) Ad Board Request for Structural Reorganization (move to CSBS) (1271)

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/consult-wgs-ad-board-request-structural-reorganization>

**1385** Emeritus Request for Audrey C. **Rule**, Professor, Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction (1272)

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-audrey-c-rule-professor-dept-curriculum>

**1386** Reconsideration of Honor System for University of Northern Iowa. (1273)

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/reconsideration-honor-system-university-northern-iowa>

**1387** Suggested Modifications to the Criteria for Regents Award for Faculty Excellence (1274)

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/suggested-modifications-criteria-regents-award-faculty>

**1388** Modifications to policy 4.21, Emeritus/a Status (1275)

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/modifications-policy-421-emeritusa-status>

## No New Business

## Consideration of Docketed Items:

**1258 (Cal#1370)** Consultation on the Dean of Students position.

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/consultationdean-students-position> (See transcript pages 12 – 20 )

**1259 (Cal#1372)** The Spring 2018 Revised Curriculum Handbook.  
\*\* (O’Kane/Neibert) Moved to April 9<sup>th</sup>, top of the docket.  
<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/spring-2018revised-curriculum-handbook>

**1260 (Cal#1373)** Athletics Dept. Presentation <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/athletics-deptproposed-visit-faculty-senate> **(See transcript pages 25-37)**

**1261 (Cal#1374)** Emeritus Request for Howard L. **Barnes**, Assoc. Prof, School of Applied Human Sciences  
\*\* (Stafford/Schraffenberger) Passed. One abstention.  
<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-requesthoward-l-barnes-assoc-prof-school-applied>

**1263 (Cal#1376)** Request for Faculty Emerita Status for Professor Katherine **van Wormer**, Department of Social Work  
\*\* (Fenech/Varzavand) Passed. <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/request-facultyemerita-status-professor-katherine-van>

**1264 (Cal#1377)** General Education Approval Process Proposal  
\*\* (Skaar/Choi) Passed. <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/generaleducation-approval-process-proposal>

**1266 (Cal#1379)** Open Review of RSP Policy on Effort Certification  
\*\* (Schraffenberger/Strauss) Tabled until a faculty and administrative committee is formed to gather further information next semester.  
Passed. <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/open-review-rspolicy-effort-certification> **See transcript pages 43-52)**

**Adjournment (Strauss/Skaar)** All aye. 5:00 p.m.

**Next Meeting:**

Monday, April 9, 2018  
Rod Library Scholar Space (301)  
3:30 p.m.

**Full Transcript follows of 52 pages and includes 2 Addenda**

**Regular Meeting**  
**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the**  
**UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**March 26th, 2018**

**Present:** Senators Ann **Bradfield**, John **Burnight**, Seong-in **Choi**, Lou **Fenech**, United Faculty Vice-President Becky **Hawbaker** Senators Tom **Hesse**, Bryce **Kanago**, Bill **Koch**, Amanda **McCandless**, Peter **Neibert**, Steve **O’Kane**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Angela **Pratesi**, Jeremy **Schraffenberger**, Nicole **Skaar**, Sara **Smith**, Gloria **Stafford**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Shahram **Varzavand**, Faculty Senate Chair Michael **Walter**, Senator Leigh **Zeitz**. Also: Provost Jim **Wohlpert**, Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**, Associate Provost John **Vallentine**, Faculty Chair Tim **Kidd**, NISG Representatives Tristan **Bernhard** and Kristin **Ahart**.

**Not present:** Senator James **Mattingly**, U.N.I. President Mark **Nook**.

**Guests:** Ann **Arns**, Brenda **Bass**, Stacia **Eggers**, Elaine **Eshbaugh**, David **Harris**, Oliver **Kidd**, Paula **Knudson**.

**CALL TO ORDER**

**Walter:** Well, let us commence. Let me call for Press Identification first. Any members of the Fourth Estate? Seeing none, we would normally go on to comments by President **Nook**, except he’s not going to be here today, so we

would then jump to comments by Provost **Wohlpart**, who will be here late today, and in his stead, Patrick **Pease** has a couple of items to cover.

### **COMMENTS FROM ASSOCIATE PROVOST PEASE**

**Pease:** Absolutely, so Jim (**Wohlpart**) asked me to fill you in on a couple of activities that are going on now: give you a heads up. The first is a task force that I put together to look at probation and suspension practices. The task force is primarily going to take a look a couple of questions. One is to review the overall policies; make sure that they are up to date, with a special eye toward looking at the duration of suspension. We suspend students automatically for a minimum of one year. That is atypical for a lot of institutions of our size, and so we're going to take a look at whether the right length or not. We also largely have a 'once you're suspended, the second suspension for the most part is an expulsion,' and we're going to take a look at whether that's the right policy or not. The other thing we're going to take a look at is to explore whether or not it's possible to develop some sort of a selective, voluntary, alternative track to suspension that would allow some students under certain circumstances to stay on campus and keep progressing, but providing some additional intensive and required support associated with that kind of alternative pathway. So, nothing has been decided yet. We're just going to take a look at these things. I will point out that today Peter (**Neibert**) agreed to represent the Senate on that committee, so there'll be some representation here in addition to anything I can fill you in on. So if you have any really burning interest in putting in your two cents worth on suspension policies, feel free to talk to either Peter (**Neibert**) or I, and we'll take that back to this task force.

The other thing I want to bring you up to speed on is the search for the Associate Vice President for Research and Innovation & Dean of the Graduate College. I think everyone here knows that I am currently the Interim Dean of the Graduate College and 'Interim' should go away soon. So I'm sharing the search for that replacement. You'll recall that Provost **Wohlpart** came around to a number of groups: Graduate Council, this group, several other groups in December and January looking for feedback. He decided on an internal search. That ad went out a few weeks ago and has actually closed—or at least the full consideration date has passed. So, the committee is going to meet tomorrow to review candidates and set up interview schedules where we're hoping to keep moving quickly and we are targeting—this is not confirmed—but we're targeting starting interviews on April 4th. So, we're going to see if we can do that or not. Nikki **Skaar** is on the committee for that, so representation from this body as well. Any questions about either of those two? Then at least for the search, I'd say to keep your eyes open for the public forum. We'll follow something similar to the way the last couple of internal and external searches that we've done for positions similar to this. So we'll have an open forum along with some other open meetings where you might be asked, depending on what your roles are on campus, to come in and meet. So just keep an eye open. We'll be scheduling kind of quickly, because we're trying to move along and wrap this up for the semester. And if you have any other questions, let me know. That is it.

**Walter:** Now, comments from Faculty Chair **Kidd**, who has brought a guest who he'll introduce.

**Kidd:** This is Oliver **Kidd**. He is here to observe. He's here to hang out for a little bit, and hopefully we will have very exciting times, and he'll be entertained.

**Walter:** Feel free to observe.

**Kidd:** And object whenever I'm talking, because this is your chance. I'm sorry—don't do that.

**Walter:** Okay Tim (**Kidd**) fire away.

**Kidd:** No, I'm good.

**Walter:** Nothing to say?

**Kidd:** No, let's get this show on the road.

#### **COMMENTS FROM UNITED FACULTY VICE-PRESIDENT BECKY HAWBAKER**

**Walter:** Okay. So next we have comments from United Faculty, now having a seat at the table.

**Hawbaker:** Thank you very much.

**Walter:** Let me apologize for not posting that until relatively recently. I didn't have it written on this and edited it in in the last couple of days.

**Hawbaker:** That's fine. I promise not to take too much time. I did want to just raise attention to a couple of issues, and use that opportunity to highlight the many ways that United Faculty works to advocate for faculty across campus, because many of you may not be aware of what we're doing. So, first I wanted to thank the work the Faculty Evaluation Committee, several of whom are here today, for all of their work, and to encourage everyone to complete the survey on workload, and to attend the next two forum meetings on April 2<sup>nd</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup>. I

know that the Committee has been busy responding to all the feedback that they've been gathering so far, and working to build an even better plan. I think this is one of the most important things that's underway at our University this year. But I also wanted to say okay, so faculty evaluation: One of the things that happens with United Faculty is as faculty bring concerns to us, we bring them to administration and we work together to solve problems. I want to thank John **Vallentine** for recently helping us to resolve some issues with a department head evaluation, and also working toward a more clear criteria for what materials get submitted to the Provost and deans when they're making tenure and promotion decisions. So, one example. Also wanted to report that United Faculty was tasked with submitting the names of faculty who will represent us on the Benefits and Retirement Committees. These are new committees, and so we're waiting to hear more because we are continuing to hear from faculty that insurance costs are going up; that there are some things that are not covered as they were before, or we're advocating for people whose tests aren't covered as medically necessary, even though the policy says they should be. So, we're working on that. We're continuing to work on fair compensation issues. You'll recall we had a pay equity study a year or two ago that resulted in some raises for some people about equity, and we continue to work on that. Also about compensation and release for non-standard teaching. That's become an issue in some departments and colleges, and fair compensation for temporary, term, and renewable term people who have been asked to take on additional service obligations, such as those who are serving on the Faculty Senate, but there are also similar situations across campus. Finally, this is Tenure Review & Promotion Season, so we're working with several faculty who are having some issues with their tenure and promotion



process. We're also keeping an eye on spending. We've done some information requests related to TIAA-CREF, the CRM purchase, and the University Bookstore purchase, because we want to watchdog that and make sure that money that could better go to faculty salary is being kept an eye on. Also, we want to make sure everyone knows you are all invited to bring yourself and a guest to the Faculty Appreciation Dinner on April 14<sup>th</sup>. There'll be dinner, a cash bar, and awards and we have a keynote from Joan **Walsh**. She's with CNN and the Nation. MC by Gary **Kroeger** and special guest is ISEA President Tammy **Wawro**. Finally, we just invite you to vote 'Yes' to recertify United Faculty next fall. We met with the Public Employee Relations Board last week and the vote will most likely be the last two weeks in October—an online vote, with a not very user-friendly process. So, more information to come there. So, thank you very much.

**O'Kane:** Becky (**Hawbaker**) I heard a rumor that people who don't vote, that's counted as a 'No.'

**Hawbaker:** That's right. And the other part is the voting is going to happen in a – there's a three-stage process to vote. First, you have to register online to vote. Step Two: PERB has to confirm that you are eligible to vote and you get a confirmation number that you're registered—with your voter registration number that you then have to use to go back in to register to actually vote. If you forget to register in the two weeks before voting, you lose the opportunity to vote.

**O'Kane:** You've actually voted 'No.'"

**Hawbaker:** Right. You've actually voted 'No.'" So we have a new system of department liaisons who have been working very hard to make contact with everyone in departments, and hopefully you or others in your department have

gotten a visit, but we're continuing to work on that, and hopefully we can get the word out. Whether you vote yes or no, if you vote 'No' I would prefer that you actually get in there and vote 'No.' Take a stand.

**Walter:** Not by default. Who needs the Russians when we can make this as complicated? [Laughter] Well we'll make sure that we iterate those instructions a number of times before the last two weeks of October.

**Kidd:** I'm sorry. I did have one statement. There's going to be Begeman Physics lecture on Wednesday night which should be really interesting. It's about using scientific techniques to uncover what's in art basically: pigments and things like that. Should be fun. Should see some good art, and I'm signed up.

**Walter:** Thank you. Thank you very much. I have no comments particularly, except to thank all of you for trudging over in the rain. The room switch was a bit of a circus, but anyway we're here and no harm done particularly. So, I would like our guests to introduce themselves.

**Knudson:** I'm Paula **Knudson**, Vice President for Student Affairs.

**Harris:** David **Harris**, Director of Athletics.

**Arns:** Ann **Arns**, Athletics Operations Coordinator.

**Eggers:** Stacia **Eggers**, Associate Athletics Director for Student Services.

**Eshbaugh:** Elaine **Eshbaugh**, Associate Professor of Gerontology and NCAA Faculty Athletics Rep.

**Bass:** Brenda **Bass**, Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

**Walter:** Welcome. Thank you very much.

**Bernhard:** And this is Kristin **Ahart**. She's the newly elected Vice-President for NISG and she'll be serving. We have our transitioning time for the next couple of meetings and then she'll be taking over.

### **MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

**Walter:** Welcome. Any other guests? Did we miss anybody? Okay, let us proceed with the Minutes. They have been posted for some time and I suppose what I need is a motion to approve the minutes as they stand. Motion made by Senator **Skaar**, seconded by Senator **Stafford**. Any discussion of the minutes? Seeing none, all in favor of approving the minutes for February 26<sup>th</sup>, please indicate by saying 'Aye.' Opposed, 'Nay.' Abstentions? None. The motion passes. We accept the minutes.

### **CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING**

**Walter:** I did make a point about the hugeness of our Docket and Items for Docketing, and I indicated my intention of basically bundling, consensus-style, all of these items under Calendar Items for Docketing. There's about six different emeritus requests; a couple of other items here. I'm going to consider that you've all read these. I'm not going to read these all to you, but in the interest of saving time I would like to go ahead and hear a motion if I can get one, on basically approving all of these for docketing en masse. If you would like anything to be pulled out for separate discussion, please indicate so. Do I hear such a motion? Moved by Senator **Smith**. Do I have a second? Second by Senator **Burnight**. So any discussion? Do we need to pull any of these out for a little discussion beforehand?

Okay, so all in favor of moving all of these Calendar Items 1380 through 1389 to the Docket, please indicate by saying 'Aye.' Opposed, 'Nay.' Abstentions? The motion passes. Thank you. That really helps quite a bit. I'll move these into the Docket and many of them could use a little bit more supporting material, so I'll be nagging people for that as need be.

### **CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

**Walter:** Moves us on to Docketed Items. Oh, New Business. Is there any New Business that we should attend to? None. Let's move right on to our Consideration of Docketed Items. The first will be the Consultation on the Dean of Students Position. Where did Paula (**Knudson**) go? Wasn't she going to talk about that?

**Kidd:** Leigh (**Zeitz**) took her away. Leigh stole her.

**Walter:** Leigh **Zeitz** is consulting and providing us with unnecessary delay. [Laughter] I asked Paula **Knudson** for a little background on this, and I honestly tried to do this to give you a little 'heads up' when you have time, to look at these items so that you can have a little framework, and I asked her, "Well what's broken? What needs to be fixed?" But apparently you're going to be happy just to give us a little talk.

**Knudson:** I will, if you don't mind. Well Happy Spring to everybody. I was just in Madison this weekend and there was no snow. Welcome to ten and a half inches. I just want to take just a little bit of time and I know that you're busy. One, I want to acknowledge Tristan (**Bernhard**), who I think has done a great job as Vice President this past year. [Applause] I'm hoping that Tristan (**Bernhard**) will stay in leadership roles with us because he's a great leader for us. And I think Kristin

(**Ahart**) will do a great job and you'll have fun getting to know her as well. So welcome, Kristin (**Ahart**).

**Knudson:** A couple of weeks ago—three weeks ago I think—we talked about one of the activities or issues on campus that when I came here I was told, “We need to do some work on these things,” and that was mental health, and Shelly **O’Connell** came a few weeks ago and gave you some update. We’re making some great progress there. Student leadership told us that this is an area that really needed some attention. The two other areas that I was told out of gate that needed some attention were Diversity & Inclusion, and kind of this portal that we make sure that we have a connection that our people are feeding information into and understanding how the community is working to make it safe. So we had a change in the office. Just a hypothetical here: Imagine if you were running a Dean of Students Office that has a Dean of Students, an Assistant Dean of Students, and an Administrative Assistant and two graduate students. And hypothetically, the Administrative Assistant leaves at the end of January, and then your Dean of Students leaves March 2<sup>nd</sup>, and your Assistant Dean has a baby on February 28<sup>th</sup>. If that were to happen, which I’ve had a couple of months here to kind of come to that realization that it’s true--that it happened. And so I had hoped to come here a couple of months ago to get your input and feedback on how we move forward. But since that time I’ve really had to make some decisions, and so I just wanted to make you aware of some of the changes, and figure out where maybe there might be partnerships in this. So one of the things you may or may not know is that Veterans Services, LGBT Resources currently report to the Dean of Students function as well as Disability Services. So those are three areas that some don’t know are associated with that unit. But, given what I

heard from students and others about our efforts in coordinating our diversity and inclusion efforts, I'm really trying to bring those together instead of having disparate efforts going on. We've made the decision to realign Veterans Services and LGBT Resources with our Center for Multicultural Education. So the Center itself will stay, but we will be renaming that organization to something more inclusive, such as Diversity, Inclusion, and Social Justice to represent the collaborative efforts. One of my hopes is that we do more partnering with faculty, because I think faculty are doing some good work in this area, but I don't know that they're in alignment with some of our other work that's going on. So we have a team now that's working on what could this look like in helping to coordinate and move our diversity inclusion efforts forward, and that will be led by Jamie **Chidozie**, who if you haven't had a chance to meet her—she's wonderful. She's been here about six months longer than I have, so that makes it a year-plus. And she's really got some great ideas to help us move forward in this area. And instead of LGBT looking at those resources, and Veterans looking at those resources, I think we can be stronger together. So, that's one change we're looking at. The other thing is the Dean of Students function. I know that faculty have had some concerns with Disability Services and how we're navigating those. I think Kelly (**Gibbs**) was in talking about a move we're making starting next fall to accommodate. That has a social justice component to it, but it also has a very real service component to it. So we're going to keep that aligned with the Dean of Students Office. We're trying to do some efficiencies there. But as I went around to student groups and other groups on campus, I said, "Tell me about your experience with the Dean of Students Office." And they've...One young man said, "What's the difference between the Dean of Students and the President?" which

was telling. I didn't have any answer for him. That was funny. [Laughter] Okay, this is that kind of group. The other thing they told me is that it feels like the principal's office. A college campus is—doesn't need a principal's office. Even though we have some accountability function, and we'll take that and do it seriously, I really look at the accountability as an educational tool. These are young minds still developing. We've all made bad mistakes, bad choices—and hopefully it's about the learning from those mistakes. Not that--those mistakes don't define your character, and that's really a shift I want to take in our Dean of Students function. I don't want our Dean of Students sitting behind a desk. I want our Dean of Students out being visible; getting to know students, getting to know faculty; helping to be problem solvers. Because all of you have been teaching, whether it's a year, whether it's 20 years, and you've encountered different things and you go, "I'm not trained for this," and I know that. And having a Dean of Students Office that meets you where you're at, and helps you solve problems and then more importantly, turns around after we help address it, and say, "Okay, this is what we found out and this is how we can partner." Because it's not about getting people in trouble, it's about helping people make better choices, and then advocating for those who really need attention. So in the meantime here, while our Assistant Dean is out with her beautiful daughter, Harper, I'm doing the Dean of Students function with two wonderful grad students who are learning a lot. We're consulting on a daily basis, and some others that have been helping. We're going to make it through April. We're still going to be still be responsive to any questions or support that you need. By calling the main line, we'll make sure that somebody's there. Then upon Allyson's (**Rafanello**) return, she's going to step into the leadership role. If you've worked with Allyson before, she has great rapport.

She's had tough conversations, but she's navigated with people still feeling like there's a compassionate element here that we're going to be here to help you. And so we're going to be moving forward. We're going to adding an Assistant Dean role that will be about advocacy and accountability—not about conduct. Yes, there's a conduct policy, but we're really here to treat everybody fairly and accountably with compassion. I think that's the move that we're moving to with the Dean of Students function. So, that was just my quick update, and I apologize for not being able to come in when I was in the information-gathering stage, but you all are busy people with a busy agenda, so I just wanted to not leave you out of that, and hope that you know we're here in partnership in all of those areas. I really think we're starting into a vision of moving out in more partnerships and getting away from the siloed effects in all of our areas. If you have any areas where you see, "Wow, there might be an opportunity here," I'm hoping that you'll bring it forward. Leigh (**Zeitz**), last time I was in Faculty Senate suggested that we need to do more training with faculty around mass shootings and so we met, and we're starting to work on a possible video targeting (Targeting? I should not say that when I'm talking about mass shooting)—but that would work more towards the faculty audience because all of you, even if you haven't really thought about it outwardly, all of you kind of had this nagging thing every time another shooting happens about, 'Could that happen here and what would I do?' I think just getting some introduction to getting that feedback, and so I pulled together Leigh (**Zeitz**) and our police, and another faculty member and said, "What do we want this to be? What do we want it to look like?" So if there's other things that you see on that, I want you to know that we would welcome the partnership and engage with you. So, any questions? Comments?



**Petersen:** I just had one comment, maybe one question Paula (**Knudson**) because I'm really disappointed to hear that disability was not included in the merger, particularly because disability is the largest minority category, and so it's disheartening to me that they've been excluded from...

**Knudson:** They haven't been excluded, it's just that the reporting line is there. I've made it very clear with our diversity efforts and with our disability group that they need to very much be a part of it. And so they are part of it. They just don't report there.

**Petersen:** I think my concern is because when we think about disability, we typically approach it from a very medical model standpoint, which is incredibly humiliating and marginalizing and oppressive to people with disabilities, and so as long as it remains within in a medical housing...

**Knudson:** My hope is that it's not going to. My hope is to move it to Gilchrist, so that it's ...

**Petersen:** My concern would still be its excluded from the Social Justice, Diversity, Inclusive Center, and so it sends a message that it's not to be thought of when we're thinking about those types of social justice issues.

**Knudson:** I think it will be included in those social justice issues, and I think it will be included in the social justice issues, and we have a task force on diversity, inclusion kicking off. Jenny **Lynes** with Disability Services will be working on that group to make sure that there's incorporated, but there's also a service and there's a legal component to disability that doesn't have the same alignment that some of the other social justice areas do. And there's also a proximity piece. So, there's not room over in that area for Disability Services, and so when you're

supervising somebody, it's not impossible to do it from afar, but it's easier to do it when there's a physical proximity that's closer. And so there's several factors that went into it, and again, I apologize for not being able to get in sooner when I was gathering those inputs from a variety of groups, but there's---but I hear you loud and clear, that it needs to make sure that we're still part of that social justice function, and it needs to be.

**Petersen:** Again, my concern is those logistical reasons send a symbolic message, and I think our department has in the past worked diligently to try to connect there, and we have not been successful, and so it's disheartening to hear.

**Knudson:** You have tried to connect with Disability Services?

**Petersen:** Yes—the Multicultural Center, to be included.

**Knudson:** Have you tried it lately, because our new effort has been much more broadening with Jamie (**Chidozie**) on board, and Keyah (**Levy**)?

**Petersen:** We have not since Jamie's (**Chidozie**) come on board, but it would seem now that it would be a moot point given that the decision's already been made.

**Knudson:** Absolutely. I will have Jamie (**Chidozie**) connect with you because we're doing programming—we're looking for a name change for Disability Services that we'll do some consulting with you on. I don't know what it's going to be, but the term is a little dated for the work that they're doing, and so Kelly (**Gibbs**) and her group are working on what could the name be, but we're also working on partnering with the CME and the broader group on incorporating disability education and awareness into that program as well. We'll initiate a new outreach now that we have total new personnel in there.

**Petersen:** But the other factor that I think is important to consider is the intersectional nature of disability with other marginalized groups, and seems difficult to make that connection if they are a separate entity in and of themselves. It seems to imply...

**Bernhard:** We want to echo that statement as well. The logistics side of things does make a lot of sense, but kind of what you were talking about earlier with Gilchrist, and especially the Dean of Students Office being thought of more as a paperwork/principal's-office-type of function. That kind of presents some challenges with working Disability Services out of there, whereas the CME has more of a reputation of community-building and student engagement. That is, I think why there's the perception that it's a lot more valuable space for students to be served in that regard. So that just might be a perspective to keep in mind in the future.

**Walter:** Nothing's ever really cast in stone. We should keep an open mind about where to categorize these things. Any other questions?

**Knudson:** Thank you for your time.

**Kidd:** It seems like more often I'm getting more students who are not good at navigating the academic system—not knowing how to drop a class, and kind of being confused by the process, or maybe they just feel awkward about it. I'm not quite sure. Is there like—this is probably a dumb question, but is there like a one-stop shop I can send them to? I'm not offended by doing it—by helping people out, but it would be great if I could say, “Hey, you should talk to these people and they're going to give you an hour and get in touch with you.”

**Knudson:** Kristin **Woods** and the Student Success and Retention would be a great point of entry. They do a lot of outreach for that, so when it comes to registration time and they see that somebody's not there, they're outreaching to them. So, Jade **Horning** in Student Success and Retention. They're located also in our shop at 118 Gilchrist, which is kind of where I want to go. I want to change the image of the principal's office. I want it to be a "You can come here for support," and we're hoping to grow some of the leadership things out of there, too. So, I'm hoping to change the culture of that end of Gilchrist by having it really be student-centric. Instead of the formality of it, I want to have some informal, "Come in, comfortable seating, we're going to help you."

**Kidd:** I was just trying to think: Where do I send people?

**Knudson:** Kristin (**Woods**)- her shop.

**Kidd:** Okay, thank you.

**Knudson:** Absolutely.

**Walter:** Other questions or comments at all? Thank you very much.

**Knudson:** Thank you.

**Walter:** Well then let's move on to Docket Item 1259, The Spring 2018 Revised Curriculum Handbook.

**Pease:** This is the handbook that comes out of the UCC, GCCC process that hopefully everyone refers to and reads carefully page-to-page before they submit curriculum processes. I'm sure everyone in here has thumbed through this at some time looking for policies. This is just a routine update. What we're doing here, this happens each year, is to clarify any policies that we find that the intent was not particularly clear, to codify anything—any practices within the committee that we find are not actually represented in here and there's a couple of small

practices that were added in here. And to highlight—sometimes that means bolding or adding the statement a couple more times in here for things in here that we see are very common mistakes or oversights. For example, for the codification of processes, because of the nature, the change to the one-year cycle and having to get new programs to the Board of Regents early, you may remember at the beginning of this cycle, we came in and asked you to approve a certain set of proposals before we even reviewed the rest of the colleges, and that's part of it. So that's one of the things that we've changed. The other is that recently the committee has instituted a consent agenda process for just routine, run-of-the-mill kinds of changes that are not going to get caught up in any sort of problems—just small changes; just tweaking the language a little bit in a description that doesn't really change much: Those end up on consent agenda items and they pass through much more easily. It's a practice the committee developed a couple of years ago and hadn't actually gotten represented in the handbook yet. The primary oversight that we addressed here that you'll find if you read this carefully, several times it points out that basically in various language that you have to watch for hidden prerequisites. That's always been something that the UCC has watched very carefully for, but for whatever reason, it's been a significant problem lately with the programs bringing curriculum proposals forward and having many more hours of required coursework than actually what is represented in the program, and that gets rejected by UCC. It's better to know about it ahead of time so you can clean those up before it ever gets there. So, it's those kinds of changes. I would take questions, or if anyone sees anything of concern in there, I'd have to take a look at it.

**Varzavand:** In regard to placing actually the curriculum online: I'm looking at Page 5 under "Participating Group Responsibilities."

**Pease:** Okay.

**Varzavand:** Okay, so almost the last paragraph, but a couple of lines down below "The UCC shall place them on the consent agenda which may be approved by UCC on their block and without discussion provided that all the items on the consent agenda be made public." Why is that? 'Public' has been removed out of it.

**Pease:** I'm looking for the spot. Can you show me the exact spot where 'public' is? That word was struck because the entire sentence was struck. So, what the intent is—I'm having to take a look at the wording—but what the intent is that things can end up on a consent agenda if no one feels like they really need any discussion. But any item can be pulled off the consent agenda—much like this body—any item can be pulled off a consent agenda at the beginning. And that's actually the first call, is for a block of material. The first call is "Should anything come off and actually be discussed separately?"

**Pease:** So that was largely just to clean up the language and make the paragraph a little shorter.

**Varzavand:** I can understand in regard to the efficiency, and for the sake of efficiency some of this procedure has been truncated, but my hope is transparency--not to be removed from it.

**Pease:** Everything is still the same process. So programs go through the same process. It has to be approved at a department level, at a college senate level, and it doesn't make it to UCC until it's out of the college senate. And anyone can

attend any of those meetings—well, not the department one maybe, but the college senates and the UCC. Anyone can attend at that point, and so anybody can request something be discussed. If the concern is specifically that the public—we can work it back in, but the reality is all the Leapfrog material is out there and it's on the UCC sites before the meetings, and it ends up actually on the Senate's site before the Senate approves it as well. And so nothing has been changed that removes any public transparency.

**Walter:** Any questions on this? So Patrick (**Pease**) is there a deadline for getting this approved or voted on? What are we looking at?

**Pease:** It's actually in this draft form up on the website now, because people are already working on curriculum, so the sooner the better so we can take the draft form off and put the final form on.

**Walter:** Okay, so the next step for this will be...

**Pease:** So I'm just...

**Walter:** We're not voting on this today I assume?

**Pease:** That's up to you.

**Walter:** I suppose we could. I haven't read it that thoroughly myself, but my inclination is to give people just a little bit more time to have a look at this.

**Pease:** Sure.

**Walter:** In the draft state, make comments. Can they send their comments directly to you?

**Pease:** Absolutely. So if there are any changes we can address those maybe next time? And then get the thumbs up, thumbs down approval on the edits. Anything that is not highlighted in color has been in the handbook for a while. That doesn't mean you shouldn't look at it. It doesn't mean it's all correct and the way it should be either, but primarily look at the parts that are highlighted in the orange text and underlined as the major edits that were made this time around. I will point out in case you're unaware of the process, the UCC Committee does all of its work and the last meeting are actually these revisions. So the committee goes through and comes up with these edits based on the experiences from the previous round of all the edits, and that's where a lot of the clarifications and complications come in from issues that arose in the year, and then we try to clean it up and have a progressively better document each year.

**Walter:** Well I had a few nods when I suggested we put this off one more meeting. The last thing I want to do is put anything else on the next meeting, which Amy (**Petersen**) is going to run, because I'm going to be in Chicago at the Higher Learning Commission Training, so Amy (**Petersen**) gets another practice run at the carrier deck here. So, I think if we run that to the top of the docket next time and vote on it pretty much right away.

**Pease:** I'll be at the same HLC meeting, but I'll share with you any comments that come to me so that you know what exactly any additional comments were.

**Walter:** Since curriculum really is our top mandate in here, I think taking a little bit extra time on that would give everybody a chance to have a look at it. Does anyone have any objections to doing that? Do I need a motion? I'll tell you what, I'll entertain a motion to move this to the April 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, top of the docket.



Moved by Senator **O’Kane**, seconded by Senator **Neibert**. All in favor of moving this item, Docket #1259 to the April 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, please indicate by saying ‘Aye.’ Opposed, ‘Nay.’ Abstentions? The motion passes.

**Walter:** Thank you very much. Next up is the Athletics Department visit to Faculty Senate. David **Harris** is here to present this material and I will bring up your PowerPoint.

**Eshbaugh:** I’m going to hand out the other document. I’m not sure that we’re really going to have time to go over it after this, so we’ll play it by ear on that. I know you’re swamped. So, like many of you guys, I play several roles on campus, and I’m here today as the Faculty Athletics Rep. I am the liaison between academics and athletics on this campus, and I help to insure the academic integrity of our athletic program. And our Director of Athletics, David (**Harris**) today is going to present a draft of our Strategic Plan, which senior staff has been working really diligently on, and then when we are finished with that I also have some data for you on the academics of our athletic program.

**Harris:** Alright, thank you Elaine (**Eshbaugh**). Good afternoon everybody. Thank you for allowing me to come and spend a few minutes with you to present you with a draft of our Strategic Plan. We’ve been working on this as Elaine (**Eshbaugh**) has said for a while, now the better part of this year, to try to get it to a point where we’re ready to introduce it to a number of different groups across campus: faculty groups, staff, as well as students to be able to get feedback. It’s in draft format because we want feedback whether it’s during this meeting, or if you want to shoot me an email or a call afterwards. If you see something you have questions about or something you want to give input to, that’s the point of us

going around and doing this. We're hoping to complete all of these presentations by the end of the semester, with the idea being to be able to present the final version at some point here this summer. So, we'll jump right into it, starting off with our vision statement, and I think everybody got a copy of the document ahead of time, so you've had the chance to read it. So I won't go through it in detail, but stop me certainly if you have any questions. A couple of things that stand out with our **Vision Statement** I really wanted to emphasize the student-athlete experience similar to if you look at the University's Strategic Plan, with student success being that ultimate goal with the three pillars underneath, we really want to emphasize the quality of the student-athlete experience. And then ultimately trying to achieve unprecedented success in all of the areas that we encounter with the academics competition, or in anything that we do. So trying to go a step beyond—a level beyond—the success that's been had in the Athletics Department previously. Trying to be smart about what we're doing, and how we're going to measure ourselves, but also trying to be ambitious, and trying to move forward in a significant way.

**Harris:** From the **Mission** standpoint, providing opportunities for student-athletes to quality learning experiences in competition, taking pride in the role as a unifying force for the campus and the community, operating with integrity, serving as leaders in diversity and inclusion; innovative with our resources, and committing ourselves to the student-athlete experience. The Vision is ultimately supposed to be where we're trying to go, and the Mission is a reflection of where we feel like we are today. So, we spent some time working with a couple of consultants here on campus to try to put into words what we felt like represents what we do each and every day in working with our student-athletes.

**Core values:** the things that we consider to be non-negotiables; that we want to make sure that we're adhering to each and every day. Academic excellence is always going to be first and foremost for us. Supporting the mission of the University—making sure that that our student-athletes are capable of doing the work; that they're graduating—that they're receiving an education. They're getting a degree and a major of their choosing, and they're able to go out into the community and have success. Community engagement: seeking to become a part of the community as much as possible, whether that's through service or different partnerships. Competitive excellence: the idea that we want to strive for and win championships individually, conference-level, and nationally. Diversity & Inclusion: Many times the Athletics Department is an area where you have quite a bit of diversity, but that doesn't mean that we shouldn't be making that a part of who we are; that we want to make sure that not only are our coaches and our staff, and our student-athletes diverse, but that within the climate of the Athletics Department, that we do a good job of making sure that everybody feels empowered; everybody feels included, and that they have an opportunity to be able to have success. **Financial Accountability:** taking the funds that are invested in athletics and making sure that we use them to grow the program; we use them to be more competitive. We use them to make sure that our students-athletes have a great experience. We use them towards scholarships, and things that make the lives of our student-athletes better. Integrity: making sure that the Athletics Department doesn't do anything to bring embarrassment on to the University. That we're role models, not only with our student-athletes, but also with our coaches and our staff, and then ultimately the student-athlete experience as I've mentioned—we want to insure that our student-athletes have

a great experience during their time at UNI, whether it's competitively, academically, the things they do within the community—that they understand, that their family understands, that when they come to UNI they are a part of the Panther family, and we want to make sure that we invest in them in a significant way.

**Harris:** Then you get into our **goals**, starting with **academic excellence**, we have several metrics for each of these goals that we want to use to measure ourselves. The idea is that we are going from 2018 to 2023. The majority of our goals are to be achieved during that time period, but then there's some of them that we want to achieve annually. And so if it's an annual goal, then we will list it. First, being to have a Federal Graduation Rate that is higher than that of the student body. The same thing with our student-athlete grade point average, to be above a 3.0 and higher than the regular student body. A Federal Graduation Rate within the minority student-athlete population that's greater than that of the minority student body, which is one that we spend quite a bit of time talking about because if you look at the Federal Graduation Rate for minority student-athletes, it's only a measure of those that are on scholarship, versus the rest of the minority student body. So that number can be relatively small, and it can fluctuate quite a bit from year to year. If you looked at the information, the data—you would see that those numbers fluctuate from 55% to 25%, depending on how many are in their cohort. And then annually achieving an overall APR score of 985. Many of you may not know, APR represents the Academic Progress Rate. Which, the best way to explain it is that it's a measurement of whether or not our student-athletes are continuing to be eligible, and whether they are being retained from one semester to the next. Each student-athlete has an opportunity

to be able to earn four points during each academic year, and the scores for each of our teams are reflected individually through a report to the NCAA. The highest that you can make is 1000 on the APR score. We chose 985 because the NCAA is beginning a new distribution of money starting next year that's going to be based on your ability to hit certain metrics: 985 is one of those metrics, and that's the one that we've identified as being the one that's most attainable for us, and so we've made that one a part of our Strategic Plan to meet that particular metric.

**Harris: Community Engagement:** Our student-athletes completing a minimum of 3,000 volunteer hours. If you look at the data, we range anywhere from the high 1000's to I believe 2,800 last year. TC's Kids's Club membership, up to 200; reach a total of 6,000 fan interactions through the Panther Caravan which just started for us. It was a new initiative last summer that went really well, and we look forward to rolling it out again here this summer. Varsity Club membership to over 200. Varsity Club—that's former student-athletes. So, student-athletes that have been through the University: We really want to do a good job of getting them back engaged with us; having them as a part of what we're doing, spending time with our current student-athletes, and feeling good about the experience that they had with us. PSC membership: (Panther Scholarship Club) in all 99 counties. I believe this last year we had 85 counties covered. Panther Scholarship Club is the annual giving arm of the Athletics Department, and all of that money goes toward funding scholarships for student-athletes. And then increasing total student attendance at athletic events by 50% in each of the ticketed sports, which we have football men's basketball, women's basketball, volleyball, and wrestling. This is critical for us because we believe if we can get student attendance up, that will have a dramatic impact on the atmosphere at a number of our games, and so we

want to work on the plans to get our student attendance up in all of our sports. Some of them have trended up a little bit. Some of them have stayed stagnant, and then others of them have gone down. So, that's going to be an important initiative for us. Competitive Excellence, we have three goals: Finish in the top 100 of the Learfield Sports Director's Cup, first in our conference, and in the top 10 among all the public FCS universities. For those who are unaware, the Learfield Sports Director's Cup is a national measurement of excellence or competitive excellence across all of your sports programs. So they look at the scoring is based on earning an NCAA tournament bid. And once you earn that bid, then depending on where you ultimately finish, for instance if you win a national championship, then they give you 100 points. And if you finish in second, they will give you 95 points—all the way down through it. So you have to qualify for an NCAA tournament in order to be able to earn points. So we want to be in a position where we're in the top 100. We're first among schools within the conference, and we're within the top 10 of all public FCS universities. We've done that once during the past five years. Win the Missouri Valley Conference all sports competition, which is on a smaller scale than Learfield: It just looks at the teams within the Missouri Valley Conference, and it's a competition on how you have done on all of your sports. We have never won that particular competition. The highest we've finished is second. We finished in second last year, so we want our goal to be to win that, and to be the best overall Athletics Department within the conference. And then, all teams finish in the top three of their conference standings. We have gone from maybe having three in the top three five years ago, to having nine in the top three just this past year.

**Harris: Diversity & Inclusion:** Bringing the department into full compliance with all components of Title IX, specifically with our participation numbers, which are not where they need to be as of yet, but we also have to look at scholarships, as well as what's called the laundry list. Scholarships has to do with—in the same way that the undergraduate student population needs to match the student-athlete population, the degree to which we give scholarships to our student-athletes needs to match those numbers. So in other words, if your undergraduate student population is 55% female, then your number of female student-athletes also needs to be 55%. And if you look at the scholarships that you're giving, then you need to be giving 55% of your scholarship money to female student-athletes, and so our commitment is to make sure that we are meeting all of those metrics.

Number two talks about surveying the department to look at the existing culture and climate. Number three, enlarging our pool of applicants to make sure that there is full representation through all classes. And then Number four, attract and retain diverse student-athletes, coaches and staff who are integrated into the campus community.

**Harris: Facilities:** There's several on here. Pretty much all of these will be contingent on private funding. So, as we're able to secure private funding, then these are the things that we are wanting to pursue, starting with the multi-purpose basketball facility, which will be on the west side of the McLeod Center, would be space not only for our men's and women's basketball program, but also an area for administrative offices as well as a new academic center, which we're in desperate need of within the department. Football team meeting room, which would be on the south concourse of the McLeod Center—excuse me—of the

Dome. Right now our football team does not have a facility where the team can meet altogether. So, we want to build this facility, and also have it double as a premium seating space on football game days. McLeod upgrades among those—our basketball court needs to be replaced. Ultimately, it's at a point where it can no longer be sanded and refinished anymore, so we have to go about replacing that. An outdoor turf field is necessary for us because we use the Dome quite a bit for non-athletics activities, trying to generate revenue for the department. So many times that can displace our coaches and our student-athletes where they have to go and practice outside. But during this time of the year—like spring practice is just starting here today or tomorrow, it's not a good situation to be able to go outside and try to practice, right? [Laughter] The field is not in the best shape, and if you go out there your student-athletes are going to get injured. We if we have a turf field outside, it gives us a better surface, not only for football, but soccer, and some of our other program to be able to practice.

Soccer/Softball/Track complex: We need to replace our outdoor track. Not only does it need resurfacing, but the asphalt underneath the track has failed. So, we have to replace the entire track. So, we want to build a complex around that area that will also bring soccer and softball back on campus. Soccer currently competes in Waterloo. Softball competes at the Robinson-Dresser complex, so we'd like to have them all on campus, so that our students will have better access to that. The UNI Dome is over 40 years old, so it's in need of a number of different renovations from the seating area to the track that needs to be resurfaced, to restrooms and concession stands, and a number of things that have been talked about around here for years. And then finally, the West Gym is in need of a few upgrades as well before we pay attention to it.



**Harris:** And then finally, **Financial Accountability:** Raising \$2,000,000 in cash donations through the Panther Scholarship Club which I mentioned is the arm—the annual giving arm—to the Athletics Department, raising money for scholarships. Increasing the number of PSC members to 2,000. Right now, we set a record in cash donations to the PSC last year with \$1.25 million. This year our goal is \$1.65 million. We want to get to \$2 million by 2023. Increasing the number of PSC members to 2,000—I think our current number is around 1,600 or so. Increasing the number of season tickets sold in each sport by 50% in each of our ticketed sports. Increasing the overall ticket revenue by 50%, and increasing the average attendance in each of the ticketed sports by the same amount. So for us, we're trying to hit three different areas: One, season tickets is kind of the baseline for us. We have to increase that number. Secondly, overall ticket revenue, which is going to look at season tickets. Single game tickets as well as any other additional promotions that we're running, and then average attendance. It's not just about selling more tickets. It's about having people use those tickets and come to the games so we can have a great atmosphere for our student-athletes to compete at. I believe that's it. Does anyone have any questions? We wanted to get this out ahead of time so you'd have a chance to look at it. But we wanted to also to have a chance to be able to present this and answer any questions that you might have.

**Neibert:** What kind of progress have you made thus far in raising those external funds for some of those facility upgrades? I hear a lot about the basketball.

**Harris:** Some of them we haven't started to raise funds, others we have. For instance, the football team meeting room is about a million-dollar project, and we

are about half way through getting the funding for that. The replacement of the basketball court is going to be about \$125,000 project, and we've identified a corporation here in town that's interested in funding that one for us. So those are two that are probably the furthest down the road. Some of the bigger ones, like the practice complex as well as the Dome, we haven't started the fundraising for those as of yet.

**Walter:** Other questions for Director **Harris**?

**Strauss:** What is the state of college football now, at UNI in particular, in terms of facing the issue having to do with brain damage to football players?

**Harris:** Good question. I would say the state of college football in that regard is evolving, in that everyone is now required to have what is called a concussion protocol. Meaning that when you have someone who is believed to have suffered a concussion, then there's a protocol that they have to go through on the sidelines with your medical professionals to identify whether or not they can be put back in the game, or whether they have to be held out. And then furthermore, if they're identified as having a concussion, what's going to be the recovery process and how long they have to sit out before they can play in another game going forward. Some schools have even gone as far as to have independent medical consultants that watch the game and identify hits that could cause concussion, even though the player is not necessarily showing any symptoms on the field, so that they can be removed from the field and tested for a concussion. And then they have to be cleared before they can go back into the game. So it's certainly much better than it has been, but it's something that continues to need work so that we can keep all of our student-athletes safe.

**Strauss:** Are the schools considering tracking the long-term health of graduate players, because it seems to be a time-based issue?

**Eshbaugh:** When we had our meeting last year for the Missouri Valley Conference, we had the medical director for the NCAA come and talk about the study that they're doing that is doing exactly that--where they're looking longitudinally. I had the exact same question: How long are we going to follow these student-athletes after they finish playing college football, because you're absolutely right. As someone who works in dementia care ironically, this may be 20 or 30 years out. So we're just really starting those longitudinal studies from what I'm learning.

**Harris:** Also, I know everybody focuses on football, but you have concussions in other sports, and those student-athletes deserve the same type of care. We have them in wrestling. You get them in soccer, you even get them in diving from time to time. So, want to make sure that we're treating our student-athletes fairly when it comes to their medical care.

**Schraffenberger:** I appreciated all the breakdown of the G.P.A.'s in each of the sports. I thought that was really easy to read. I noticed one of your goals was to have a 3.0 and higher than the rest of the student body, but it looks to me like you're already doing that. The only populations that aren't are the international students, the minority, and minority male, and just male students. I'm wondering if that goal was for all the student body, or directed to those populations within athletics?

**Harris:** It was a goal meant to look at the student-athlete population as a whole, versus the student body as a whole, but certainly we can adjust it in whatever

way we feel that we would like to. It's one of those where everywhere that I've worked, that goal has been in place just as a general measurement, and it's just fortunate that we've been able to do a good job in that regard. So, if we wanted to change or add one, that specifically looked at a part of the population, whether that was men or international students, we could do that, which is one of the reasons we put minority student-athletes up there, because that's one where we haven't done a good job, and we need to do a better job.

**Schraffenberger:** So that's just a goal that will be maintained?

**Harris:** Yes.

**Schraffenberger:** You wouldn't add that to say 3.15?

**Harris:** It's possible. We thought about that 3.0 seems like a general mark that everybody understands. But we could make it 3.1, 3.2—certainly to further challenge our student-athletes to step it up.

**Schraffenberger:** I'm just thinking about student-outcome assessment in my life, so you assess what you have, and then you set goals that are a little higher that you can reach so you can continually improve. It's obvious that you're already meeting that goal, and it seems like pretty easily.

**Harris:** That's great feedback, and it's certainly something that we can put on our list to look at. The idea is that as we're meeting with all of the different groups, we're taking the feedback in and then once we've met with everybody, then we're going to—Ann is (**Arns**) helping us with notes, and we can go back in and look at all the notes of the areas where we want to make adjustments to the draft. Other questions?

**Walter:** Other questions for Director **Harris**.

**Harris:** If not, I want to turn in back over Elaine (**Eshbaugh**) to finish us up.

**Eshbaugh:** Because we have a very limited time today, I don't think we have enough time to really delve into these numbers. But I do have a handout for everyone. Each summer I am required to write a report that goes on file with the Athletic Director, President, and Provost. And what I have done is not included the full report in this handout. Because you are faculty; because you like data, I have pulled some of the data that you might find most interesting out of that report. There is a link at the end, where if you would like to look at the whole report with the narrative and with additional data, you can obviously go to that link. I don't know how many people access this report online with all of our graduation rates, our APR data is on there obviously that David spoke of, our GPA data. But it is accessible to everyone, and it is required that I do post that report online for the sake of transparency. So, I'm more than willing to take questions about it at any point in time. I don't believe we have a lot of time for questions today.

**Walter:** Not so much.

**Eshbaugh:** Not so much. So, I will leave that with you and my contact information is on there if anyone would like to get in touch with me and talk with about specifics. I spend a lot of time with data, so I'm always excited to discuss it. Thank you everyone.

**Walter:** Thank you very much. We really appreciate it. A note also on that particular petition, that pdf that you're looking at right now is attached to that.

**Harris:** Thank you all very much for your time.

**Walter:** Thank you very much. So that brings us to two different emeritus requests. One for Howard **Barnes**, and one for professor Katherine **van Wormer**. Had anyone here intended to speak on these requests? This is the one for Howard **Barnes**. Here is the emerita request for Katherine **van Wormer**. Does anyone have anything to say on behalf of them?

**Stafford:** Regarding Howard **Barnes**, I worked with him for the last couple of years that he was the Director of the School of Applied Human Sciences, and I always found him to be so supportive of both student success and faculty success.

**Walter:** Thank you. Thank you so much. Anyone else want to say anything about this emeritus request for Howard **Barnes**?

**Vallentine:** He served as the Voice of the Panther Marching Band for many, many years, giving of his time.

**Walter:** Voice of the Marching Band? How does that work?

**Vallentine:** He does all the announcing.

**Walter:** Oh, okay. And Professor Katherine **van Wormer**, does anyone have anything to say to support this emerita request, or a comment of any sort? Okay, so let me take these one at a time here. I'll make this really quick. I'll need a motion to approve the emeritus request for Howard **Barnes**. Moved by Senator **Stafford**. Do I have a second? Seconded by Senator **Schraffenberger**. Any further discussion? All in favor of approving the emeritus request for Howard **Barnes**, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstentions? One abstention by Senator **Strauss**. The motion passes.

**Walter:** So now, the request for faculty emerita status for Professor Katherine **van Wormer**. Do I have a motion to approve this? Senator **Fenech**. Do I have a second? Seconded by Senator **Varzavand**. He beat Senator **Strauss** by just a fraction of a second, let the record indicate. Okay, any further discussion on this? All in favor of approving this request for faculty emerita status for Katherine **van Wormer**, please indicate by saying ‘aye.’ Opposed, ‘nay.’ Abstentions? The motion passes. Thank you very much.

**Walter:** So, I believe that brings us to Dr. **Bass** and a presentation on the General Education Approval Process.

**Bass:** I’m here today primarily in a support role as one of the Co-Chairs of the Committee, but three of your members: Jeremy (**Schraffenberger**) and Steve (**O’Kane**) and Tristan (**Bernhard**) serve on the committee, and so they were going to do the general discussion of it, and I’m happy to answer any questions that might arise that they feel I could help provide some additional information.

**O’Kane:** I can make a few comments. Then I’m going to pass it on to Jeremy (**Schraffenberger**) before my voice is gone. The Provost sent us—five of the members of the General Education Review Committee, to Philadelphia a short time ago. One of the things we noticed—all five of us—was that the schools successful in getting Gen Ed revisions in place, and those schools that felt they were being successful in getting them in place, had a document similar to this one that laid out very, very clearly how this process would be presented to the University community: all different levels of the University community, with the idea of being as open to scrutiny as possible, but also being expedient. We talked,

as I said, with a number of our colleagues at this conference, and we got a lot of kudos actually, that we were ahead of the curve, having this almost in place.

**Schraffenberger:** The most important thing, at least in my mind is that there really isn't substance yet to discuss. I know everybody wants to talk about General Education and have their two cents and give feedback. This is simply describing a mechanism for the campus community to do that. So, if there's any discussion, I would suggest we talk about the process, rather than the further substantive discussion which will be very interesting. There will be plenty of time for that kind of feedback. So right now we're eager to have a kind of mandate in a way. We were given the mandate from the Faculty Senate before in November saying, "You have to form this committee; you're approved to form this committee." Now we're simply saying, "Alright now, is this okay if we operate in this way?" And essentially we're asking the Faculty Senate to be the final approval, or have the final approval function as the end result of this whole process.

**O'Kane:** You notice as we go through the various levels of consultations, that it keeps coming—it ends back with this body.

**Schraffenberger:** So you might get tired of hearing about it eventually, but this will be the body where there is a final 'yea' or 'nay' after all of the feedback is gathered from the campus. And from the student's perspective, Tristan (Bernhard) might want to offer some insight.

**Bernhard:** Yes. So sitting on the committee before we kind of play the game, it was important for us to establish rules of the game, which is kind of what sits before you today. I think it's our hope—the committee's hope—both student's



and faculty's perspective that when you read this it does come across that transparency was our utmost priority. It goes through I think all of the appropriate bodies, and I think it's something that serves everyone on campus's interests fundamentally, both students and faculty and otherwise.

**Walter:** So can you comment yet on the implementation and assessment part of this? How do you predict that's going to pan out?

**Schraffenberger:** Since we haven't yet agreed upon student learning outcomes or a mission for that matter, or even a structure within which we will be deciding how those outcomes are achieved, there's absolutely no way we can talk about assessing or implementing. Those details I think are going to have to come as future conversations.

**O'Kane:** Assessment of course will be a big, big, piece of this.

**Schraffenberger:** We should say there are two phases. This is first. I think most of the first phase and some of the second?

**Bass:** The first phase will be the learning outcomes and the mission and vision that we're currently working on. Phase Two will be the structure, and then Phase Three would be the implementation, and rolling it out and figuring out how it all fits together.

**Walter:** So, you were given a mandate in November. You went to Philly to work this out with consultation with people who have done this before. This is the most final draft. What is your timeline like in terms of getting a vote on it, et cetera?

**Schraffenberger:** We'd like to be able to vote on it today, as soon as possible, mostly just so we don't have to worry about it anymore, and work on the substance.

**Walter:** Yes. Next steps; substance. Any further points to discuss?

**Stafford:** Is there a proposed timeline for going through those stages?

**Schraffenberger:** It's in the original document that we voted on in November.

**Wohlpert:** Could you remind us?

**Schraffenberger:** I have to look at it actually.

**Wohlpert:** I think it was pretty ambitious. I thought that we would be done with goals and mission—learning goals—by the end of this semester, and then that we would have structure in the fall. That may be really fast. And actually, to be quite frank, most Gen Ed revision processes are usually about two full years and maybe even three years. So we got started half-way through the year this year. To get it done by the end of this semester is probably ambitious. It's probably in the fall semester that you all would be getting feedback I think for mission and learning goals. Approved at some point in the fall, and then its probably another six months or a year before structure is done.

**O'Kane:** I could not have said it better.

**Walter:** Did you have any feedback on whether those are rather ambitious goals from your colleagues in Philly?

**O'Kane:** I think the Provost is right. It usually takes two years to three years. So we discovered at this conference that two years is really ambitious. As you can

imagine, once we begin moving ahead, and we have goals and mission statements, people are really going to want to weigh in and really think about how those sort of things might impact their programs. The best thing to be is to be as absolutely transparent as we can possibly be and to listen, to make it clear that the committee—and it's a fairly large committee--that that the committee truly is truly listening to all these constituents.

**Walter:** The transparency part has to be organic. So I would accept a motion to approve this document, such as it stands at this point, unless there are further points of discussion. Approved by Senator **Skaar**, seconded by Senator **Choi**.

Unless there are further points of discussion, all in favor of approving this document such as it stands, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstentions? The motion passes. Great work guys. Thank you very much. Thank you very much Brenda (**Bass**) as well.

**Walter:** So next, we're almost going to be on time. We have an Open Review on Effort Certification. I have one item for that. Are we going to be presented with a talk on this?

**Kidd:** No, I just have a couple of statements. So like he (the Provost) points out, in 2014 there was an Effort Certification Policy put forth in RSP because we didn't have one, and that's definitely not a good thing—not to have one at all, because federal grants and such—you get audited, it's probably not such a good thing. What I was looking for too, perhaps is having some additional discussion of this policy, because I think some of it, while being very open for faculty work, some of it, it seems like bureaucracy—inhibits faculty work as well. And one of the areas that's come up: [Looking at highlighted areas on document] Here's a good place:

Effort Certification. I fully agree with this statement. Our current policy, effort is not defined as 'compensated work,' and I think that's a failing of the policy. I think we should be cognizant that if you're not being paid for work, it's not to be considered. It's your free time, and so as long as you are putting forth the effort required by the funding, I don't think anyone should be involved in what you're doing outside of work, even if that might be related to work. Even if I'm writing a letter of recommendation or et cetera, as long as I'm putting forth the hours required for the grant, if I'm not being paid, it's my time. That's just my opinion, and I believe that's consistent across most universities that it's not about the effort you expend—compensated effort is a completely different story—if you're being paid to do something by administrative or teaching or service, you have to be very cognizant of that, right? But if you're not being paid, well then that's fine. The other area which comes into focus here is that the reporting period for effort—actually different universities have very different reporting periods: Some reporting periods are based on like a semester, summer. Some use reporting periods as academic year or summer. Some use reporting periods of, like UNI I believe does per month. And most grants, they use reporting periods based on the time of the grant. It could be an annual, et cetera. And so where this comes into play is when effort spans more than a month—which it does for grants. It does for sponsored programs. So for example, one could think of like during the Christmas break, one could be doing some work on a grant. Now rightfully so, there is no mechanism for you to be paid from a grant in excess of your salary. That causes all kinds of potential issues. However, at least with some grants, you're allowed to average your effort over the entire reporting for the grant, which is on an annual basis. So, one could see putting two weeks of effort into the

time over Christmas break, and then of course in the summer, maybe that counts towards it. Currently, that's not possible here. And it's not possible at all universities either. I'll be honest. It varies dramatically I think.

**Walter:** Tim (**Kidd**) you think that's complicated because of the time card analogy? You can't take hours from Christmas and pop them over into summer?

**Kidd:** Yeah. Exactly. Exactly. You know I've worked with the federal government labs, and they're not paid like we are. They're paid on an hourly basis, and the way things are done as a federal employee or a federal contractor is very different than it is for an academic. Like you know for example, if you work eight hours in June, you actually get paid less than if you get paid eight hours in February, but that's the wrong month. But because we're paid as a percentage, right? And we get paid as a monthly salary, and so different days in different months actually have different percentages. It gets kind of complicated that way. And I think it's just overly complicated there, and there might be some areas where this could be improved.

**Kidd:** Another aspect is there's a cap on the overall effort. And I believe the standard cap that we use at UNI is about 95%, at least that's my department. And that's pretty typical. The way that effort is capped for Sponsored Programs, that means that you can't get 100% of your salary. And I think they do that for avoiding I guess—reporting issues. And so that percentage varies from 90% which I believe is ISU is 90%. Many have a 95%. Some, what they do is say you can get two months in the summer, but not three. Okay? So 95%--I get it. It seems like that's standard, or it's a nice standard. I wouldn't change that, but I'd like to actually in the policy, because I think that adds some confusion for some people

when they go to say, “Hey, why can’t I get paid?” Because I said so. It would be nice if it was just in there, like you know—boom: This is why. We have reasons for this. And I think having that kind of thing in there would just reduce the need to say, “What are you doing on Wednesday? What are you doing on Friday when faculty are trying to do their work?” Now, I don’t expect the University Senate—we’re not in charge of this, right? Faculty are not in charge of this policy, and so I’m promoting taking a wider University-view of this policy, and I think it’s nice it’s dovetailing with this new position, to be honest—because I think a lot of our RSP offices that I’ve looked at—they’re much bigger than ours. They’re huge, right? We have a very small office in comparison, and I think we could use some more eyes on the subject. Now, do most universities have this policy as a big-letter policy? I would say probably ‘no.’ I would say it’s a minority, but some do. It’s kind of hard to tell what’s policy, and what’s RSP policy in different areas, but that’s what I’m looking for: I would like to see not major changes, but I would hope that we could take a look at is there ways that could be used to—I guess average things out more smoothly? I mean at UNI, we’re not an RI institution, and we face a lot of hurdles in getting external funding. We face hurdles in reputation. We face hurdles on campus. We don’t have the same support structure. Like when we try to do reporting, it’s on us. We have to do all the reporting. And that’s a lot of work. Other places, they have a lot more bureaucratic staff that can do this for their faculty. So it’s a real challenge. Anyway, that’s really what I’m hoping for. It’s just that we get more eyes on this. Maybe get some things—I don’t know. I wouldn’t say I don’t want to be the average. I want to say, is there a way that we could make this so that faculty have an easier time doing scholarly work? An easier time with reporting—all those kinds of things. There’s my speech.

**Walter:** I guess if I wrote more federal grants, I would probably welcome this problem—or won them.

**Kidd:** In terms of experience, I've worked for the DOD, I've worked for DOE, I've been funded by NSF, DOD, DOE, Iowa Energy Center, many internal grants, Mattel—God knows who. And this is stuff that I use to support my students, right? And I'll be honest, I'm a real headache—not recently, but I've been a real headache for people. So you have four grants that you're going to pay yourself and your students for the summer, and the RSP Office is like, "What percentage of your time are you working on this project?" and I'm just—make it work. Make it add up, because I can't tell you if I'm in the lab, what project I'm working on. Probably two or three at the same time. And if you look at the original federal regulation—I don't remember the number—my phone's dead, but even the regulation says: It's not expected to get this exact. Okay? It's not expected to have this exact.

**Walter:** They want accountability.

**Kidd:** They want accountability, but they do understand that this is a complicated bunch of moving parts. I guess the last thing is to reduce reporting. Effort certification is not required by all external funding. It's required for federal and many others, but not for all of them. And why not, if it's not required--just use the least-restrictive policy you can, as opposed to the most-restrictive policy? That's all. Some university even have it set in the very beginning that: This policy applies to federal grants and grants which require effort certification. And that is all.

**Walter:** So if I went to look for the University policy on that, would that be easy to find?

**Kidd:** For this one? I've included it.

**Walter:** Right. But would it be instructive if you were to rewrite language for that from you what you're suggesting?

**Kidd:** I don't know if I personally should rewrite language without consultation with someone in the RSP Office. I think I would like a discussion. And there definitely I have some language that I could put in, but remember, I'm not an auditor, and so I would never think that someone should take my language and it should be passed as policy because that's not my role. I feel more the impact of policy, and unintended consequences I think. I think the RSP Office is not going, "You know I think it would be great today to make faculty work harder." No one wants that. That's all.

**Walter:** Is there anything else on this document that we need to look at? We're kind of running out of time.

**Kidd:** I'm good unless people have some questions.

**Walter:** So this was an open review of RSP Policy. Does anyone have any points to discuss on that?

**Wohlpart:** I would encourage you to look at the rest of the document because as Tim (**Kidd**) said, we are in line with what other institutions do. We're not out of line with that. I think the question is, should this become a 'Capital P' policy? That's a question for you all, to recommend.

**Kidd:** We couldn't decide.

**Wohlpart:** You could recommend it.



**Walter:** I'm not sure I know what that means.

**Wohlpert:** So we have a place on our website where we have University-wide Approved Policy—'Capital P' policies. We also have policies that lots of people create in lots of different areas—'Small P' policies. And so this is a policy that is in RSP. And I do understand, from Tim's (**Kidd**) perspective, this is accurate, that there wasn't a lot of community feedback on the creation of this policy. We needed to get something up and in place, and we should have done a better job of being more inclusive in that.

**Kidd:** I have no criticism of the initial rush to get something in place. Absolutely.

**Wohlpert:** At the very end of this document, you will see that there are some very heavy fines if you don't certify effort appropriately, and it is the Institution that is responsible for that. It is RSP that is responsible for that. It's not Faculty Senate. It's not the PI's. They're the ones responsible for that, so that's why the policies need to be as clear as possible. I think the question is: Do you all want to recommend there be a formal policy? What I will say is if it's a formal policy, it will invite more scrutiny, and probably more rigidity. So that's something I would be very cautious about.

**Walter:** Well, if we get scrutiny and rigidity, do we also get guidance and direction? Because I assume that rigidity and scrutiny is going to come from the upper administration as well as the funding agencies. Is that a safe assumption?

**Kidd:** I don't see how the funders would look at this at all.

**Wohlpert:** Well, it comes from the funding agencies as you said, federal grants have certain expectations that other grants don't.

**Kidd:** I don't imagine that FCS is going to read our policy.

**Wohlpart:** No, but we will get feedback as we look at this. So, it's really the call on the part of your Faculty Senate if you want to recommend that this be reviewed as a potential University-wide policy.

**Walter:** Sounds reasonable. Do I have a motion to review this as University-wide policy? Going once.

**Wohlpart:** If I could suggest another alternative is to suggest a working group of faculty and administrators to come together to review this, and update it and then have a conversation about what you want to do with it. That's another possibility which I think would be very welcomed.

**Walter:** I think that would happen this semester.

**Wohlpart:** No, that's not going to happen this semester.

**Kidd:** I would take that as a friendly amendment to the proposal.

**Walter:** So the friendly amendment that we form committees to have a look at this policy. Do I have a motion consistent with that suggestion?

**Wohlpart:** Or we could just do it without a motion.

**Kidd:** Or we could just leave it as it is.

**Walter:** I'm not hearing any motions at all, not even from Dr. **Kidd**.

**Kidd:** I can't make them.

**Wohlpart:** I would be happy to assign this to the new Associate Vice President.

[Laughter]

**Kidd:** I can't make motions.

**Walter:** That's true, you can't. Well, we'll just let that lay where it is. It's excellent to have a good close look at this stuff. I find that as infrequently as a I get outside funding, it's pretty Byzantine.

**Kidd:** They're not saying the policy should stay as it is.

**Walter:** No one stepped up to offer a...

**Wohlpert:** We will create a joint committee to look at this.

**Schraffenberger:** I don't know exactly what we're talking about. I don't know all that we're talking about. I'd rather have information, and I think that I would love to hear about this, but first I would like to have somebody else go and gather information to put the question forth, than to have it be an official Faculty Senate recommendation. That's where I stand. I don't think it's a bad idea. I just don't know it's a good idea.

**Walter:** So I'll take a motion to table this until we have more information on that, if I could suggest that.

**Petersen:** Are you tabling under the understanding that there will be a working group to look at this?

**Walter:** Not that formal.

**Wohlpert:** Yeah. I think a formal working group to gather information: Faculty and administration come together, gather information, review the policy, make recommendations for changes, and then bring it back to this committee with 'Here's what we found, here's what we recommend.'

**Walter:** So Senator **Schraffenberger**, would you care to offer that motion?

**Schraffenberger:** I will offer that motion.

**Walter:** Do I have a second on that motion? Seconded by Senator **Strauss**. All in favor of tabling this particular petition until the just-described committee is formed and we can gather further information in all likelihood, next semester. Please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain? Thank you very much. I'm sorry we ran a little bit over, but I'm amazed that we actually got this much done. Thanks a lot. Motion to adjourn by Senator **Strauss** as usual. Second by Senator **Skaar**. Thank you very much. Excellent.

Submitted by,

Kathy Sundstedt

Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist

UNI Faculty Senate

**Next Meeting:**

**April 9, 2018**

**3:30 p.m.**

**Rod Library (301) Scholar Space**

**Addenda: Emeritus Requests Documents**

Addendum 1: Howard **Barnes**

Addendum 2: Katherine **van Wormer**



Request for Faculty Emeritus Status

Name Howard L. Barnes Department Sch of Applied Human Sciences UID 406571

I wish to retire from my position as Assoc Prof  
at the University of Northern Iowa, effective June 30, 2018.

I have twenty (20) or more years of credible service in higher education. (List institutions and dates of employment)

<u>U. of Northern IA</u> Institution	<u>Aug, 1997 - June, 2018</u> Date
<u>East Carolina U.</u> Institution	<u>Aug, 1992 - June, 1997</u> Date
<u>Kansas State U.</u> Institution	<u>Aug, 1985 - July, 1992</u> Date
<u>Howard L. Barnes</u> Signature of Applicant	<u>Dec 28, 2017</u> Date

**College Chair Senate:** Include a statement verifying that ten (10) years of meritorious service has been concluded with the University of Northern Iowa. (Use the back of this form if more space is required.)

[Signature]  
College Senate Chair

2/5/2018  
Date

**Approved and Accepted**

Annette Lyle  
Department Head

2/5/2018  
Date

[Signature]  
Dean of College (if applicable)

2/6/18  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
University Faculty Senate Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Provost and Vice President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Please prepare this form: sign and submit to your department head. When the process for approval has been completed, the division head's office will make copies and distribute them to each of the above signatories and the Department of Human Resource Services.

The college senate chair has verified Dr. Barnes' more than ten years of meritorious service at UNI.

Notes on the academic career of Dr. Howard L. Barnes  
Written and submitted by Dr. Barnes

Hired as the department head for Design, Family and Consumer Sciences (DFCS), Howard Barnes joined the UNI community in August, 1997. With a doctorate in marriage and family therapy, and a master's degree in family life education, he has taught in family studies and gerontology. During his tenure of leadership, programs within the department changed significantly and eventually, with substantial growth, the department evolved into the School of Applied Human Sciences (SAHS).

Initial challenges included low enrollment programs and retirements for a high percentage of the faculty. Several factors contributed to the department decision to close the dietetics program. About the same time interest in gerontology and related careers was developing throughout Iowa and surrounding states. This, combined with the aging population created a need that was not being met in Iowa. The department, working across disciplines on campus, developed the first undergraduate gerontology major and minor in the State of Iowa, which quickly gained popularity among students. At about the same time as the launch of the academic programs, to help address the many and diverse needs for gerontology information for different fields, Drs. Barnes and Wallace (as Co P. I.s), wrote two successful grants to the U.S. Department of Education. The four years of funding for nearly \$500K resulted in establishment of the Iowa Consortium of Applied Gerontology (ICAG). These resources allowed an interdisciplinary team of UNI faculty and staff to produce and distribute a wide variety of educational materials and programs that were offered to professionals in several different fields. Multidisciplinary training workshops were presented around the State of Iowa, culminating in a large conference at UNI that was subsidized by grant funds.

To provide greater visibility to the separate programs in the department, the name was changed to emphasize the different disciplines. The new name was Design, Textiles, Gerontology, & Family Studies (DTGFS) to increase awareness that the department offered academic degrees in Interior Design, Textiles and Apparel, Gerontology and Family Studies. Enrollments continued to expand.

In the mid 2000's, the faculty from the Counseling m.s. programs were seeking additional ways to interface with the Family Services and Gerontology programs to provide a richer academic experience for students in all those areas. Faculty discussions were held over a three year period that concluded there was likely sufficient overlap of focus and interests to provide a solid basis a new school combining the undergraduate programs in DTGFS and the Mental Health and School Counseling master's programs. Endorsed by the faculty of the involved programs, proposal applications were prepared and submitted to campus bodies involved in the approval process. Fall semester of 2009 the School of Applied Human Sciences (SAHS) became an official academic unit on the UNI campus. I was instrumental in the formation and approval process for the school and was asked by the dean to assume the role of director of the new school. I agreed on the understanding I

would do the job for no more than five years. I retired as director in Dec. 2014, and after 17 ½ years of leadership, was granted a one semester leave to prepare to go back into the classroom. I started phased retirement with fall semester, 2015, and will take full retirement effective June 30, 2018.

At the time the Counseling program joined the school, their application for national reaccreditation was due. I attended the national CACREP training for reaccreditation and realized the current leadership in UNI's program was not sufficiently organized to meet the program needs. Simultaneously the program was experiencing personnel changes. With the support of the dean and provost, I was able to hire a new coordinator for the counseling programs, who organized the process and work load. We were already a year late in submitting our materials and had been told the new norm was for programs to receive approval for part of the period, rather than the full 7 years. Stakes were particularly high for UNI because ours was one of the very first programs to receive national accreditation and had maintained it continuously since its initial approval. Dr. Swazo, with support from faculty, including a new faculty member, was able to organize the work load and they produced the required documentation and narrative to demonstrate how the program met all 144 criteria. During the 2015-16 school year they were notified of reaccreditation for the full 7 year period!

Overlapping timewise with that process, the Interior Design program faculty had long desired to pursue national accreditation (Council on Interior Design Accreditation). This would be their initial application, despite the programs many year history at UNI. I supported their efforts and attended the national training on how to prepare for the review. Previously it was my conviction the program did not have the strength of student work to be successful. With some new, talented faculty in place my opinion changed. Also the program had grown in student interest and was attracting stronger, more highly committed students. Unlike accreditation in most other fields, CIDA requires that all program standards must be obviously met in the work of the students over the previous 4-5 years. This required the assemblage and organization of many student projects from each of the courses. This effort was also successful and the program received full national accreditation, which should result in raising the level of students recruited into the program.

Prior to UNI, I was a clinical faculty member in the marriage and family therapy program at East Carolina University, 1992-1997, and adjunct faculty in the Psychiatry Department of the ECU School of Medicine. During that time I served three years as the Chair of the Department of Child and Family Development and practiced marriage and family therapy, supervised clinical students, and served on a family therapy treatment team at the ECU Family Therapy Clinic. Prior to that I taught seven years in the Department of Family and Child Development at Kansas State University where I was tenured and principal investigator on the largest research grant ever secured by a faculty member in the department.



Katherine van Wormer has been with the UNI Department of Social Work since 1990 and was promoted to full professor in 1997. Her professional highlights while at UNI include numerous publications. Katherine is a prolific writer, with 16 1<sup>st</sup> edition books (many with multiple editions), 31 book chapters, and 74 peer-reviewed journal articles. Katherine is most proud of the book, *The Maid Narratives: Black Domestic Workers and White Families in the Jim Crow South*, which shares the memories of black domestic workers and the white families they served, uncovering the often intimate relationships between maid and mistress.

It was common for Katherine to use her scholarship talent to help new faculty jump start their publication record. She was a valued member of the department and has earned the distinction of Emeritus Professor.

Cindy Juby, PhD  
Department Head, Associate Professor  
Department of Social Work  
University of Northern Iowa  
Sabin, Room 235  
[319-273-6249](tel:319-273-6249)