

SUMMARY OF UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING

4/14/08

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:19 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 3/24/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East. Motion passed with one abstention.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker stated that as the Iowa legislature will soon be ending its session, there is reason to believe they will be approving the three Regents university salary bill at a 90% level. The Science and Math bill of \$5.5 million to be spread out among the three Regents universities has been recommended to be funded at \$4.7 million by the governor, which we won't get. Estimates of what we might get range from zero to \$4 million.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, IRA SIMET

Chair Licari reported that Faculty Chair Simet is ill and will not be attending today's meeting, and had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari had no comments.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Licari noted that Interim Athletic Director Mark Farley was here to present information on the UNI Athletic Budget, which comes out of the Senate's request last fall for additional information on athletics at UNI.

Mr. Farley stated that on behalf of the UNI Athletic Department, he appreciates the time to present this information to the Faculty Senate and hopes that this will become an annual report. When he was appointed Interim Athletic Director one of the things he wanted to do was to send a clear message about the Athletic Department's integrity. They felt it was important to tell their story and to be factual about it.

Mr. Farley reported that there are 280 student athletics from the state of Iowa, out of a total of 409 participants in athletics here at UNI. Student athletes from the Midwest are well represented at UNI, being close to the student proportionality of the university. In looking at diversity, student athletes are much more diverse than the university, approximately 15%, but they do try to match the culture of the university.

Intellectual vitality is a large part of the values they seek in student athletes Mr. Farley noted. He reviewed the academic honors and awards the student athletes have won since 2000. He also noted that the total cumulative GPA for all UNI student athletes through fall 2007 is 2.96. UNI is also high in the graduation success rates for its student athletes.

Mr. Farley also discussed how UNI, as a 1AA school, is perceived as being as good as the other 1A teams in the state, noting that financially there is a huge difference between 1A and 1AA schools.

As of 2006 UNI generated 50% of their expenditures, compared with approximately 72% for peer institutions, with the additional 50% support coming from UNI's general fund. He reviewed other ways the Athletic Department raises revenue such as scholarships and endowments.

Mr. Farley noted many of the benefits to the university community from the Athletic department, such as classes that coaches teach without pay and raising awareness of UNI among high school students who participate in UNI's summer sports camps. Overall, \$3.7 million of the Athletic Department's total current \$10 million budget is reinvested back into the university.

Mr. Farley noted wins and losses do make a difference for UNI, as the perception they want people to have is one of a school able to go head-to-head with Iowa and Iowa State. A positive

perception benefits both the Athletic Department and the university. He noted from personal experience that UNI is a great university because professors give their students individual attention and opportunities to learn.

In conclusion, Mr. Farley reiterated that the Athletic Department would like to make this an annual report to the Faculty Senate and would welcome suggestions.

Mr. Farley answered questions and received suggestions from the Senate.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

960 2007 Annual Report from the Committee on Admission, Readmission and Retention

Motion to docket in regular order as item #868 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

Chair Licari noted that Calendar Item #963, Proposed Changes to UNI Policies and Procedures Manual, should be considered with Calendar Item #961, Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook, as it is an additional set of changes to the same document, which were made a later date. Calendar Items #961 & #963 are essentially the same items and would appreciate the Senate docketing them together.

Motion by Senate Soneson to docket Calendar Item #961 and Calendar Item #963 together in regular order as item #869; second by Senator Mvuyekure. Motion passed.

962 Liberal Arts Core Course Proposal to Category 1C - 810:025 Computational Modeling and Simulation

Motion to docket in regular order as item #870 by Senator East; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

964 Education Discussion and Initiatives Team (EDIT)

Motion to docket in regular order as item #871 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Christensen. Motion passed.

965 EDIT Proposal - Transparent Grading Practices

Motion to docket in regular order as item #872 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

966 Graduate Certificate in Women's and Gender Studies

Chair Licari stated that this is listed as a tentative item on the agenda, pending approval from the Graduate College Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council. He noted that this item has been approved by both bodies.

Motion to docket in regular order as item #873 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Mvuyekure. Motion passed.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

863 CSBS Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion to adopt by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Bruess.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Voting to adopt the resolution from the CSBS Senate was defeated with 4 in favor, 7 opposed, and 1 abstention.

864 Liberal Arts Core Committee 2006 - 2007 Annual Report

Motion to accept the report by Senator East; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Motion passed.

865 Capstone Management Guidelines (excluding Section III)

Motion to approve by Senator Basom; second by Senator Bruess.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Senator Smith proposed an amendment to the Capstone Management Guidelines to replace the existing Section VI with:

Because of their unique end-of-program status in the LAC, Capstone sections may be used to provide information on Students Learning Outcomes by means of the MAPP or other designated examinations. Capstone instructors are required to make one session of their course available for outcomes assessment each semester. Instructors are encouraged to provide incentives - for instance, class participation points - for students who participate in outcomes assessment activities.

Second by Senator East.

Additional discussion followed.

Voting on the amended motion passed with one opposed.

Voting to approve the Capstone Management Guidelines, excluding section III, was passed with one abstention.

Chair Licari noted that the ongoing items, Calendar Item #951 CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee, will be part of the discussion when the Senate looks at the Curriculum Handbook at the next meeting. The Electronic Devices Policy is a reminder that last year the Faculty Senate approved language that would prohibit students from having electronic devices out and operating during class time. That communication device is necessary now for the UNI Alert System, and will be left on the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING

4/14/08

1659

PRESENT: Maria Basom, Gregory Bruess, David Christensen, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Michael Licari, James Lubker, David Marchesani, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Phil Patton, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Ben Schafer was attending for Paul Gray.

Absent: Mary Guenther, Bev Kopper, Steve O'Kane, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Ira Simet, and Michele Yehieli

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:19 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 3/24/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East. Motion passed with one abstention.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker stated that UNI officials are hoping that the Iowa legislature will end it's session this Friday, and that there is reason to believe they will be approving the three Regents university salary bill at a 90% level, which is livable. The Science and Math bill in which we requested \$5.5 million to be spread out among the three Regents universities has been recommended to be funded at \$4.7 million by the governor, which we won't get. Estimates of what we might get range from zero to \$4 million. Whatever we get, that will be it; there will be no infrastructure money, no emergency reaction/action bills.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, IRA SIMET

Chair Licari reported that Faculty Chair Simet is ill and will not be attending today's meeting, and had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari had no comments.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Licari noted that Interim Athletic Director Mark Farley was here to present information on the UNI Athletic Budget, which comes out of the Senate's request last fall for additional information on athletics at UNI.

Mr. Farley noted that on behalf of the UNI Athletic Department, he appreciates the time to present this information to the Faculty Senate. It is their hope that this will become an annual report. When he was appointed Interim Athletic Director one of the things he wanted to do was to send a clear message about the Athletic Department's integrity. They also felt it was important to tell their story and to be factual about it. Many times in athletics there's perception and there's reality. In this annual report he will show where the UNI Athletic Department is, and will incorporate any information or details that the Senate feels are missing to make it more informational for the Senate in the future.

Mr. Farley reported that there are 280 student athletes from the state of Iowa, out of a total of 409 participants in athletics here at UNI. Student athletes from the Midwest are well represented here at UNI, being close to the student proportionality of the university and making UNI a Midwest university. There is also international representation in athletics here at UNI. In looking at diversity, student athletes are more diverse than the university, approximately 15%, but they do try to match the culture of the university.

Student athletic enrollment in the various colleges closely matches the totals, with 25% in Business Administration and 28% in the College of Education. Dr. Farley reviewed the top majors of student athletes, with 44 in Exercise Science, 33 in Biology, 32 in Business Management, 23 Marketing, and 19 Communications.

Intellectual vitality is a large part of the values they seek in student athletes. Since 2000, UNI has had 186 academic all conference honors, the women's basketball the finished second nationally due to their 3.6 GPA, the tennis team won an academic award three times for combined GPA 3.3 or higher as team, wrestling finished fifth in the national as far as overall academics and finished second in public schools, and the football team was a semifinalist for the Draddy Trophy in their division, which is an award for academics. There are 15 students participating in athletics that are part of the UNI Honor's Program. One of the football players, Josh Mahoney, is

a Presidential Scholar, who recently presented a paper in Boston representing the Economics Department.

The total cumulative GPA for all 409 UNI student athletes is 2.96 through Fall 2007. Average GPA for male athletes was 2.77 GPA and females were at 3.27. Mr. Farley noted that there are NCAA standards that UNI has to stand by to be eligible to compete.

Mr. Farley highlighted the graduation success rate for athletes in the state, which is more valid than the graduation rate because it also includes students who transfer in to or out of the university. In men's basketball UNI was first, in football UNI was second, and in women's basketball and volleyball UNI was first. UNI was first in six sports and second in the remaining four sports compared with the University of Iowa and Iowa State, which speaks volumes when you take into account the limited resources UNI has compared to the other schools.

Mr. Farley also noted that service is part of the values the Athletic Department looks for in student athletes. All members of the football team and the women's basketball team hosted a participant involved in Special Olympics, spending the entire day with that participant getting them to their events and just spending time with them between events. Student athletes also spend time going out to the area schools and reading to the kids. It is important for these students to represent the university in such service activities and show what this institution is about, not just winning and losing.

The Director's Cup compares the wins and loss records of all sports of all the Division I competing schools, over 300 total. What is noticeable is in 2000/2001, UNI was perceived as a 1AA institution, a FCS (Football Champion Subdivision School). We are now perceived as FBS (Football Bowl Division Series), a 1A school. 1A schools are those that you read about, which is exactly what UNI wants as far as an athletic program. We want the perception that we are as good as any Regent school in the state. Perception is one thing, reality is another Mr. Farley stated. The reality is that financially UNI is a FCS school, a 1AA school.

In looking at FBS, the Big Ten and Big Twelve schools, these are the schools that compete in the bowl games and have TV contracts. And when one school, such as Kansas the other night, is televised, all schools share in the profit. 1A schools will generate 75% plus of their income. With 1AA schools, the

average is 27-28%. UNI is at 50%, meaning we generated 50% of our expenditures in 2006 through ticket sales, advertising, sponsorships, and such which is high compared to our peers who are at 28%. Funding allocated from the university for UNI is at 50% compared with 72% for our peer institutions. UNI is above their peer institutions in this regard.

Athletics at UNI generated \$6.2 million in 2006. The generated dollars come from various sources including the Panther Scholarships. In 2001 \$600,000 was raised and in 2007 \$1,037,000 was raised for scholarships. The goal is \$1.2 million for the drive that is currently going on.

Endowments are another way to generate revenue, Mr. Farley stated. A big push was made three years ago for endowments. An endowed scholarship is the interest earned off the principal. UNI currently has \$3.2 million in principal, which only generates \$156,206 in scholarship dollars. When the athletic staff is out presenting, endowed scholarships are what they advocate.

Sponsorship is another way that the Athletic Department generates revenue. Currently \$784,000 has been generated through sponsorships.

Mr. Farley reported that UNI is signing on with a third-party marketing group, the Learfield agreement, who are basically buying our property. They are coming in with a property value of \$775,000, which they guarantee, and which increases as our time with them increases. University of Iowa and Iowa State both have signed on with them. Learfield is probably one of the most highly rated third-party marketing groups out there. And these are guaranteed dollars, which give us stability.

Mr. Farley stated that student fees are also part of the Athletic Department's budget, with UNI receiving \$1.1 million in 2006 from student fees.

When you put all those things together, the allocated versus the generated, that results in the 50/50 split.

Mr. Farley noted that scholarships at UNI are like a job for students, and not all athletes here at UNI are on scholarships. Students at UNI may receive a partial scholarship, which can be upgraded to a full scholarship. Student athletes at the University of Iowa and Iowa State have full scholarships. In our division scholarships can be cut up; the better the student

athletic is, the more scholarship money they receive. UNI has \$3 million in total scholarship money with 298 of the total 409 student athletes receiving some type of scholarship. The average scholarship is \$7500, approximately 60% of in-state full room and board tuition. For male sports, there are 253 scholarship recipients, with 84 that are walk-ons and their scholarships average about \$6500, approximately 50% for full in-state room and board tuition. Females receive about \$9000 per athlete, not quite full in-state room and board tuition.

UNI has to make their dollar go further to fill teams so they can compete. Tuition increases have hurt UNI athletics in regards to how far scholarship dollars go. This is why they are doing some things outside the Athletic Department to raise revenue to make up the difference, such as signing with Learfield. That is an ongoing fight that they will have because that's not something that's going to change any time soon.

Mr. Farley noted that there are benefits to the university community from the Athletic Department. Many people are unaware that UNI coaches are adjuncts and teach classes. This academic year, a total of 35 hours were taught by coaches, which included 463 students registered for those 35 hours. Mr. Farley also noted that coaches are not paid for their time spent teaching. Granted, the Athletic Department has a large budget and they do a lot within the university and they do ask for a lot. However, they believe that they are reinvesting in the university. Athletes without scholarships, walk-ons, who pay tuition, room and board, paid \$1.5 million. Athletics with partial scholarships paid \$1.6 million. Summer athletic camps raise awareness in youngsters about UNI. During the summer, June and July, the period when the Department of Residence would normally be shut down, the UNI Athletic Department paid the UNI Department of Residence \$111,000; \$60,000 for food and \$40,000 for rooms for their summer camps. Because of these summer camps, the Department of Residence was operational. Over \$3.7 million of the Athletic Departments total \$10 million budget is reinvested back into the university, whether through student employment, Marketing and Public Relations, Print Services, or other things like that.

Mr. Farley continued, noting that wins and losses do make a difference for UNI. It's the perception that we want to have in the state, that we are able to go head-to-head with Iowa and Iowa State. He's been told that the population in Iowa will be declining for the next five years which means student enrollment will also be declining. Student fees help keep UNI strong and

the Athletic Department goes out and recruits students, not just student athletes. One of the ways of doing this is by making it to the front pages, which gets us noticed by kids. It's not giving an admission to them but an awareness to them so they'll come on campus and check us out. It is his feeling that if you get kids on campus you ought to be able to sign 90% of them because UNI sells itself, but you have to get them here in the first place. We're perceived in other ways of being a smaller school than Iowa and Iowa State, and we need to overcome that. UNI has been featured several times on the front page of USA Today's sports section. Not that many people in Iowa read USA Today but if you've ever been in an airport you've noticed that that's all people are reading.

Branding is also important. The UNI logo doesn't just represent athletics; it represents the university, all the programs and colleges here at UNI. He has made two trips to Phoenix to speak with the UNI Alumni organization there, which is basically older alumni because Phoenix is a retirement area. They talk about all the things going on at the university, not just football. After he speaks department representatives from UNI's Foundation sit down and talk with attendees from those various departments, as this is the time when alumni are more apt to give. This is a way for them to open the door to tell their message, whether it's about business, music or athletics.

One of the reasons he stays at UNI, Mr. Farley continued, is what he calls the "priceless factor." He shared a photo of soldiers in Iraq with the Panther logo and a letter from a former graduate who continues to support and related how his brother worked with former UNI coaches and served in Vietnam. These are ways to open up conversations to make our whole university better.

Mr. Farley stated that he's not here to just win games. He's here because this is a great university; it gives people opportunities that they don't normally get. He came to UNI to play football but majored in Industrial Technology Education. He did well in that program because the teachers gave him the opportunity; they made learning fun, just as the coaches gave him an opportunity when he walked on. When he recruits he tells kids that UNI is unique because of the professors, they teach their classes giving students individual attention and go above and beyond the call of duty to do what's best to give students an opportunity to learn.

In conclusion, Mr. Farley noted that the Athletic Department wants to make this an annual report. If there are things that senators would like to have described or explained in more detail, they're open to suggestions. They want to be transparent and need the Senate's assistance; they want to be a part of the plan and not just across Hudson Road.

Senator Smith commented that he has had a number of students in his classes who are athletes and they are always good students. He's been impressed by the academic values that the Athletic Department insists on for their students. The athletic program here at UNI is one of the things that he is most proud about in being associated with UNI; it is really outstanding for the size of the university. Many faculty are concerned with the amount of money that goes into athletics and is a draw on the funding from the state. One thing that he would be interested in seeing in future reports is a breakdown per sport of revenues and expenses, scholarship and otherwise. If the faculty were convinced that the money going into athletics is being spend where it should be they wouldn't have any concerns. Where there are concerns is if faculty feel that a lot of money is going into sports programs that are kind of marginal. This is not a big community where you can fill up a big stadium all the time. Is every program, every sport that we're involved in, is it justified? That's what he personally would like to know more about.

Mr. Farley responded that one of the things that they have done, and continue to do, is to look at the supplies/service budget. He's figured out where they have been budget-wise for every sport since 2000. They then went back and took out what they didn't need and put in what they did need. Athletics needs to control their spending, and they have to be transparent. Every program is going through that process so this can be presented in the manner that Senator Smith referred to. It has always been his thought that if you want to do right by the university and by your department, you have to be transparent and allow people to help you. There are a lot of people willing to help if you let them. And there are a number of things that no one really thinks about. For example, travel this year is already up 40%. Officials are a cost no one thinks about and UNI spent \$200,000 in official fees alone. The Missouri Valley Conference required their schools to improve their officials for basketball to make this a stronger league in getting to the NCAA tournament, which resulted in an increase of \$20,000 this year. North Dakota and South Dakota State both were just brought into our league, and it's a long way to both schools for some of

these conference schools. UNI is in a much better position for travel than Youngstown State, which is located in Ohio. North Dakota and South Dakota both put money into the pool the help support flights of those schools that are located further away. Fiscal integrity is important but they have to have revenues and expenses for every sport lined out and every coach has to hit their budget line, and that hasn't been done in every sport in the past. The Athletic Department wants to show their integrity because ultimately they answer to the university, and if they do it right they gain a lot more respect.

Senator Funderburk thanked Mr. Farley for his presentation and his enthusiasm. He would be interested to see a detail showing exactly what the comparison institutions are.

Mr. Farley replied that there are differences in universities with how things relate. There are some indirect costs that can't be accounted for with some universities. When preparing his figures he took the Gateway Conference football schools, the Missouri Valley Conference sports schools and combined those two conferences to make fourteen teams. He broke down budgets per sport among those fourteen schools to see where UNI stands and then found out what the allocations are for each and then used this information to prepare their budgets.

Senator Soneson also thanked Mr. Farley, noting that this was quite an educational experience. He reiterated that UNI's overall athletic budget is approximately \$10 million (\$9.2 million for 2006), and that the athletic programs raise about \$5 million. The other \$5 million comes from the university's budget.

Mr. Farley replied that approximately \$5 million is allocated from the university's budget and student fees, per 2006 figures.

Senator Soneson remarked that it would be nice to see a seven year progression of budget and what percentage was raised by the Athletic Department and what percentage from the university so we can see how things have grown, that sort of thing.

Mr. Farley responded that he liked that idea and will take that into consideration. They were to be visible to the public but yet it also helps them make decisions of where they are weak and have challenges.

Senator Van Wormer commented that when athletes get into trouble it's dreadful publicity for the institution and wondered what

they do, how they check out moral character, criminal background, those kinds of things.

Mr. Farley replied that in football they have what's called Junior Day, and it's the first step in recruiting. Approximately 30 kids and their parents visit and tour campus. They next find out about these students' athleticism and grades. UNI can't even bring them on campus until they take the ACT test and reach "clearing house numbers." NCAA rules also state that they have to have fourteen core curriculum classes meeting a set GPA. Coaches have to find out all this information and the academic criteria weeds out a lot of kids. Next the coach goes into the high school, with one visit in May, where they pick up transcripts, talking to counselors and coaches, however they cannot talk to the individual student. That information is evaluated over the summer, inviting some kids that they are interested in for summer camps where the coaches watch them play. The following December and January the coaches spend the weekends on the road making home visits and talking to the kids individually. The best way to evaluate a prospect player is the home visit. He related a story about when he was a young coach here at UNI in the early 1990's and made a home visit out of state. The student was a good football player but was disrespectful while he was doing the home visit, being rude and interrupting his mother while she was asking questions. As a coach, his whole instinct was that if this student was being rude in his home to his mother, what's he going to be like at college? Young and naïve, he signed the kid because he was a good player and that kid lasted only one year. He was rude; he was obnoxious not caring about the university whatsoever. He was a selfish individual, just as he showed in front of his mother. You can tell during those home visits if that's a good home and a good kid. It's a lot quicker to the front page by doing something wrong than it is by doing something right.

Senator Funderburk noted that from the projected fiscal year budget of the Board of Regents, Iowa was getting 2.81% of their general fund for athletics, Iowa State was getting 8.86% and UNI is 53.63%. Are they looking at becoming more self sufficient, finding a better way to live within their means or to generate more revenues? Comparing within the state, it's a large percentage of our general education budget for a very successful athletic program.

Mr. Farley responded that that figure is actually down, and it's been as high as 54%. They are trying to become more self-sufficient but they can't stand-alone. But because UNI is not

at the "TV" level they need the support of the university. The Learfield agreement is something that they are doing to become more self-sufficient. He talked with Bob Bowsby, former UNI Athletic Director and now Athletic Director at Stanford, and other people associated with Learfield to make sure it's a sound stable deal that's right for UNI. The Panther Scholarship Club meets every week to discuss ways to generate more revenue. Ticket prices for next year have increased and they will be charging for parking. His plan is to distribute a portion of the parking fee with the Department of Residence and UNI Police. This is a way for the Athletic Department to make some money but to also spread it around and be a partner within the university.

Chair Licari thanked Mr. Farley for his information.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

960 2007 Annual Report from the Committee on Admission, Readmission and Retention

Motion to docket in regular order as item #868 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

Chair Licari noted that Calendar Item #963, Proposed Changes to UNI Policies and Procedures Manual, should be considered with Calendar Item #961, Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook, as it is an additional set of changes to the same document, which were made a later date. Calendar Items #961 & #963 are essentially the same items and would appreciate the Senate docketing them together.

Motion by Senate Soneson to docket Calendar Item #961 and Calendar Item #963 together in regular order as item #869; second by Senator Mvuyekure. Motion passed.

962 Liberal Arts Core Course Proposal to Category 1C - 810:025 Computational Modeling and Simulation

Motion to docket in regular order as item #870 by Senator East; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

964 Education Discussion and Initiatives Team (EDIT)

Motion to docket in regular order as item #871 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Christensen. Motion passed.

965 EDIT Proposal - Transparent Grading Practices

Motion to docket in regular order as item #872 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

966 Graduate Certificate in Women's and Gender Studies

Chair Licari stated that on the agenda this is listed as a tentative item pending approval from the Graduate College Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council. This item has been approved by both bodies.

Motion to docket in regular order as item #873 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Mvuyekure. Motion passed.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

863 CSBS Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion to adopt by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Bruess.

Senator East stated that he has no serious reservations about the resolution and would recommend the Senate not approve it. He does agree with the part about having open discussion but has no serious reservations and will be voting against it.

Siobahn Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC) Coordinator, clarified that this item also goes back to original CHFA resolution about devising a process for reforming the LAC. In the Curriculum Handbook, the LACC has proposed a method of proposing structural changes to the LACC, which involve at the onset open, diverse, widespread discussion, and feedback. There is a new form in the handbook for this, which is self-explanatory. The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) has taken those proposed changes from the previous CHFA resolution into account.

Senator Smith asked if, in the coming academic year, this process will actually generate something?

Dr. Morgan responded that if you want to change the structure of the LAC it will not be time constrained as the regular curriculum cycle is, if you want to propose a new program, it can be done at any time once this handbook is approved.

Senator Soneson asked if there has been any discussion in the LACC about exploring the best practices and reviewing LAC programs from universities like ours?

Dr. Morgan replied that would be left up to the people that were consulted for proposals. If a proposal is made, reasons for the change would also have to be brought forth, the academic reasons, the pedagogical reasons and justified with the best practices from other institutions or research and such. That would also have to be made known to the constituents here at the university, and feedback gathered from all departments concerning those changes.

Senator Soneson noted that he's wondering if there's going to be a serious reconsideration of the LAC and that there be a systemic proposal at some point about the major steps that would be taken, one of which would be a serious exploration into the LAC. His guess is that the Provost's Office would be supportive of a team that would be interested in going to various schools who have just gone through this process for purposes of discussion and enlightenment. As well as inviting people, major figures in education from across the country, to our campus to help us think about what this kind of program is about.

Dr. Morgan responded that she's not sure you can get structure and systemicness in this, it's not organized enough that you can take another institution's experience with their general education process and apply it to UNI. If we want to think about revamping the whole LAC program there would have to be some message from on high telling us so.

Senator Soneson continued that the message from on high is right here, the Faculty Senate. The curriculum belongs to the faculty with the Senate having final say over that. It would be up to a body like the Senate to instruct the LACC to begin the process. In talking about being open for a reconsideration of the philosophy and the LAC as a whole, it would seem that one proposal that the LACC could be thinking about bringing forward to the Senate and other bodies would be to do a systemic reconsideration. Back in 1988 there was a systemic reconsideration of this. The proposal that's floating around that faculty have serious reservations about was meant to be a

systemic reconsideration of this, scrapping what we have and starting fresh again. That kind of comprehensive reconstruction is important but it would seem that we could rethink approaching it in a systemic way. What he's asking of Dr. Morgan, as head of the LACC, if she foresees her committee considering a proposal to consider this in a systemic way, or is she going to let things float and consider things as they come up? What is her strategy?

Dr. Morgan replied that she doesn't want to constrain anybody.

Senator Soneson asked what is her strategy as "leader" of the LACC.

Dr. Morgan replied that she's not the "leader" of the LACC; she's the guardian, overseer. She doesn't guide, she just oversees it.

Senator Soneson continued, noting that the largest program on campus has no leader?

Dr. Morgan replied that yes, that's what she's saying. She also noted that you can look at it as there are hundreds of leaders, the faculty are the leaders.

Senator Soneson continued, that we're stumbling around in the dark with our most important, largest program with no leader.

Dr. Morgan responded that what was put together in 1988 only had a few committees that oversaw or kept track, and even know what the LAC is about. Many faculty teaching LAC courses, when asked why the students are in their course, apart from giving them a job, wouldn't have a good answer. They don't see it in the "big picture" sense. She did not either until she began attending LAC meetings.

Senator Wurtz noted that two pieces of information needed to be put on the table to make sense. Every committee belongs to someone. To whom does the LAC belong? It is a president's committee?

Senator Soneson replied that it belongs to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Wurtz continued, noting every committee is given a charge. What charge did the Faculty Senate give the LAC? Her point is that it belongs to the Faculty Senate but further discussion without that charge in front of us seems pointless.

Chair Licari reminded the Senate that what they should be discussing is the motion in front of them, which is to accept the resolution that was forwarded by the CSBS Senate. He also reminded the Senate that there will be opportunity discuss the topics of this conversation at the next meeting when the Curriculum Handbook is addressed, which actually includes the LACC guidelines.

Senator Basom stated that she agrees with what Senator East stated at the beginning of this discussion, that unless the Senate is going to discuss the LAC Design Proposal, which she doesn't have in front of her, she doesn't know if we can agree to have serious reservations because that has not been discussed by this body. She'll have a hard time voting that she has serious reservations with something that the Senate hasn't discussed.

Senator Basom continued, with the second part of the resolution, it just says, "we think an open discussion would be a good idea", she doesn't understand who could vote against that. Getting back to Senator Soneson's point, do we want to charge a body with having that kind of systemic discussion? There's an implication that there should be a charge to a committee to do that, or is it that that would be a good idea but we're not going to charge a committee at this time? If we charge a committee, whom do we charge because that was not the original charge to the LACC? However, there could be a new charge.

Senator Funderburk noted that maybe in the wording it comes off wrong, his understanding of this is also that it's time to re-evaluated or reaffirm the LAC, as it's been twenty years. Probably half of those faculty are no longer here and many don't buy into what's currently being done. As long as that's the case it's very hard to have it working. It's probably time to find some way to structure a discussion.

Voting to adopt the resolution from the CSBS Senate was defeated with 4 in favor, 7 opposed, and 1 abstention.

864 Liberal Arts Core Committee 2006 - 2007 Annual Report

Chair Licari noted that the LACC is asking the Faculty Senate to accept or receive this report; it doesn't require any action on the Senate's part.

Motion to accept the report by Senator East; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Senator Soneson thanked Dr. Morgan for all her work on this.

Motion passed.

865 Capstone Management Guidelines (excluding Section III)

Motion to approve by Senator Basom; second by Senator Bruess.

Senator Smith asked if there had been any further development or suggestions on the question of the course prefix numbering.

Dr. Morgan replied that the Senate had decided that at the last meeting.

Senator Smith asked that the Senate look at Section VI on Outcomes Assessments. He would personally like the Senate to mandate that faculty who teach in the Capstone course be required to make available one session of their course for outcomes assessment as this is an end of program course. We have to get our students to do this and there is the issue of getting our students motivated to do this, but there's also the issue of getting faculty to make a session available so the MAPP (Measure of Proficiency and Progress) or whatever else assessment tool is used can be given. He would like the Senate to require this. The LAC people should not have to go around begging faculty to do this. It should be something that is part of that course.

Senator Smith proposed an amendment to Section VI of the Capstone Management Guidelines, to replace the existing Section VI with:

Because of their unique end-of-program status in the LAC, Capstone sections may be used to provide information on Students Learning Outcomes by means of the MAPP or other designated examinations. Capstone instructors are required to make one session of their course available for outcomes assessment each semester. Instructors are encouraged to provide incentives - for instance, class participation points - for students who participate in outcomes assessment activities.

Second by Senator East.

Senator Bruess asked what the MAPP is? And as a Capstone instructor of Greece, he's supposed to be administering it?

Dr. Morgan responded that MAPP stands for Measure of Proficiency and Progress, but it is basically a skills test, not looking at content but skills that should have been enhanced over a student's college career, such as quantitative communication, reading skills, analytic skills, and it is a real test that is multiple choice. The only caveat with MAPP is that we're only allowed to test seniors. If there's a junior in a Capstone class their test scores are invalid. In working with Donna Vinton, Director, Academic Assessment, they have looked at sections of Capstone to find those with the higher senior ratios and contact those instructors to get them to participate. Not all instructors would have to do this, only those with a high senior ratio.

Senator Smith reiterated that his proposal states that an instructor would only have to make a session available.

Senator Bruess reiterated that it is not mandatory that every Capstone section be assessed.

Senator East noted for a point of clarification, juniors can take the test they just can't be included in the results.

Senator Soneson commented that an instructor can't give half the class extra credit for something the other half can't participate in.

Dr. Morgan responded that it makes it a bit difficult on the instructor because they have to come up with something for the rest of the class who can't take the test to do to also earn equal credit that those students who are taking the test will get.

Senator Funderburk noted that it might be more even-handed to require it of every section, whether or not it's administered doesn't matter. Faculty can plan their class with one less class period and if their section is not tested then they just have one fewer class period.

Senator Smith stated that there would be early notification for instructors as to whether or not their sections would be assessed.

Dr. Morgan remarked that early next week they will know who will be in Capstone for next fall. There is the reality that those new Capstone courses fill up quicker and they tend to be senior heavy.

Senator East commented that the only concern he has with the amendment is the wording that suggest the instructor chooses a section to make available, that actually from an assessment point of view the assessors should be allowed to choose those randomly. An instructor could have one section that is "better" and have that section assessed, which provides the possibility of skewing the results.

Senator Smith replied that the way this was intended is for all sections to be available, if you teach multiple sections they all have to be available. The LAC people actually decide which ones are actually going to be used. The issue of which actual class session to use could hopefully be decided early on so the instructors could plan for it.

Senator Funderburk asked if it would be reasonable and necessary to even predefine which section would be used for organizational concerns? If it could be, say the last class session before Thanksgiving and the last class session before spring break, or something along those lines?

Dr. Morgan responded that because it's a proctored test, there are room availability issues with the ITTC. It might be that certain weeks of a semester could be identified.

Senator Bruess questioned that the students even have to go to somewhere else to take this test? How long does it take?

Dr. Morgan replied that yes, they can't take it with their friends looking over their shoulder. She's not sure as to the length but believes it's approximately an hour.

Senator Soneson asked if we're committed to the MAPP?

Dr. Morgan responded that there are other standardized tests. We have to have some kind of end program assessment for all students and MAPP was selected a few years back.

Senator Smith noted that he's done some of these and the logistics weren't a big hassle. There are other ways of doing it and personally he doesn't think MAPP is that great. Some faculty have rightfully objected because it's a generalized test

of intellectually ability but it's hard to see how what is actually done in a program would result in improved scores on that exam. We are committed to doing something so at least for the time being do that. It would turn out to be not as erroneous as what Dr. Morgan is deciding now but we still have to try to set the requirement, try to change the assumption that faculty do have an obligation for assessment.

Senator Neuhaus asked if we are base lining freshmen?

Dr. Morgan responded that MAPP is done at both the beginning and end.

Senator Funderburk asked if we actually correlate where students have taken these LAC courses?

Dr. Morgan noted that it's also the idea that LAC courses in general will help build various skills. Students are not just learning skills in this one area, but other courses will enforce those skills and help students improve them over time. Students who come in with two years of community college credit learn this pool of skills as well.

Senator Soneson remarked that it is then not a test evaluating our LAC.

Dr. Morgan replied that they don't shift out the community college kids.

Senator Soneson asked if we're testing our education at UNI as a whole?

Dr. Morgan responded that they're trying to test everything but in a way that does apply to the LAC as the one common area for students.

Senator Soneson continued that if it's testing students who have not taken our LAC program, what value would the results have?

Dr. Morgan replied that she would hope that there would be enough significance in the scores, but honestly she doesn't know.

Senator East commented that the test could be administered anonymously but it doesn't have to be anonymous, you could associate a test with a student and go back and look at those records and differentiate them easily enough as to whether they

transferred in from a community college. It's not something that's beyond imagine and computers are fairly easy to program.

Dr. Morgan responded that they could do that.

Senator Marchesani reiterated that a random group of freshmen are being tested.

Dr. Morgan replied that yes, they are.

Senator Marchesani continued, and a completely different set of random seniors are also tested, creating generalizations by the numbers.

Senator Soneson noted that for this to be really effective it should be a testing of the same group

Senator Funderburk stated that he has some concerns about this kind of testing, that if we're not correlating, it could be making some very negative points about a program when those students were never even in our program. It strikes him as totally useless data unless we do some sort of correlation, and is certainly not true outcomes assessment. We could make some very good arguments if we correlated that, that we're perhaps doing a better job for those students who do their Liberal Arts here on campus where we spend a lot of time talking about it.

Senator East stated that there's a whole science called statistics that allows people to make these kinds of assessments of not the same people, having to do with populations and samples and random sampling, and it works. Yes, you can tell by taking a random sampling as freshmen, a random sampling as seniors and collected over time we can tell whether or not there's any change in them. You can't tell from year to year but you can over time, and it's a valid and well-established assessment process.

Senator Van Wormer noted that she is thinking about students coming in from community colleges; the scores might actually go down.

Senator Soneson stated that it's important to remember that a large percentage of the people who go to community colleges would have scored much poorer on the initial test than those that come to UNI, as a whole.

Senator Neuhaus asked if you could differentiate that, that would be valuable to know. Students could indicate if they came from a community college or not and then we'd be able to do a real nice comparison.

Chair Licari reminded the Senate that they are running out of time for today's meeting, the motion is an amendment from Senator Smith to language in Section VI, which would now require some form of outcomes assessments. The actual form can be debated at some other time. The amendment is to require one session of each LAC Capstone section be reserved for possible use for outcomes assessment testing.

Voting on the amended motion passed with one opposed.

Voting to approve the Capstone Management Guidelines, excluding section III, was passed with one abstention.

Chair Licari noted that the ongoing items, Calendar Item #951, CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee, will be part of the discussion when the Senate looks at the Curriculum Handbook. The Electronic Devices Policy is a reminder that last year the Faculty Senate approved language that would prohibit students from having electronic devices out and operating during class time. That communication device is necessary now for the UNI Alert System, and will be left on the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Bruess to adjourn; second by Senator East.
Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary