

**SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**8/25/08**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Wurtz calls the meeting to order at 3:18 P.M.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of the 4/28/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

No press present.

**COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER**

Associate Provost Kopper noted that Interim Provost Lubker has received a few names related to the Academic Affairs program prioritization that he discussed at the Faculty Senate retreat on Saturday, and asked for additional volunteers to serve on those two task forces.

**COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN**

In what he hopes will be a precedent for future meetings; Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

**COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ**

Chair Wurtz had no comments.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Siobhan Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC) Coordinator, stated that Senator Basom is the Faculty Senate representative on the LACC and the Senate needs to select a replacement for her as she is on PDA this semester.

Discussion followed with self-nomination from Senator East; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

**CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

Calendar Item #951 Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Chair Wurtz stated that her records indicate that when the senate considered this item last it was referred back to the LACC. Discussion followed and it was noted that previously that Senate Calendar Item #951 was a component of Docket Item #869 Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook, which was approved at the 4/28/08 Faculty Senate meeting.

Chair Wurtz asked if it was the Senate's understanding that this is not yet complete and needs to be addressed?

Dr. Morgan replied that she believes that it has been done in that the resolution asked for the Senate to direct the LACC to design a process, which was done, and has been approved by the Senate.

Senator Heistad asked if the design process was incorporated into the new handbook.

Associate Provost Kopper assured the Senate that it was.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Various suggestions by senators were made as to how to resolve this, noting that it was returned to the Senate by the LACC, as that is who sent it to the Senate in the first place.

Chair Wurtz noted that this issue can be resolved once she sends a letter to the CHFA Senate describing what has happened.

**OTHER DISCUSSION**

Electronic Devices Policy

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate will have a little bit of the same issue with this. In tracing the documentation on this item, she found item 920/828 NISG Resolution on Electronic Media Devices Policy, the original NISG resolution that was approved by the Senate at the 12/11/06 meeting. It is her understanding that this item was on the agenda because the 2007-2008 Faculty

Senate Chair noted that there are inconsistencies between the Electronic Device Policy proposed by NISG and approved by the Senate and campus-wide security policies and procedures put in place shortly after the Senate approved the action proposed by NISG.

Discussion followed.

To resolve the inconsistencies, the Faculty Senate Chair will need to receive a written petition for action which can then be placed on the calendar of the Faculty Senate.

Senator East stated that former Senator Paul Gray served as the Faculty Senate representative on two committees and the Senate needs to selected replacements.

Chair Wurtz noted that it might be a good thing for the Senate to take a good look at all their committees and see what stands where with all the committees the Senate has created and the ones that we send a representative to.

Senator Bruess stated that on the way to today's meeting he noticed two yard sign advertising classes, and wondered whom we could ask about them. He approves of the classes they were advertising but who has given the permission or approval for this and where does it stop? Discussion followed.

Chair Wurtz reiterated from Saturday's meeting that the way we will know if we should take action is if someone cares enough to do the next step. Discussion followed.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

---

**DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW**

**MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
8/25/08  
1649**

**PRESENT:** Megan Balong, Gregory Bruess, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Mary Guenther, Deirdre Heistad, Bev Kopper, David Marchesani, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Steve

O'Kane, Phil Patton, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Katherine van Wormer, Susan Wurtz, Michele Yehieli

Becky Hawbaker was attending for Donna Schumacher-Douglas

**Absent:** James Lubker, College of Natural Sciences representative, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences representative

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Wurtz calls the meeting to order at 3:18 P.M.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of the 4/28/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

#### **CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

No press present.

#### **COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER**

Associate Provost Kopper stated that Interim Provost Lubker is currently at the UNI Cabinet meeting. She did note that Interim Provost Lubker had stated that he had received a few names related to the Academic Affairs program prioritization that he discussed at the Faculty Senate retreat on Saturday, and asked for additional volunteers to serve on those two task forces.

#### **COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN**

In what he hopes will be a precedent for future meetings; Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

#### **COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ**

Chair Wurtz stated that she had no comments but commented on how fortunate we are to have such wonderful weather for the first day of classes.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Siobhan Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC) Coordinator, stated that Senator Basom is the Faculty Senate representative on the LACC and the Senate needs to select a replacement for her as she is on PDA this semester. Meetings have been held Friday mornings between 8:00 and 10:00 A.M., but that could be changed. She noted that there are no pressing matters currently coming forward for the LACC that she's aware of.

Discussion followed with self-nomination from Senator East; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

**CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

Calendar Item #951 Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Chair Wurtz stated that her records indicate that when the senate considered this item last it was referred back to the LACC. Discussion followed and it was noted that previously that Senate Calendar Item #951 was a component of Docket Item #869 Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook, which was approved at the 4/28/08 Faculty Senate meeting.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that related to the resolution, Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook, integrated into those changes was a mechanism by which proposals were to be brought forward related to major revisions of the LAC.

Chair Wurtz asked if was the Senate's understanding that this is not yet complete and needs to be addressed.

Dr. Morgan replied that she believes that it has been done in that the resolution asked for the Senate to direct the LACC to design a process, which was done, and has been approved by the Senate.

Senator Heistad asked if the design process was incorporated into the new handbook.

Associate Provost Kopper assured the Senate that it was.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that she would like to have the opportunity to bring the Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook to the Senate to discuss those changes and the Senate can see how it all ended up in the handbook.

Chair Wurtz responded that that would be put on the agenda for review at the next Senate meeting.

Discussion followed and Faculty Chair Swan stated on page 17 of the 4/28/08 minutes, former Chair Licari made it very clear that all that was being approved was the Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook, with special instructions on Form J. Nothing else was approved or rejected.

Chair Wurtz asked if it was still the desire of the Senate to have the issue continued/revisited?

Senator Soneson asked the status of the issues; Associate Provost Kopper has stated that these resolutions have already been implemented.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that the Senate directed the LACC to come up with a process, to address the consultation process and any major changes which would be made to the LAC, which was incorporated into the new Curriculum Review Process Handbook which then came back to the Senate and was approved at the 4/28/08 meeting.

Senator Heistad asked about the draft, given that the new Handbook is coming out, is the draft still being considered?

Dr. Morgan replied that it is not.

Senator Smith noted that that draft was a proposal developed by faculty and other members of the LAC subcommittee at the time, and as he's made clear previously, any faculty can bring a proposal for curriculum change forward to the Senate going through the LACC. As member of the design team that developed that proposal, he fully intends to move ahead with it after talking to other members of the design team. What this action did was delay that for a year. They have talked about making changes in the LAC, and the Senate discussed this at their retreat on Saturday as something they should be doing. That proposal is one proposal that is going to be considered. It will come forward just like any other proposal. As he said on Saturday, the Senate ought to be encouraging other groups, including CHFA, to come up with their own proposal.

Dr. Morgan remarked that the original document was a draft of a working document; it was not a full fledged proposal plan of action. As such it wasn't suppose to be considered as a proposal to be discussed and implemented.

Senator Smith commented that it's a proposal that can go through the process that has now been revised.

Senator Soneson stated that the one thing that was behind the resolutions was the concern that reconsideration of the LAC as a whole is a good thing. Secondly, that in order to reconsider the LAC as a whole we need to take a step back and think more thoroughly about "leading research into best practices", having to do with revision of such a large program. Last spring the Senate was given a process to consider which involved small changes rather than comprehensive changes. This is for a full re-conception of the LAC, and are we not going to ask faculty to study best practices and all that?

Dr. Morgan replied that the Form L in the Curriculum Handbook dealt with large scale changes, how to go about proposing those changes. The mechanism on how to do large-scale changes to the LAC was improved, including people bringing forth justifications including best practices, accreditation, feedback.

Senator Soneson continued that what the Senate was doing in effect was legitimating small groups here and there to go ahead and do their own research, and then bring it before the Senate.

Dr. Morgan responded that that is not the process. The process would have them bring it to the LACC and they would then say to go forward and take it to the faculty, not just the Faculty Senate but the whole faculty.

Senator Soneson thanked Dr. Morgan for that clarification.

Chair Wurtz noted that it's going to take a while for all of us to gear up. It appears that the Senate does not need to take any action on this.

Faculty Chair Swan stated that that contradicts the 4/28/08 minutes as former Chair Licari made it clear that #951 was part of the discussion but at the end he made it clear that we were only to act on this. The thing to do is to say that we no longer want to act on #951 and thereby dispose it.

Chair Wurtz added that it was sent to the LACC, and the LACC is sending it back to the Faculty Senate. The Senate now needs to decide what to do.

Senator Bruess commented that there is a problem with that because the Senate has acted on two-thirds of that item. We've addressed the issue of the design team; we then had the LACC design a process by which proposals could be addressed in methodical and consistent manner. We then acted on the third component of the item.

Discussion followed with various suggestions by senators as to how to resolve this, noting that it was returned to the Senate by the LACC, as that is who sent it to the Senate in the first place.

Dr. Morgan noted that the LACC was working in conjunction with the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) on this as a result of the Faculty Handbook revisions.

Chair Wurtz reiterated the issue. The Senate has in front of them a piece of business that came to them as a calendar item. The Senate chose not to docket it and returned it to the LACC for their review. It is now hanging in limbo. The Senate needs to resolve it.

Senator East stated that it is not hanging in limbo. It's residing with the committee until they bring something back for docketing.

In response to comments, Faculty Chair Swan remarked that the Senate has not voted to docket this item, and the Senate has surpassed docketing.

Senator Smith noted that if there's nothing in the request that needs to be acted on, and he doesn't really see anything that needs to be acted on, he doesn't see the point in docketing it.

Senator East recommended that whoever is interested in this figure out something for the senate to consider.

Senator Smith suggested that Chair Wurtz send a letter to the initiating body, CHFA Senate, saying outlining what has happened.



Senator Neuhaus suggesting referring them to the minutes and anything Associate Provost Kopper might have. If we miss something they will let us know.

Associate Provost Kopper remarked that the Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook is printed and they are in the process of finishing up the Curriculum website. At the beginning of the summer she met with the IT person who handles the online system to make some improvements and those are not yet completed.

Chair Wurtz noted that this issue can be resolved once she sends a letter to the CHFA Senate describing what has happened, not everything that's a calendar item gets docketed.

#### **OTHER DISCUSSION**

##### Electronic Devices Policy

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate will have a little bit of the same issue with this. In tracing the documentation on this item, she found item 920/828 NISG Resolution on Electronic Media Devices Policy, the original NISG resolution that was approved by the Senate at the 12/11/06 meeting. It is her understanding that this item was on the agenda because the 2007-2008 Faculty Senate Chair noted that there are inconsistencies between the Electronic Devices Policy proposed by NISG and approved by the Senate and campus-wide security policies and procedures put in place shortly after the Senate approved the action proposed by NISG.

Senator East stated that it seems the Senate has the same problem with this as with the previous item, we don't have anything to consider. It will just end up being a bull session with no motion. It is his understanding that the Senate is suppose to have things to work on, to be docketed or a motion in front of us to discuss rather than just sitting around shooting the breeze. He opposes discussing something without a motion to define what the discussion is.

Vice Chair Funderburk noted that it was his understanding the Senate needed to review this policy in light of the new alert system to see if anything needs to be amended. If we wanted to have a review it would be best to form a committee to look at it first to see if there are any changes to be made or if it's ok as it stands.

Senator Bruess commented that in reviewing previous minutes he found that this was referred to Public Safety and they are suppose to get back to us with a new action plan.

Senator Soneson stated that in reviewing the policy, there doesn't appear to be anything that needs to be changed. Professors are given the right to make exceptions to this policy and do what they like. The only things that are of real concern are the abusive use of technologies for cheating or surfing the web, and none of that should change. We should still have the authority to limit the technology if it interrupts the process of education.

Chair Wurtz added in addressing the issue of our procedures, anyone can bring an item to the Senate for their consideration. What we have with this is an implied petition that the world is changed and maybe we need to reconsider this.

Senator East stated that an implied petition is not sufficient.

Chair Wurtz continued that it was a voluntary act of the Senate.

Senator Neuhaus remarked that in the minutes of the 4/28/08 meeting it is stated that Chair Licari notes Public Safety is still looking into this and "will probably be coming back to the Senate next year with recommendations." Public Safety is looking at security and the alert system, and they will come to the Senate to define those concerns.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate's choices are to wait for Public Safety to bring forward a petition or we can choose to bring the business forward ourselves.

Vice Chair Funderburk commented that there is some concern among faculty on this, specifically how this applies to the classroom and information given to students in classes.

Chair Wurtz stated that this is the document that still stands, and there really is no reason for us to go to Public Safety.

Senator Soneson asked if we could go to Public Safety and say faculty on campus are wondering about this.

To resolve the inconsistencies, the Faculty Senate Chair will need to receive a written petition for action which can then be placed on the calendar of the Faculty Senate. She added that the

Senate can bring things to their own attention; we don't have to wait for someone else to bring it to us.

Senator East stated that former Senator Paul Gray served as the Faculty Senate representative on two committees and the Senate needs to selected replacements.

Chair Wurtz noted that it might be a good thing for the Senate to take a good look at all their committees and see what stands where with all the committees the Senate has created and the ones that we send a representative to.

Senator Bruess stated that on the way to today's meeting he noticed two yard sign advertising classes, and wondered whom we could ask about them. He approves of the classes they were advertising but who has given the permission or approval for this and where does it stop? Discussion followed.

Chair Wurtz thanked the senators that attended the meeting Saturday. She reiterated that the way we will know if we should take action is if someone cares enough to do the next step. Senator Bruess has proposed something that people might care about and let's see if someone cares enough to go to the next step of saying we need to do something about it, whether it's to just ask questions. Discussion followed.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

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

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden  
Faculty Senate Secretary