

Regular Meeting #1779
UNI Faculty Senate
April 25, 2016 (3:29 – 4:56)
Oak Room, Maucker Union
SUMMARY MINUTES

1. Courtesy Announcements

A. No members of the Press were present.

B. Faculty Chair **Peters** thanked everyone for the opportunity to serve as Faculty Chair and listed some accomplishments of his term, such as the Leadership Series as well items still in progress, such as voting rights and the future of a student-driven diversity exit requirement. He will work with incoming Faculty Chair **Kidd** on these during the transition.

C. Faculty Senate Chair **O’Kane** said that it “has been an absolute pleasure” to serve as Faculty Senate Chair this year and thanked everyone for the support during his term. He also thanked for their service Cathy **DeSoto**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Gary **Shontz** and Laura **Terlip** who are retiring this year from the Senate.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript of April 11, 2016

** (**McNeal/Walter**). Motion Passed.

3. Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

1298 Priority Registration – Military and Veteran Students

<http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/priority-registration-military-and-veteran-students>

** (**Walter/Smith**) Docketed in regular order #1193 to be considered today.

1299 Emeritus request for William **Clohesy**, Philosophy and World Religions; John **Johnson**, History; Stanley **Lyle**, Rod Library; and Cheryl **Roberts**, Languages and Literatures. <http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/request-emeritus-status-william-clohesy-john-johnson>

** (**Smith/McNeal**) Docketed regular order #1194 to be considered today.

4. New Business

Committee on Committee Report <http://uni.edu/senate/committee-committees-2015-2016-report>

** (Terlip/Smith) Motion to accept report.

University Writing Committee Report <http://uni.edu/senate/university-writing-committee-2015-2016-report#>

** (Cooley/Walter) Motion to accept report with further consideration next fall, after completion of the Academic Master Plan.

** (McNeal/Gould) Approval of Honorary degree recipients.

** Senator Michael **Walter** elected by acclaim, Vice-Chair, Faculty Senate.

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1297 1192 Emeritus request for Katheryn **East**, Educational Psychology & Foundations. <http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-katheryn-east>

1298 1193 Priority Registration – Military and Veteran Students
<http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/priority-registration-military-and-veteran-students>

** (Walter/Smith) Motion passed.

1299 1194 Emeritus request for William **Clohesy**, Philosophy and World Religions; John **Johnson**, History; Stanley **Lyle**, Rod Library and Cheryl **Roberts**, Languages and Literatures. <http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/request-emeritus-status->

** (Smith/McNeal) Motion passed.

6. Consultative Session

Quality Initiative Projects – Comments for Provost Wohlpart pages 29-37.

7. Adjournment ** (Gould/Terlip) Motion passed.

Next Meeting of 2016/2017 School Year: Date to be determined;
Scholar Space, Rod Library

Full Transcript follows of 37 pages and 0 addenda.

Regular Meeting #1779

FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI Faculty Senate Meeting
April 25, 2016 (3:29 – 4:50 p.m.)
Oak Room, Maucker Union

Present: Senators Ann Bradfield, John **Burnight**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Associate Provost Kavita **Dhanwada**, Senators, Xavier **Escandell**, Todd **Evans**, Senate Vice-Chair Gretchen **Gould**, Senators David **Hakes**, Tim **Kidd**, Karla **Krueger**, Ramona **McNeal**, Senate Chair Steve **O’Kane**, Faculty Chair Scott **Peters**, Senators Gary **Shontz**, Gerald **Smith**, Nicole **Skaar**, Jesse **Swan**, Senate Secretary Laura **Terlip**, Senator Michael **Walter**.

Not Present: Associate Provost Nancy **Cobb**, Senators Arica **Beckman**, Cathy **DeSoto**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Lou **Fenech**, NISG Avery **Johnson**, Provost Jim **Wohlpart**.

GUESTS: Alison **Altstatt**, Dale **Cyphert**, Philip **East**, David **Grant** and Thomas **Hesse**.

O’Kane: Good afternoon everyone and it’s our last session. It’s a beautiful day and we have a lot on the agenda today so I’m really going to keep us cooking along through that agenda. Normally I’d asked for comments from Provost **Wohlpart** but unfortunately the Provost is ill today, as is Nancy (**Cobb**). Everybody’s getting some kind of flu-thing, that’s really knocking them down. In lieu of that, I’ll ask for comments from Chair **Peters**.

Peters: The first comment is to stay away from the Provost’s Office apparently. [Laughter] Well I just wanted to thank everyone for another successful year and thank you for the opportunity to serve as Faculty Chair for the year. We did a number of things I think that were helpful. The

Leadership Series that Steve (**O’Kane**) and I organized with Nancy (**Cobb**) I think resulted in some good conversations. I co-chaired the Quality Initiative Selection Committee, which put the things on the table that we’ll be talking about later today. I took a few faculty members down to Des Moines to talk to legislators about what we do. I wish I could claim that got us more money, but we do what we can, right? Unfortunately, one thing that I was not able to accomplish this year, which I wish I had made more progress on, is on the on-going issue of voting rights for some contingent faculty members, particularly those that have service obligations in their contracts. But, I’m going to talk to Tim (**Kidd**), the incoming Faculty Chair, and volunteer to keep working on that next year and try to see that through. We have made some progress on it, but it’s not quite to the point where it’s ready to introduce. At any rate, I do want to give you one ‘head’s up’ about something that will likely be coming your way next year. This week I think, the NISG will –they seem likely---to pass a resolutions calling for the creation of a diversity exit requirement; graduation requirement in the curriculum. This would not be additional credit hours required but it would be simply---well, not simply---there would be a process by which courses would be tagged as related to diversity in some way, and you would have to amass a certain number of hours of such courses in order to graduate. This is completely student-driven and it came out of those forums that were held last fall. They have put together a preliminary proposal, but it’s a serious proposal. They did some homework. They gave really serious thought to it, and they now want it introduced into the curriculum process. Some challenges that there is nothing in the curriculum

handbook about how one does an exit requirement. So a starting point will be for the Faculty Chair to form a committee of faculty members to take up what the students have drafted, and come up with a requirement that is actually of a specificity and level of feasibility that it can move forward. And so I'll be working with Tim (**Kidd**) on that as well, as we hand off duties here this summer. But, that's something that will likely fall into the faculty's lap in one way or another next year, whether it's through the Senate or whether it's through some other parts of the curriculum process or through faculty action. Other than that, I won't take up any more time. I wish everyone happy grading and hopefully see you at Commencement. Thanks again for the opportunity to serve as Faculty Chair.

Cooley: I believe that the foreign language requirement at UNI is partly conceptualized as an exit requirement.

Peters: Yes.

Cooley: That may be a place to look for how you capture something like this.

Peters: Yes. Absolutely. That's a good model for how you would write it. The question is, how you would do it? What is the process by which one adopts? We're not sure. So, one thing we might be able to do is go back and look at the old Senate minutes and find out how that was adopted. Was it adopted through Senate? Was it adopted as a vote of the full faculty? How did it happen exactly?

Smith: For purposes of discussion, let's say that this proposal has merit and is well motivated. But I would like to share that in the 27 years I've been at UNI I have had employers and prospective employers tell me how important it would be to enhance our student's oral and written communication skills. It's consistently. Not one year or one semester, but over and over and over. As we're going to think about having exit requirements, there are universities that have a requirement to demonstrate proficiency in oral and written English communication requirement, and perhaps this would be an opportune time for us to think about having an exit requirement for at least written communication if not for oral and written communication.

O'Kane: Further comments? Thank you Scott (**Peters**). Thank you for your service.

Peters: Steve, thank you for your service this year as well, especially given that you didn't know at the start of the year you had no clue you were going to be in this job. Thank you very much.

O'Kane: Thank you. I would add to what Scott says, it's been an absolute pleasure to be able to work with all of you. Everybody's been so helpful and supportive, from the President to the Provost on down, particularly given I was just plopped into this position. Thanks for all the handholding. Those are my comments. Let's move to approval for the minutes from our last session, April 11. May I have a motion to that effect? So moved by Senator

McNeal, seconded by Senator **Walter**, any comments or questions?

Hearing none, all in favor please say, “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstain, “aye.”

Thank you everybody. Okay, since it’s our last session, we have two items that are on the calendar that the requesters would like moved to today’s docket, rather than wait until next fall to deal with these two items. Pardon me, I want to back up for just a few moments. I do have a few more comments. I’d like to thank also Cathy **DeSoto**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Gary **Shontz** and Laura **Terlip** who are retiring this year from the Senate. I have certificates for you but the Provost isn’t here to sign them. So I will be getting those signed and mailing those off to you all. Okay, back to business at hand. Our first calendar item is Calendar Item 1298, which concerns priority registration for military and veteran students. This is a petition that these folks be given priority registration during registration. If you so choose to docket today, that will be docketed as Docket Number 1193. Do I have a motion to docket that item? So moved by Senator **Smith** and seconded by Senator **Walter**. We will discuss this in a few minutes but is there any question about whether or not to docket? Hearing none...yes, Scott?

Peters: Is the person who made the motion here?

O’Kane: Is the person who made this motion here?

Peters: Did it come from a faculty member or a student?

O’Kane: This came from, let’s take a look at it, from Norman **Ferguson** and he knew about it. I’m not sure how to proceed without him present.

Gould: Can we put it on the docket for the fall?

O’Kane: We can put it on the docket for the fall.

Smith: Why could we not just proceed? I don’t see why this person would have to be here.

O’Kane: I wouldn’t be able to answer questions about it.

Smith: Maybe there won’t be any questions.

O’Kane: Okay, we can proceed. Let’s do it. All in favor of docketing this item, all in favor please say, “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstentions, “aye.” Motion passes. Moving on to Calendar Item #1299, which is an emeritus request from William **Clohesy**, John **Johnson**, Stanley **Lyle** and Cheryl **Roberts**. Do I have a motion to docket in today’s agenda? So moved by Senator **Burnight**, seconded by Vice-Chair **Gould**. Any discussion? All in favor please say, “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstentions, “aye.” Motion passes. Moving on then to New Business, we do have two people here to represent the two reports that the Senate has been asked to receive. Is that correct? The first one is the Committee on Committee Reports. If you would give us your name please, sir?

East: Philip **East**. May I join you up here?

O’Kane: You bet. Is there anything you need to introduce concerning that report?

East: Not that I know of.

O’Kane: Are there any questions concerning that report? You should have all had a link to that report. It looked very thoroughly done to me. Any questions or comments? [Silence] Wow, this has gone faster than I thought. Could we have a motion to accept this report please? So moved by Senator **Terlip**. Seconded by Senator **Smith**. Is there any further discussion---or any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor of receiving this report, please say, “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstain, “aye.” Motion passes. Phil (**East**) thanks for your trip over. [Laughter] I wish they all went that quickly. We now have a report to also accept from the University Writing Committee. I would like to hear from that committee, because I believe their report is asking for further work of the Senate. So would you introduce yourselves, please?

Cyphert: I’m Dale **Cyphert** from the College of Business.

Grant: I’m David **Grant** from Languages and Literatures.

Altstatt: I’m Alison **Altstatt** from the School of Music.

O’Kane: Thank you very much. If you could all summarize it, and I know that near the end there’s some language that we’ve got to do some more work.

Grant: Yes, and I thank you Jerry (**Smith**) for the words and we support him for the things he said earlier in the meeting. We’ve been studying writing outcomes and writing procedures at institutions all across the country. We presented to you folks a year or two ago how we [UNI] are very much a low outlier on the number of courses that are required by students to take. We

are falling very far short of that. We have gone on, and looked at local data showing that faculty are very much in favor of something to the effect of more writing somewhere in the curriculum. We are trying to work within the structures, but have felt that with the change in leadership at the head, we are having to do a little two-step and are trying to do work with the Provost to get in QIP process (Quality Initiatives Proposals) process and that's been helpful in reaffirming that there is actually a broad consensus among faculty, especially that writing is warranted. I would go so far as to say even the secondary data from students and from staff implies a lot of the outcomes that are associated with the Writing Program, or with some sort of concerted effort, one of which is the report we have from 2015 by **Paul Anderson, Chris Anson, Robert Gonyea and Charles Paine**. [Anderson, Paul, Chris Anson, Robert Gonyea, and Charles Paine. "The Contributions of Writing to Learning and Development: Results from a Large-Scale Multi-institutional Study." *Research in the Teaching of English* 50.2 (Nov. 2015), 199-235. <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/RTE/0502-nov2015/RTE0502Contribution.pdf>

Grant: This study looked at NSSE data which we were also part of and which showed that writing programs have a strong correlation to both engagement and diversity outcomes. So, we feel that this puts us in again--- this is something that the students are wanting---diversity. And writing can be part of this as well. Despite all this and the consensus about writing, that is enumerated right here in our report, at the same time we feel that the University has really gone backwards in terms of its resources allocated to writing. So there is no course release for a writing person in the Languages and Literature Department. Many of us feel that Cornerstone has sort of

lost complete faculty oversight; it's almost totally administrative at this point. We feel that the kinds of conversations that we've been having in terms of how we integrate writing throughout the University are just not there. So we're going backwards as much as we're providing data to move forward. That would be the long and short of it. If we can clarify what we want to do as faculty and as a body, that would be very helpful for us, so we know where to invest our energies appropriately because it's an obviously very large issue. So we would accept any guidance from you.

Kidd: The Provost is starting up some review of the Liberal Arts Core, is that correct?

Grant: My understanding is...I was on a subcommittee with Kristin **Moser** and Laura **Strauss**. We recommended one of three proposals that would be for the reaccreditation with the QIP proposals. It was my understanding he would be here today to get some feedback from you all on that. I don't know where that is.

Dhanwada: There were three proposals and the way that the three were generated was based on, I think we had 33 or 34 applications; and we kind of grouped them based on where they were falling. These were the three major groups that came in. I think there will be discussion today.

O'Kane: There will be later today.

Dhanwada: One was restructuring of the LAC; it's actually a process, not to do it per se, but the restructuring of the Liberal Arts Core, how we may go

about doing that. The second one is on diversity and it also has a little bit to do with Liberal Arts Core as well, and the third one is on engagement, which also includes diversity as well. Those are the three proposals.

O’Kane: Further comments or questions?

Terlip: I would like to definitely support what you have in the Committee’s document related to Cornerstone. I’m in Communication Studies and the initial agreement said it would be a small group of classes taught by full-time faculty. Over the years, full time faculty has disappeared, but the number of courses has grown significantly. Right now, that’s a very important course and we have some wonderful adjuncts, but we should at least have faculty oversight of what happens in the course with respect to curriculum. So this is really being driven by the administration, and I think that process needs to be looked at because it’s very troubling.

O’Kane: Do you have suggestions for how the Senate can help—help us all out here?

Cyphert: That’s kind of our question. We are a committee of the Senate and we were charged with recommending Best Practices Writing. We did that. We are so far behind at this point already that it’s ludicrous. Not only have we not been able to go forward with that because the system changed basically. We now have a strategic planning process that is not the same as the LAC Core, and the Curriculum Committee. So we’re dead in the water as far as having a real role in that process, but we also see that the resources for what little writing we do have are being diminished, and

that's does actually include Oral Communication too, because I'm a Speech Com. person too; but it's a writing committee. I teach in Cornerstone now; I think I'm one of two full time faculty. I won't be doing it again because that's one of the resources that's being pulled out. And you're right---the adjuncts are actually very good adjuncts, and some term instructors--- but there is no qualified faculty from either English or Oral Com. involved and no release time in English for the Freshman Com. We have so many other ways students can even get their credit without even going through those, but the two primary ways that we can at least do what little we can with just one course---are not supported.

Grant: I'll say that there is elaboration too on Senator **Swan's** fine publication. His publication at least examined some of the assertions that have been made about Cornerstone course. Now, we as a committee of course are concerned with more than just that one course, but some of those things are in there, as how those assessments are conducted, and what kind of information comes out that's actually useable so...I'll just mention that's hopeful for our purposes.

Swan: Dr. **Grant** is referring to this issue, the current issue of *UNiversity* under Reviews and Responses. Dr. Grant has a review of the Cornerstone forum that was published last year, where he also talks about, in an expert way, all of the issues involved in Cornerstone.

Grant: It's not a ding. Cornerstone is valuable and has its place. Can faculty have oversight of it, rather than administration?

Terlip: On a related note, in our department at least, the course Cornerstone has been discussed as a primary tool for retention. It's not talking about the pedagogy at all, and I think that there are a number of ways we can teach it better and still have good retention, but they're not looking at them.

Cyphert: Well that's the administrative element of it. As somebody who has, and David (**Grant**) has, Research and Integrated Communication---It's a very sophisticated process. It's not an easy one to necessarily do. But, it can be done and it can be done really well and this is a wonderful model, but you have to have some expertise to be able to do it. It doesn't take away from the engagement and retention. The structural part is actually that part of it that isn't going to go away.

Kidd: First, as a faculty member, a committee---you're allowed to make contributions to the curriculum process, so you could suggest an exit requirement or anything you want. So I urge you to do this. I support it.

Cyphert: That's what we did. We proposed that last year.

Kidd: Okay.

Cyphert: Actually last year we were asked to stop in that process because Jim **Wohlpart** was still coming on board and so we were going through the vetting our proposal with the UCC, with the LAC committee, and then it was supposedly the Master Planning Committee, but that's where we kind of

stopped. And all of the faculty that we've talked to so far are very much on board with, "Yes, let's figure out how to do this," but even the process of figuring out how to do that will take some resources, and I'm pretty adamantly opposed to starting something without some indication that we have the resources to continue with it.

Kidd: I guess I'm confused. What stopped it? Did it go through the College Senates?

Cyphert: Well first we have to have a proposal. There has to be some sort of specific curriculum component---an exit requirement, if you will, right? We made a fairly general proposal that said we would recommend two more classes required: One at a mid-level course, junior level; one at a senior level course, and that would be major-specific, so every program could determine how it wanted to handle that. So the next stage to do that would be to see what are resources the University would have to allocate to have that happen. There would have to be faculty training. There would have to be larger classes. There would have to be presumably different classes in some areas. That would probably be very different in different departments and different colleges. But just the process of coming up with what resources would be needed would take some time to do. It doesn't happen by magic. We can't just say, "Have more writing," and then not have any support for that writing.

Grant: It takes faculty time to dialog with departments and where they feel a writing component would be appropriate for them. It can't be a top down

kind of mandate. This has to be something where faculty are working together, and some of us, a few of us here, would lend our expertise, but it's going to take time and resources.

Cyphert: We honestly can't even say what University resources would be needed without going through that process of talking to the departments. Just in the conversations we've had, some departments go, "Wow, that's a class we already teach." Not a problem. Public Relations is an excellent example of a program that probably wouldn't need to do anything. Other departments would probably want to have Liberal Arts Core courses available that they could require their students to take, because they don't have the expertise in their own area and don't really want it. There are other departments that have interdisciplinary writing and communication expectations and they have courses that could be repurposed. They're being taught, but they're being taught in sections of 60 or 65, and you couldn't do a writing class in that kind of environment. So they've already got the course, maybe not the expertise, but they'd have to have more courses. It's such a wide variety of scenarios that we can't even say what the University would have put forward to support that yet.

Kidd: Just a quick question: Who set the syllabus for Cornerstone?

Cyphert: Well it's a committee. It has been a committee of the faculty who teach Cornerstone basically, are the ones who look at it and revisit it each year.

Grant: Are they in total control? The folks I've talked to said that it's a heavy hand that the LAC director plays in that process.

Cyphert: Not this year. Not since last year.

Kidd: I was just curious because you said that there was a heavy administrative component to this. I'm not familiar with Cornerstone at all. I don't teach in that area. I was curious if the faculty set the syllabus? I don't understand.

Terlip: Initially they did, but it's been renegotiated over time. At least our faculty hasn't been consulted as to whether that meets the Com. requirement.

Cyphert: That internal group of Cornerstone faculty includes no tenure-track faculty from Oral Com or English.

Swan: When it was set up, originally, it did go to relevant department faculty, and the faculty approved the foundational syllabus. But that's never occurred again, although the syllabus presumably that's changed.

Terlip: The other thing that's changed is we all wrote objectives for that course, and those have been changed without any consultation from our department. I don't know if they consulted with English.

Cyphert: It's come from the Liberal Arts Core basically. I've been on those committees, so it's not that there hasn't been any faculty involvement, but there are only two of us now, I think, who are full-time faculty out of 25.

Terlip: But one would think they would consult with the departments.

Cyphert: It seems reasonable and that's all we've said. We think that the Faculty Senate ought to say there should be faculty oversight. And that doesn't mean that they have nothing but full time instructors, which is probably not doable, but it does mean there needs to be at least consultation or something of some sort.

Grant: Those non-tenure line folks, we have to look at their training. One of the things that's been pointed out to me anyway is that there are folks who maybe don't have the number of graduate credits that the Higher Learning Commission would want someone...They wouldn't be able to teach composition at Hawkeye, if they're Composition or Speech, because that wouldn't satisfy the Higher Learning Commission, yet they do it here. I don't know what the status is, or what it's covered under, or how much training they get.

Dhanwada: Are you talking about Graduate Assistants?

Cyphert: No. They're term instructors.

Dhanwada: If you have a Master's degree, you're able to teach Bachelor's students that are obtaining their Bachelor's degree.

Cyphert: It doesn't matter what department you're teaching in?

Dhanwada: That's really in the Community Colleges. That has to do with hours of credit because they're not teaching within the same area. So now the new requirement is to have 18 hours of content knowledge in the area that you're teaching. But if it's a Master's, I don't think that that's...

Cyphert: It hasn't come up yet?

Dhanwada: Yeah. Usually, if they're tenure-track instructors, and they have a certain level of experience teaching...you don't have to be tenure-track. You have to at least have a Master's degree in what you teach here at the University, unless you're a Graduate student, which is a different track because they're under the supervision of a faculty member.

Grant: Is that something we as an institution need to look at in terms of what the Higher Learning Commission is going to say in 2020?

Dhanwada: Yes. That's what we're looking at right now. We are on that believe me.

O'Kane: It seems appropriate to me to have the Senate ask the Cornerstone Committee to report to us and have a dialog next fall. Does that seem reasonable?

Grant: You mean the staff of Cornerstone?

O’Kane: You said that there was a committee consisting of those who teach it. Correct?

Cyphert: It’s not an official committee; it’s just the faculty. We have meetings once a month.

O’Kane: And that’s where the curriculum is made for the class?

Terlip: We really don’t know.

Cyphert: We discuss it. We can make changes. We were talking about one today. We thought that today that we should move one assignment to later in the semester. We talked about how to realign that. Yeah. We as a group would be in a position to make those changes.

Swan: That’s actually disturbing. It shouldn’t be that group. Any changes should go through at least the two departments, English and Communications for their expert consideration. You were starting to say...there were different things that were starting to be said here. That group maybe could pose changes, but it should always go to these tenured faculties in the disciplines for their approval or recommendation. And perhaps then they can come to the Senate or the Liberal Arts Core. It really is a Liberal Arts Core issue---Cornerstone, is taking the place of requirements in the Liberal Arts Core. It’s a different way of fulfilling certain requirements.

Cyphert: The Liberal Arts Core which aren’t necessarily English or instructors who would know about what to put into the syllabus, or what

changes in instruction for some freshmen. That's the level that we're talking about is instructional methods.

O'Kane: What I've been hearing is that there is not enough---correct me if I'm wrong---not enough writing in Cornerstone?

Cyphert: Oh there's plenty of writing in Cornerstone.

O'Kane: I'm not sure then what the concern was earlier.

Cyphert: Lack of faculty oversight in one of our major writing courses. We don't have enough writing in the requirements of the University. We have one writing courses. The average is six units: two courses. Many, many universities have nine units. We are at the very lowest low end.

Grant: It's kind of like the oversight expertise question that Senator **Swan** was talking about, points to the fact that would we feel it's okay if a mathematician teach biology, or that they run the biology curriculum? This is the same thing with writing. There's an area of expertise in speech and communication that is also an area of specialty. Those people who are trained in that, should have, or those bodies should have some say in that.

Terlip: Two comments: Again, first of all, and correct me if I'm wrong. My recollection is this was not a faculty-generated idea. This was an administrative idea to try it for a couple of years, and it's just taken over, and so I don't know that the faculty anywhere really voted that it's good to keep this configuration in place. And it does drain resources.

Smith: I'm just asking for a clarification. David (**Grant**) when you made reference to support, that you said earlier, were you referring to my comments? it's important, because a couple of years ago another colleague named Jerry Smith said something. Are you supporting something Jerry **Smith** had said?

Grant: No. It was your opening comments.

Smith: Okay. That's all I wanted to know.

Grant: We are not doing enough to prepare our students in writing.

Peters: My suggestion would be that if the Senate wants to follow up on what the Chair suggested a minute ago, would be that it ask for a consultative session with whoever the proper person would be who oversees Cornerstone. Whether that's the Associate Provost or whether that's the Director of Undergraduate Studies, I don't know,

Dhanwada: ...Not the Associate Provost.

Peters: ...But whoever that is and the Chair of the Senate could ask for a consult on progress, achievements and oversight of the Cornerstone class or something like that, which would give the Senate a chance to ask all these questions and presumably it would also give a chance the departments who--- if departments feel that they don't have enough oversight over it, it would give them a chance to come as well.

O'Kane: Let's take that up next fall.

Cyphert: I just want to be careful that you don't think that's the only recommendation we have because we actually had other recommendations, which I think are more to the point. You've asked us to make recommendations about additional writing requirements and we are not able to come back to you with that recommendation. Do you want us to stop and give up? Come back in the fall?

Kidd: I guess I'm not sure. Why can't you make the recommendation?

Cyphert: You asked us to come back with a carefully formulated recommendation; a proposal, a fleshed out proposal. That will take: A: It takes resources to do it in the first place, because we have to go talk to every department head and find out what all those things would require, and B: There's no point in doing it if the faculty doesn't have the resources to implement any of that, which is what the LAC and the UCC said to us. They said this is a great idea. Don't do this without the Academic Master Plan.

Kidd: Could you distribute the proposal to us? I've never seen it.

O'Kane: There's a link on the agenda.

Cyphert: The proposal from two years ago is on the...

Kidd: It was two years ago.

Swan: You applauded it. You were the Chair.

Kidd: I guess I'm confused. I'll ask you later. Yes I'm sorry. I'm confused.

Dhanwada: I will say that the Academic Master Plan, we are moving near completion. It think we'll have something much more...we've been working on it all through this year and will this summer. So that at least will be there. I don't know about the plan or the resources: I think sometimes it's the chicken or the egg thing. How do we know how many resources we can get? Do you come up with a plan first to see if there's something we can do? I don't know, but I will tell you that the Academic Master Plan is moving forward and we should have something by the beginning of the fall.

Grant: You're right. We've struggled with this 'chicken or egg' thing before when we were starting in 2009. That's how long we've been struggling with the 'chicken or egg' thing.

Peters: Two things: First of all, I want to make clear that I don't think anybody has made any decisions. I do expect, based on the wording I've seen in the drafts of the Academic Master Plan, the wording talks about strengthening the Liberal Arts Core. It's very prominent in it. I would expect, and I know these things don't always get acted upon, but if the Academic Master Plan gets acted on, I think there will be opportunity for faculty who want something like this to say, "Look, this is supposedly central to the University's plan, let's do it." But the second thing I was going to say was that, and this in a way gets back to what Senator **Smith** mentioned earlier in the meeting, was that one thing that's changed substantially in the last 20 years is the number of students that come with credits already. Some of you may have seen the article a week or two ago

that apparently Iowa is tops in the country for high school students earning college credit. And so I don't know what the numbers are, I don't know if the members of the Writing Committee know what the numbers are, but I would be willing to bet ---by the time you add up students that already come in with writing credit from Community College---probably earned in a high school classroom, or those transfer students who earned an Associate's degree, I would bet that well over half of our students do not take their one required writing class here on campus, and so that alone, that changes the issue. That alone to me would be a justification for the University revisiting its writing requirements to try to make it so that every student bumps up against some kind of writing requirement while they're here on this campus.

Cyphert: That was part of our original reason, and one of the many reasons for a requirement.

Smith: I didn't mean that they would have any additional course requirements. I was hoping that we would have an exit requirement for effective oral communication---actually have accomplished something.

Cyphert: Well that was one of the reasons that our proposal does go to the department level, because we were pretty sure that there was no way to handle adding courses to our degrees. That's just not going to happen. So, we came up with what we thought was a proposal that we thought would actually be doable here.

O’Kane: I suggest that we bring this up again in the fall after the Academic Master Plan is in place and really look at this part, because I think you have a lot of allies here. By the way, thank you to your committee very much for the work you did. Any last comments before I look for a motion, I don’t think we’ve had a motion to accept this, have we? So moved by Senator **Cooley**, seconded by Senator **Walter**. Any further discussion? All in favor, please say, “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstain, “aye.” Thank you very, very much.

Grant: Thank you.

O’Kane: Okay. We now have the honor actually to begin looking at approval of Honorary recipients of the Doctoral degree from UNI. We have to do this piece in Executive Session. I’m looking for motion; a two-part motion: A motion to go into Executive Session to consider the Honorary degree recipients, and the second part is that we ask Associate Provost **Dhanwada** to be here to fill us in on who those people are and be able to answer any questions we might have. So moved by Senator **Walter**, seconded by **Gould**, all in favor please say, “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstain, “aye.” Okay. We are now in Executive Session. We’ll come get you a little later.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: 4:12 – 4:28

O’Kane: All right, we need a motion to approve the slate of candidates for an honorary degree. So moved by Senator **McNeal**, second by Senator

Gould, all in favor please say, “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstentions, “aye.” Motion passes. Thank you all very much. I need to move on to electing a new Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate so at this point I’m looking for nominations, either self-nominations or nominating someone else.

Walter: Under your instruction, I guess I have to nominate myself.

O’Kane: Are there other nominations? It really is a fun job. In the email I sent, I meant every word of it. There’s some work in the beginning because I didn’t know a thing, but it is a very enjoyable position. Any other nominations? I believe we can probably elect you then by acclaim. So all in favor of electing Senator **Walter** to the Vice-Chair position, please say “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstention, “aye.” Michael, [**Walter**] thank you. Seriously, thank you. [Applause]. It’s a very important job. Okay let us move then on to docketed items. We now have three of those. Docket #1297 is Emeritus request for Katheryn **East**, who’s in Educational Psychology and Foundations. Would anybody like to speak in favor of Katheryn?

Skaar: I’m a colleague of Katheryn’s, and I’m actually taking over one of her courses in the fall, which is really hard and it will be big shoes to fill. Katheryn’s an amazing instructor. Her emphases has been in reflection and becoming a reflective practitioner, a reflective teacher of Higher Ed instructor. It will be quite something to take over her position in that course, but we’re happy that she gets to go spend time with her grandkids.

O’Kane: Thank you. Anybody else? All in favor of approving this emeritus

request please say “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstentions, “aye.” Glad to hear that Katheryn (**East**) is now an Emeritus faculty. Please give her our thanks. That means that we’re going to move on to Docket Item 1193, which we moved to the docket earlier in the day, and that is Priority Registration for Military and Veteran Students. Hopefully you’ve read that petition. It seemed fairly straightforward to me. I talk with Phil **Patton** about it, and he did indicate to me that he does need the Faculty Senate’s approval to move forward with being able to do that. Is there any discussion? Questions? Seemed pretty cut and dried to me.

Kidd: Is there a problem right now where people aren’t able to register?

O’Kane: I’m not aware of that. I don’t know.

Dhanwada: I think that are certain groups, like athletes get to register early--- student athletes--- so I don’t think that veterans do.

Kidd: Why do student athletes get to register early?

O’Kane: So they can get to practice.

Dhanwada: Their practice schedules are early in the morning, or in the afternoon.

Kidd: That makes sense actually.

O’Kane: Any other discussion? If not, then may we have a motion to approve this petition? So moved by Senator **Walter** and seconded by Senator **Smith**. Any last minute discussion, if not, all in favor please say “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstentions, “aye.” Motion passes. Thank you, all.

And next we have the Docket Item 1194, which is Emeritus request for William **Clohesy**, from Philosophy and World Religions, John **Johnson** from History, Stanley **Lyle** from Rod Library and Cheryl **Roberts** from Languages and Literatures. Do I have a motion to approve? So moved by Senator **Smith** and seconded by Senator **McNeal**. Would anybody like to speak on behalf of any of these people?

Burnight: I'd like to speak on behalf of my colleague Will **Clohesy**. He has been here for nearly 30 years. I came here about five years ago, and he was held up as a model faculty to emulate in terms of being both a scholar and a teacher. And I can testify to the fact of his teaching ability, because he allowed me to sit in on his Ancient Philosophy course a few years ago and it was one of the academic joys of my life. He was a master who's still really good at engaging very difficult material---ancient philosophy--by making it comprehensible to the entire room. He's an extraordinary teacher and his courses, like PAT---the Philosophy and Art of Thinking, in the LAC are always the first sections to fill. In my department Chair, Jerry **Soneson**, would note that Ethics, when he was teaching it, it always filled. He is a tremendous teacher and I'm happy to say that he does plan to stick around and teach courses for us once in awhile.

O'Kane: Thank you, John (**Burnight**). Anybody else? If not, those in favor of conferring emeritus status on these four colleagues please say "aye," opposed, "nay," abstentions, "aye." Motion passes. Very good, we're now going to move into another Consultative Session without the person that requested it. Provost **Wohlpert** would like any comments that we have

concerning the three QIP, Quality Initiative Program proposals, that have come forth. I don't know if Kavita (**Dhanwada**) can address those?

Dhanwada: I was on the committee. Scott (**Peters**) was on the committee. We can all take turns.

O'Kane: If there's any question I can call them up here, too.

Dhanwada: I can read off, I think I mentioned those earlier—have you all had a chance to look at it again? There's been a cultural shift at UNI towards diversity. That's one of the three prime goals for the revision of the Liberal Arts Core. It's more of a process, not talking specifically eventually getting there, but the project is the process of doing it. Then finally, the third one is diverse and civically engaged campus.

O'Kane: I do note that two of the proposals have 'diversity' in their title. I don't know if you can speak to how and in what major ways those two proposals differ?

Peters: One is toward a 'more diverse-inclusive campus,' I would say a more broad-ranging attempt to address diversity across all areas of campus culture and structure. The 'diverse and civically engaged campus' one I felt like was more curricular-focused, and would focus more on integrating civic engagement, especially that which has kind of a diversity component to it. I think that's the key difference. The "toward a culture shift" or whatever it's subtitled, it includes student retention, faculty retention, recruitment and retention---things like that that the other one doesn't really encompass.

O’Kane: Questions, comments? We probably can’t get a lot of questions answered, but I’m sure the Provost would like any of your comments.

Dhanwada: To talk about the ideas, is what he’s [**Wohlpart’s**] wanting as far as feedback. We are moving towards engagement you know, so two of these issues are being addressed currently on campus; the diversity issues. I’m not saying this is going to address it, but we are making strides in trying to address some of these issues that have to do with diversity. As far as community engagement, we’re trying to---that’s part of the type of engaged-learning that we are trying to do, and has been expressed in the Academic Master Plan. The LAC process hasn’t necessarily been addressed, but we have some history with that. So those are kind of the main ‘where we are at this stage,’ I would say. So thoughts about---because I think he’s really interested in what you’re thoughts are moving forward with one plan over another.

Swan: I think I was preferring the ‘diverse campus’ one, and I wonder more if Chair **Peters** can talk about that one. It includes the diverse campus, which is somewhat involved in all three of them. I think it is the ‘diverse campus’ one that you headed up?

Peters: The one I headed up was the ‘cultural shift at UNI towards a diverse and inclusive community.’

Swan: That's actually the one that I thought was most fleshed out; most developed that you could actually move from; that the Provost could move on. Could you talk more about that one?

Peters: There were four key goals to that, and keeping in mind of course that with any of these, the first step in whichever one the Provost chooses, the first step is going to be to form a committee to actually write the proposal and zero in on the exact things that would have to be accomplished. So with all three of these, the types of goals that are suggested are just that: They're suggestive. So keeping that in mind, there were four suggested goals: [1] improving support to students from underrepresented groups [2] providing systematic opportunities for on campus and off campus interaction among members of diverse communities [3] enhancing the treatment of diversity issues within our curriculum and [4] recruiting and retraining a diverse faculty and staff. The proposal gives again, just ideas, just suggestions on different kinds of things in each of those four areas that could be focused on. Obviously, part of this is...One thing to keep in mind about all of this is what the Higher Ed Learning Commission is trying to do is to change the accreditation process from one where you don't do anything for eight years and then in the last two years leading up to accreditation, it's an 'All hands on deck. Oh my gosh they're coming and in the year we better have all these people write this big self-study.' So the idea behind the Quality Improvement is actually that the University takes on some projects to improve an area of need or concern on campus. And the kind of neat thing about this is obviously

there's aspects that...There's a lot about accreditation that you wouldn't normally describe as 'neat,' right? But the neat thing about this is you actually don't get held accountable if what you do fails. It's peer reviewed. It's actually NOT whether you succeed or not is NOT considered in whether or not you get reaccredited. So universities, they can set lofty goals, they can take risks. It's designed to be an attempt to really spur universities to do more of the kind of things we should be doing all the time, which is to be always thinking about, "Where are we falling short?" in serving our students, and "Where can we improve?"

Dhanwada: Continuous improvement.

Swan: Last time, we do something like The First Year Experience and then that led somehow to Cornerstone.

Peters: I think that technically precluded---preceded---this new pathway, but it's effectively the same thing.

Swan: That was done for the review. We have a lot of that, and we did spend a lot of resources, and get a product and that product is what we seem to be addressing now. Right? It's become, perhaps a problem and so we still don't want---I understand that we could---okay I understand that we don't get judged by the failure or lack of great success on that other project, yet we still have it and we're still expending resources, and doing things and we really should address that, and not just create a second one. Although, I guess we need a second one, or do we need a second one? Can

we say, “We are going to redo The First Year Experience” this time because we are invested in it?

Peters: We could say that, except the process that the Provost has created has resulted in these three at this point. That could have happened six months ago, but now the Provost is kind of committed I think, at least I think he is.

Swan: With the three that have been proposed, it does also in fact (with the QIP process) engage the whole campus. And the only problem that I had with the process, was that on this one, which seemed to be managed better, was encroachment onto the curriculum from the other areas. As long as we manage that, knowing that--- I think this is the best of the three it seems.

Cooley: I’d like to speak about the one about ‘diverse and engaged,’ in the title, and the thing that was elegant about this proposal was that it tries to focus on what we do on campus with majors and minors and programs and curriculum, but it also allows us to dovetail our efforts here on campus with what we want to produce in our students when they graduate. It has a lot of practical implications I think, for creating a certain type; a person of a certain profile would go out to the job market and leave our campus with perhaps a more well rounded preparation. That one seems to me is well crafted.

O’Kane: Seems to me, the timing on either of the diversity proposals is right on with as you know, we’re hiring a Chief Diversity Officer. For that person to sort of slide into that new job with either of these on the table, seems like a good way to go to me.

Kidd: I had a question actually about that proposal. When I looked at the index report that said that these graduates have these things, that they would have more successful lives if basically the professor who cared about them and engaged with them, on an internship or job that they are able to apply what they learned in the classroom, things like that. And I didn’t see--one thing that I think is lacking is the opportunity to engage in the professional area. For example, the career center issues coordinating with career centers with Iowa State and Iowa--We don’t have a centralized internship kind of database that I’ve had at other schools that I’ve been at. It’s very departmental when you look at it. And everything on here is fine about diversity and civic engagement but what about the professional engagement? I just worry that in the quest for civic engagement, there’s a lot of things that research isn’t necessarily civic engagement, but I think it’s important for my students to accomplish before they graduate.

Swan: I don’t like this proposal nearly as much, but I’m just speaking about the thing we’re thinking about not the professional engagement because the feeling is that people get so much of that already on campus and they get no or very little civic engagement, and there’s a craving for that. The students are asking for civic engagement. The committee said that they couldn’t find appreciable instances of civic engagement for students,

though they could find lots of professional engagement. But, that would be another proposal to increase professional engagement for that group of people.

O’Kane: Any further comments? I’m wondering if we ought to provide the Provost with a Sense of the Senate, in terms of what our favored proposal would be? This would be our only time to give that voice, so would you all think it appropriate if we had a count of hands? [Silence] Is it inappropriate? Okay. Let’s do the one on LAC first; to revamp the LAC. Those of you who would prefer that one of the three, please raise your hand.

Swan: It’s not really revamping the LAC, it’s coming up with a structure that might be used to revamp the LAC. The achievement of that would be coming up with a process. It wouldn’t be coming up with a new LAC.

O’Kane: Those who prefer that one, please raise your hands. I see none. The second one, then we have two that include diversity, just to refresh: One of them is diversity and civic engagement, and the other is a diverse and inclusive campus. So let’s do the first one. Those who would prefer the diversity and engagement: One. I’ve got one. Those who prefer the diverse and inclusive campus? Hands up please. **Thirteen hands.**

Swan: May I say that I’d also like the Provost to think about the previous HLC (Higher Learning Commission) activity, experience et cetera and how to continue to address and its continued outcomes; making that even better.

O’Kane: Thank you, Jesse (**Swan**).

Swan: I don’t know if that would be a replacement for this. I certainly wouldn’t be opposed to it since we already have it.

O’Kane: Further comments? Hearing none, we’re done. Can I have a motion to adjourn? Vice-Chair **Gould** seconded by Senator **Terlip**. All in favor? See you all later. Thank you, Michael! (**Walter**).

Gould: Thank you, Michael (**Walter**).

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathy Sundstedt
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate