

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
09/10/18 (3:32 – 5:07)
Mtg. #1810
SUMMARY MINUTES

Call for Press Identification: No members of the press were present.

Introduction of Guests: Tim **Bakula**, Tim **Kidd**, Kristin **Moser**, Diane **Wallace**, Kristin **Woods**.

Courtesy Announcements

President **Nook** informed faculty of the death of Kevin **Bley**, who died today while working on repairs to the campus steam tunnel system. He encouraged Senators to keep **Bley**'s family in their thoughts.

Nook commented on the Fall 2018 enrollment and budget impact: He explained that planning and cushions were in place for lower enrollment and that there will be no reduction in faculty. While enrollment is down from 11,900 to 11,212 he urged faculty to keep in mind the change in Board of Regent's accounting: Students who take courses but do not earn credit (about 60 last year) are no longer counted. Also, while headcounts have dropped, FTE (Full Time Equivalent) student credits have not changed as much, so the ratio of drop in budget is smaller. A suggested remedy is a focus on marketing and recruitment to improve enrollment through the CRM. **(See pages 4-11)**

Regarding changes in enrollment count, Provost **Wohlpert** noted that students who drop classes before census are not counted now, and that students take more classes and graduate faster. (The four-year graduation rate rose from 29% to 43%.) **Wohlpert** concluded that UNI's real enrollment drop is 350 students and that this is not a crisis like 2011, when the real drop was 1,000 students, and followed years of budget deficits. **(See pages 7-11)**

Faculty Chair **Cutter** reminded members of the Fall faculty meeting Mon. Sept. 17 at 3:30 p.m. with reception at 3:00. **(See page 15)**

The United Faculty Executive Board voted in favor of expanding voting rights to contingent faculty, reported United Faculty President **Hawbaker**. She thanked Amy **(Petersen)** and the Faculty Evaluation Committee for organizing public forums. She noted there is a commitment to create a "merit pot of money" that would go to faculty base salary. She announced a committee to assess deans and department heads made up herself, Donna **Hoffman**, Suzy **Freedman**, and for the administration, Eric **Lange**, Mary **Connerley**, and Fabio **Fontana**. **(See pages 15-17)**

Faculty Senate Chair **Petersen** seeks faculty willing to serve on the Security Working Group Committee and/or the Facilities Planning Committee as well as Senators to explore a UNI Honor Code, discussed Aug. 27 and to note the special election for Chair of the Graduate Faculty in the week of Sept. 24th. (**See page 17**)

Minutes for Approval Aug. 27, 2018 – Summary Minutes & Transcript

(Stafford/Skaar) All aye. https://senate.uni.edu/sites/default/files/minutes/minutes_08272018.pdf

Calendar Items for Docketing

- ** (Gould/Strauss) Consent Agenda Docketed in regular order.
- 1403 [Request for emeritus status for Kathy Oakland, Department of Teaching](#)
 - 1404 [Request for emeritus status for Lee Weber, Department of Teaching](#)
 - 1405 [Request for emeritus status for Ardith Meier, Department of Language & Literatures](#)
 - 1406 [Consultation on Phishing Education](#)
 - 1407 [Consultation on General Education Revision](#)
 - 1408 [Request for emeritus status for Thomas Davis, Health, Recreation & Community Services](#)
 - 1409 [Request for emeritus status for Dianna Briggs, Department of Teaching](#)
 - 1410 [Request for new membership in Senate voting faculty](#)
 - 1411 [Undergraduate program name changes](#)
 - 1412 [Faculty Handbook and Evaluation Committee Consultation for October 22](#)

Consideration of Docketed Items

- 1367 1255 ** (O’Kane/Stollenwerk) [Elimination of using transfer credit to calculate cumulative GPA](#)
Motion failed. Abstentions by **Burnight, McCandless, Smith, Stafford, Stollenwerk.**
- 1399 1276 ** (Stafford/Zeit) [Request for emeritus status for Barton Bergquist, Department of Biology](#)
Motion passed. One abstention: **Smith.**
- 1398 1277 ** (Strauss/Mattingly) Motion passed.
[Request for emeritus status for Ronnie Bankston, Department of Communication Studies](#)
- 1397 1278 ** (Mattingly/Skaar) Motion passed.
[Request for emeritus status for Geraldine Perreault, Department of Communication Studies](#)
- 1388 1275 ** (Varzavand/O’Kane) [Modification to Emeritus/a Policy 4.21.](#) Motion passed with an amended word “shall” to replace “should.”
One nay: **Strauss.** One abstention: **Skaar.**

Adjournment (Gould/Strauss) 5:07 p.m. by acclamation.

Next Meeting: 3:30 p.m. Monday, **Sept.24, 2018**

301 Rod Library (Scholar Space) University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa

A complete transcript of 53 pages and 0 addendum follows.

Regular Meeting
FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
September 10th, 2018

All Present: Senators Imam **Alam**, John **Burnight**, Seong-in **Choi**, Lou **Fenech**, Faculty Senate Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Senators Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair James **Mattingly**, Senators Amanda **McCandless**, Peter **Neibert**, Steve **O’Kane**, Faculty Senate Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Mark **Sherrad**, Nicole **Skaar**, Sara **Smith**, Gloria **Stafford**, Andrew **Stollenwerk**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Shahram **Varzavand**, and Senator Leigh **Zeitz**. Also: Faculty Chair Barbara **Cutter**, United Faculty President Becky **Hawbaker**, UNI President Mark **Nook**. Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**, Provost Jim **Wohlpart**, Associate Provost John **Vallentine**. NISG President Drew **Stensland**.

Guests: Tim **Bakula**, Tim **Kidd**, Kristin **Moser**, Diane **Wallace**, Kristin **Woods**.

CALL TO ORDER, PRESS IDENTIFICATION, & INTRODUCTION of GUESTS

Petersen: Alright, let’s call the meeting to order. Thank you. Let me begin by asking if there are any press? Press identification? I don’t believe so. And let’s also begin by introductions of our guests. If you don’t mind Kristin (**Woods**)?

Woods: I’m Kristin **Woods** from Students Success and Retention in Student Affairs.

Moser: I’m Kristin **Moser**, Institutional Research in Academic Affairs.

Wallace: Diane **Wallace**, Registrar's Office. Joyce (**Morrow**) could not be here today.

Kidd: Tim **Kidd**, Physics.

Petersen: Thank you and welcome. We will begin with our Courtesy Announcements. We'll start with President **Nook**.

Nook: Thank you. Just a few things here. I want to talk a little bit about the incident that occurred this morning, maybe a little bit on enrollment since those numbers are out, and the impact on the budget. But first of all, I want to just take a moment and talk about Keven **Bley**, he was killed this morning in an incident in the steam distribution system tunnels. There has been an email that went out to campus. There's been some things in the news reports too, but I wanted to make sure that you all heard about it if you hadn't had a chance to see your emails yet. I know that some of you aren't able to check your emails during the middle of the day, so I wanted to mention that. Kevin (**Bley**) was working on a steam tunnel that feeds into the Rialto Dining Center, and we had a steam incident in there earlier this year—just a week ago. Rialto has been down, and we're hoping to get it back online very soon for our students who are in the north residence hall complex that includes the Towers plus Campbell. We don't know exactly when that will be. We kind of had it figured out, but with this, it's not so clear. But, there'll be more. We'll keep you and everyone else updated on this. The incident happened, as some of the media has reported about 8:39. We got the first releases out on what was going on within about an hour and a half of that I think it was—around 10:00 or a little after that. So, we're trying to be responsive and keep people informed but it has been not a great way to start any week on a campus to lose one of our

colleagues in this way. We'll know more and let people know more as the days go on. Hopefully, we can get the facility up and running. Right now both Bender and Dancer residence halls are without hot water for showers and things. They were out last week for a day or two without hot water as well and we made arrangements for them to use other facilities to at least shower in and take care of their dining services and things, so we're doing everything we can to make this as easy as possible for our students. I would ask you again to keep Kevin (**Bley**) and his family in particular in your thoughts over the next few days as we deal with this. We have no idea yet about services and those sorts of things, but as those become available, we'll get those out to you as well.

Nook: An update on enrollment. Our official numbers are out. I know you all had a chance to see them, and I also know they may have raised some concerns around campus. They fit pretty well though with what I said during the University address. At that time, we didn't know them well enough to put a number out there, but we're going to be down from the 11,900 that we were at last year. Our actual number is 11,212. That number though, can't actually be compared to the 11,907 because the Board of Regents has changed the way it counts students. That sounds odd, but these are headcounts. The number of students we have in the past we have counted students that weren't actually taking credits in the same sense as we are now. So students on, especially on the other two campuses who were taking post-graduate work would be counted. On our campus, I think it was CIEP students who weren't enrolled for any courses other than CIEP, but those don't generate credits. Those were being counted. We are no longer counting them. So if you wanted to compare the 11,212 to a number last year that is counted in the same way, you'd have to drop the 11,900 by about 60

students, so it's really 11,840-something. I don't have the exact number, but that's close enough anyway. The other thing that's important I think to realize, especially as this impacts budget—and I know that's what everybody's really worried about—is what's the impact on our budget? The impact on our budget

(1) During the late spring as we were starting to look at our budgets, we realized that our enrollment wasn't going to make 11,900, so we put a budget together for about 11,600. That's the number we working with, and as we looked at the enrollments then as we got closer and closer and we were realizing we were going to be a little under that, somewhat under that—we also realized that these are all headcounts. They're not FTE (Full Time Equivalent) students. And heads don't necessarily buy credits. Right? What's important is the total number of credits that are purchased. That's what's the revenue. An FTE, Full Time Equivalent, is a measure of that. You take the total number of credits generated and divide by 15. So, it's the equivalent of the number of full time students you have. What we've seen is that our Full Time Equivalent numbers didn't drop anywhere near as much as our headcount. And one of the ways to see this quickly, and it's helped us in this budget a lot, is last year there were 300 graduate students in the fall taking a single one-credit class that aren't back. Alright, so a lot of heads—no credit generation to speak of. Very little: Only 300 credits instead of the nine times three hundred or 2,700 credits that should have been taken. So, what we're saying is that if you want to compare these two numbers for enrollment, there isn't nearly as much budget impact as you would think there is:

(1) Because we anticipated it and planned for a lower number of students, and (2) These are headcounts, and we didn't see the same drop in our Full Time Equivalent—didn't see the same ratio of drop in our budget. So we're in better shape. The other thing is that on this campus, we have moved over the last

several years to a different budgeting model where we put in a little bit of a cushion in a few places. So we had a 50-student reserve in enrollment, we had another 50-student reserve in some operations. The 50-student reserve in enrollment—we pulled that right off the top. And so we've got some cushion to work with, and the impact isn't going to be anywhere near as big as it has been. I know people are saying this looks like 2011-12 again. It isn't. Our budget's in better shape. We had future planning on this. We got things set up a little bit better, so we're in a much better place, and I'll let Jim (**Wohlpart**) talk a little bit about what that means in Academic Affairs in particular. I'd be happy to take a question on that. I've got one last comment to make on a completely different subject, but I realize there may be a question or two, too.

Wohlpart: Questions about our budget? So, in addition to CIEP students, we were also counting students who were signed up for classes on the first day of class and dropped before census, two weeks in. Those students were still being counted. They weren't paying tuition. Those are no longer being counted. It's not an apples-to-apples comparison when you look at the enrollment numbers. If we had looked at the number last year, it would have been more like 11,650. What we're seeing this year, even though we have 11,212 is the equivalent tuition paying of about 11,400 based on previous year's history. We have the highest percentage of full-time students that we've had. Highest percentage of transfer students. So all those things are up. More students are taking more classes. The place where that will hurt us is at the other end: they'll graduate faster. They're not lingering as long, right? So we have to be ready for that on the other end. Those are good things: We want them to graduate faster. We just have to be prepared for that. Our four-year graduation rate has gone from 29% to 43%. That's huge. That's a

good thing. We have to figure out the budget model. The other big difference between this and 2011-2012: We dropped 1,000 students in one year and that was apples-to-apples comparison. A thousand students in one year. We're down about 350 students. Big difference in what happened then. And, we were sitting on budget deficits that started in 2008, '09, '10, '11 that hadn't been dealt with. So in addition to budget deficits that hadn't been dealt with, we also had a 1,000-student drop. That was definitely a crisis. This is not. This is being carefully managed.

Nook: So neither of us or the other VP's are looking at cutting departments—that is eliminating departments or programs at this point. There isn't any reason. We're not in that situation at all. We're looking at how we manage this and lead our way through it, but we aren't going to eliminate programs—those sorts of things that had to happen back at that time. Questions?

Stollenwerk: Are we thinking ahead? Our budget being crunched every year or at best constant. Are we thinking of anything that would—a contingency plan so that we're not doing this at the last minute.

Wohlpart: Again, let me say that we haven't done this at the last minute. We haven't cancelled any searches. No faculty searches got cancelled during the...

Stollenwerk: I mean so that it's not like in 2011 where all of a sudden we're in trouble, we have to go through this with no input.

Wohlpart: Good question. So we do have a Program Vitality Committee that is looking at the health of all our programs with an eye towards—this is me being always optimistic—when our enrollment goes up and our tuition and revenues

starts going up—where will we invest? Where are the students going in programs and how do we then focus our revenues in those kinds of ways? So we do have that committee that was put together. Tim **Kidd** worked on that I think a few years ago. Andrew (**Stollenwerk**), you were on it for a year. That committee has been gathering data and probably would come to this body to share what kinds of things we're looking at, but that will up on dashboards for everybody to see.

Nook: One of the things we did this year that helped us sort of minimize the impact on this is, when we first started to talk about budgets the original enrollment we looked at was 11,900 and a few of us on the Leadership Team said, "Is that realistic? Are we really going to be at 11,900?" And we asked people to go back and look at those real numbers and tell us, "Can you make 11,900? Can we make 11,900?" and we made an adjustment, right. So, we're asking much tougher questions on the front end, and trying to predict and use some analytics to predict where we will come in on our enrollment, right? And so instead of going ahead and putting together a budget for 11,900 and then seeing in July and August that we're going to be significantly short of that, we had already taken the steps to set the budget up in much closer alignment. And we're going to continue to do that, right? So, forecasting it out. The other thing that we're doing, and this goes back to the University Address, and if you weren't able to attend or didn't see it stream, it will be up on my website as soon as we get it edited.

Wohlpart: He shared it on *Twitter*. He keeps talking about this.

Nook: about the cucumber piece.

Wohlpart: He wants it to go viral.

Nook: And if you weren't there, we'll tell you about it later. We'll get it segmented into pieces so you don't have to watch the whole thing. You can get the pieces. But what we were talking about in there was that you know we don't have a budget problem. We have an enrollment issue that's impacting our budget. We have to address the enrollment issue. That will take care of the budget issue. We're not looking at a crisis in either of those, but we need urgency around enrollment, and we've started to take that on. In fact, we started to make some changes in things we were doing starting really last fall with a heavy recruitment effort in Minnesota which has actually paid off. We've got the largest percentage of Minnesota kids we've ever had now. We're up 7 from 40. I'm going to be honest with you, that's a huge percentage, but it's a tiny number and it didn't cover what we lost in Illinois, because Illinois finally figured their budget out and students are going to school back in Illinois. Alright, but, we have seen some of those efforts pay off. We have also put together this marketing and branding team—a group of eight from across the campus—that we had go to a conference for four or five days to focus just on marketing and branding in higher education and marketing and branding to improve enrollment, especially to institutions like ours. We've put several other things in place, like bringing up the Client-Relationship Management system. We all call it the CRM, but again it's a tool. It's no better than the way we're going to use it. We're going to help everybody understand what that means and how we can impact our enrollment in a very positive way. A lot of Iowa State's growth is directly attributable to their launching a CRM successfully. The key words there are successfully, and that means getting people to understand what it can do and mean, and do for us. We are creating a new marketing and branding program. We've got several things going on to really turn enrollment. We're still trying to figure out what that means

for next year. Anything you do in enrollment, you've always got to have a long-term eye. Turning things in a year is hard. We started a year ago. We're seeing some of that start to pay off. But you really shouldn't be recruiting seniors. You should be recruiting sophomores, and work with them throughout their junior year, and their senior year. And the messaging you need for sophomores is different for juniors and is different for seniors. So we need to get that right and the CRM can help us with that. We've got to get our price point right. We are in a competitive market, and we've got to make sure we've got our price point right. So those are all things we're working on to get adjusted and in place so that the enrollment can start to come up. We are in the same place that just about every other comprehensive university in the country is in and many other universities, period. It's an extremely competitive market. As long as the unemployment rate is low, students will choose to go to work instead of college and we've seen that here. Jim (**Wohlpart**) mentioned that we've got a much higher FTE than we expected, because we got more full-time students. The students we lost are those that would be part-time. We lost a lot of those. We did lose some full-time students, but the students that are here are more likely to be full-time, taking full loads, which is a good thing, but it is impacting our male students in particular. Our male/female ratio in the freshman class is out of balance even further than the rest of the campus. And a lot of the jobs that are open are and paying well, and this talks about our society unfortunately, are male-dominated positions: truck drivers, welders—those sorts. It's not that women can't do those, it's that they traditionally don't, and young 18 year-old males will jump at \$15 to \$18 an hour in a hurry. So those are some of the things that we're working through and working on, to get at this point so we don't have to do it again. We're going to

have to focus on marketing and we're going to have to focus on recruitment to get those numbers up.

Wohlpart: And the other piece I would add is the University Budget Council, which is new. We are looking more holistically at our budget.

Neibert: In our area, we're doing a lot of work. We're trying to do a lot of our own recruitment, right—trying to do our part. This new system—we had a question about this the other day: Will this new system—like as a faculty member, an Associate, can we go to someone and say, “We want data or contact information, because we'd love to contact people at different institutions—students directly at different institutions about our graduate program.” Is there a way to basically pull up that?

Wohlpart: Peter (**Neibert**) if they're in our system, we can interact with them and create a journey for them and you can be in touch with them. If they're in ours, we have to find a way to get them into our system, so that we can then be in touch with them. And there are ways that we can do that. In the past we would buy those names, and we'd have them on a spreadsheet, and then we'd have to manually interact with them and communicate with them. So it didn't make a lot of sense to buy a lot of those lists.

Nook: One thing that will help with this is if you get a contact for a student, what's going to be important is that you get it that into the CRM so that other people know about it from the Registrar to Admissions, Financial Aid--everybody. So once it's in, it's in. And we don't want to keep passing the spreadsheets from office to office. Everybody will have it, right? So, one of the things that you can

do, especially as recruiters for graduate programs is make sure that you're populating the system and it's relatively easy to do. We actually opened the system in June. It was today that we got everybody that's on University Council, which includes all the department heads, and walked them through an exercise on how to use it and what it can't do. So, we're starting to get people to understand the power of this thing. We've got a lot of work to get to full implementation because right now we're really good at having things set up for communicating with seniors in high school. We've got to build out some of those others. We also want to make sure that students on our campus—camps—Model UN or an Athletics Camp--we get them into this, too. And we get their parent's information and communicate with them and keep them engaged. While this will help us with recruitment, the other thing it will help us with is—and this has been proven time and time again in research—it will improve our retention because if you develop a relationship with them when they're sophomores instead of when they're seniors, they've known you much longer. They have a feeling of family with you that is two years deeper. They're much, much more likely to stay with you when the bumps come in that freshman year, or that sophomore year because they feel like they're a part of the campus simply because they've been hearing from you for two extra years.

Wohlpart: Other questions about budget?

Nook: Okay, my last thing before I leave and Jennifer (**Yarrow**) is waiting out there, so something has come up: If you're ever travelling in Asia and you need something to eat, get a hold of Lou **Fenech** and he'll take you to the best places throughout Asia. [Laughter]

Wohlpart: It's absolutely true. [Laughter]

Nook: I had the great honor and pleasure to travel with the College of Business to China and award the diplomas to our international M.B.A. students this year and we did the ceremony in Hong Kong but it was the first time that students were graduating from that program at the Shanghai program. They came down to Hong Kong as well, but then we went up and visited the Shanghai campus and the people that are running that and some of those students and had an alumni event there. Also, went out to Nanchang where we have a 2+2 arrangement with Nanchang and Hangkong University which is an aviation university that we have an electrical engineering technology program with. Students attend there for two years and then come to our institution for two years. The first group of those students are coming to our campus this year. We also met at Dianji, Shanghai-Dianji University, and that program's been going on for a long time. It too is a 2+2 program, ostensibly in business. They take two years of business courses there and then two years of whatever they want to when they get here because we're America—not quite, [Laughter] but most of them do take business courses. Lou **Fenech**, Mike **Prophet**, and who was the other person who was there with you? There was a female teacher at the time and I've lost that?

Fenech: She's in English.

Nook: The faculty that we exchange every year. We send them there to teach in that program. It helps them with their English skills and gives our faculty a great opportunity for a study abroad—to work internationally. But then during that time, Lou (**Fenech**) found us a really great Indian restaurant while we were in China to have dinner in, and it was just a wonderful evening, so thanks, Lou (**Fenech**). I wanted to make sure everybody knew that if you're going to China or Asia, let him know. Welcome to the new year. This is a tough way today to start

the new year with the news of the loss of a colleague. Our enrollment numbers haven't made us really happy, but we aren't in the kind of shape we were in in the past. I think we are in a pretty good space with this budget. I would love to be telling you that we are up and that we had extra money and resources to work with. We'll get there. It will take a little bit of time, but we'll get there. We're putting the infrastructure in place, the processes in place to get there. I wish you the very, very best this year, and now I've got to go see what's waiting for me out there. But, thanks very much.

Petersen: Thank you. Provost **Wohlpart**? You're good? Let's see—Faculty Chair **Cutter**, announcements?

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR CUTTER

Cutter: Just quickly to reiterate. I sent out the announcement to hopefully everyone this afternoon about the fall Faculty meeting next Monday at 3:30 p.m. and the reception at 3:00. The agenda's attached. Some information about the discussion topic, which is the expansion of faculty voting rights is also attached, so please if you can, attend and encourage colleagues to attend because we want to have a good crowd, especially to have in addition to recognizing faculty to have this talk on voting rights.

Petersen: Thank you. United Faculty President?

COMMENTS FROM UNITED FACULTY PRESIDENT HAWBAKER

Hawbaker: I'll just reinforce what Barbara (**Cutter**) said. Please come to the Fall Faculty meeting. There's sometimes, some years I've gone there where administrators outnumber the faculty and that's just not right, right? We're

talking about a really important issue. I'd also like to report that the United Faculty Executive Board voted in favor at our meeting Friday of a motion in favor of expansion of voting rights to contingent faculty, and I'll talk more about that in my speech on Monday. I wanted to thank Amy (**Petersen**) and others who are on the Faculty Evaluation Committee for the great public forums that they held last week, and also for being so responsive to the feedback that's been given in previous forums. Sometimes you go to those things and give feedback and you feel like no one's listening to you. I see things changing on the basis of what has been said. I also wanted to note with pleasure that there is a commitment to creating a merit pot of money again and that merit award would go to our base salary, especially in times of enrollment drops and budget crises, and all of that kind of thing it would be easy to say, "There's no money for that," and the fact that we're committing to that is a strong voice of support for the importance of the work that we do as faculty. So that's very great. And since our last meeting we also we finalized the membership of the dean and department head assessment by faculty committees. United Faculty's position is that if faculty are going through regular post-tenure review and regular annual review, that there ought to be a mechanism of accountability for deans and department heads as well. That committee will be made up of for faculty: myself, Donna **Hoffman**, Suzy **Freedman**, and for the administration, Eric **Lange**, Mary **Connerley**, and Fabio **Fontana** and we'll start meeting soon. So we're very happy about that. And so finally reiterating that we've got the recertification vote coming up, and we now have the list from administration of those who are eligible to vote. We'll be sending out more information to clarify things. We have been sending it out to everybody because we want people who know they have to vote to get the information. So, lots of questions we've received about "Do I have to pay to vote?"

“What does it mean to vote ‘Yes’ and what does it mean to vote ‘No,’?” So we’ll have a communication out in the next day or two on that.

Petersen: Thank you, Becky (**Hawbaker**)

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR PETERSEN

Petersen: I have just two logistical announcements. First, I am still looking for individuals who might be willing to serve on a committee. I’m looking for individuals for the Security Working Group Committee and/or the Facilities Planning Committee. These individuals do not necessarily need to come from our body, but could come from your department, your college. So, if you have any ideas we are happy to connect with those individuals and try to twist their arm if you know of someone who might be willing. I’m also looking for individuals here within our body to begin to explore the Honor Code from the last meeting. So if you’re interested in serving on a special committee to review that Honor Code from 2006 and take a look at the most recent documents, please let me know. The last announcement is as many of you might now, Dr. Chris **Curran** was previously our Chair of the Graduate Faculty, and she took an administrative position late this summer and so she resigned her position as Chair of the Graduate Faculty. We have successfully recruited some additional faculty to run and so please watch your email for a Special Election. That should be occurring the week of September 24th, and so we ask you to vote and participate in that.

Minutes for Approval

Petersen: Let’s move on to the Minutes for Approval. Kathy (**Sundstedt**) provided us with those minutes a week ago. Is there a motion to approve those minutes? Thank you Senator **Stafford**. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Skaar**. Is there

any discussion needed? All in favor of approving the minutes from August 27th please indicate by saying “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? Excellent. The minutes are approved.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Petersen: The next items are the Calendar Items for docketing. What I would like to do is bundle these items in Consent Agenda format so that we can approve them in a bundle versus one-by-one. But I do want to ask if there are any items that any individual would like to pull out for separate consideration?

Zeitz: Can we discuss the meaning of one of them, or will that me after the motion is made? I want to know what Phishing Education is?

Wohlpert: You all know that we get external agents who are trying to penetrate our system to get information—Social Security numbers, I.D. numbers. So we will be doing a campaign on our campus to educate our college campus about phishing so that we are all up to speed, and we know what to click on and what not to click on. One of the messages that’s been going out is an email from Mark **Nook**, but it’s not Mark.Nook@uni.edu. And unfortunately, we have had folks click and surrender some information. So that’s what it is.

Petersen: That’s a great question and if you’re interested, the Security Working Group I believe, plays a part in this. [Laughter] You do also remind me that I do need to make two corrections to the consent agenda. The first correction is Item #1410. It should read “Request for New Membership in Voting Faculty.” So this request, I recorded it inaccurately, and the request is for “Full Voting Membership Across Campus.” And the second correction is Calendar Item #1411. These are

curricular program changes to both undergrad programs as well as a grad program, to clarify. And it is corrected on the website now. Is there a motion to docket these items? Thank you Senator **Gould**. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Strauss**. All in favor of docketing the Consent Agenda, indicate by saying “aye.” Any opposed? Any abstentions? Excellent. The Consent Agenda has been docketed.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Petersen: We have a number of items for consideration today. What I would like to do because we do have guests here is to start with the Item 1255, The Elimination of Using Transfer Credit to Calculate Cumulative GPA and then after we consider this item, we could look at if we wanted to reorder the Docket and do the Emeritus requests next. We have Kristin **Moser** and Kristin **Woods** here and originally this was a petition by our former Chair of the Faculty, Tim **Kidd**. Tim (**Kidd**), did you wish to introduce what your original petition-action that you proposed?

Kidd: The original proposal was based on I had some faculty come to me and also some interactions with my students over the years—more of my students, to be honest—who have had challenges because of how the Cumulative GPA is awarded at UNI. UNI does things very differently than most schools as far as I can tell, which is to not only have both a Cumulative GPA and a UNI GPA, but also to use the Cumulative GPA extensively. So, most students are confused by this because some of the graduation requirements are based on UNI [GPA] as opposed to Cumulative GPA. Also, I talked to people at various College Senates and they didn’t always know that they were awarding scholarships perhaps on the

UNI [GPA] versus Cumulative [GPA] because in most places, Cumulative [GPA] just means your grade point average at the institution. It doesn't count—external places. So, whether it's a matter of completely eliminating the usage, or going to something like the University of Iowa, where it's just not used very often—that's my proposal: To reduce the use of external grades as metrics for our students because, well it's challenging for those students who have come in with let's say poor grades. Let's say they had a year of zeroes or ones, like my students have had at community college. Those grades stick. I had one student who transferred from Iowa State who had a lot of elective credit, and that student had a really hard time getting rid of those F's. In fact, he eventually dropped out. And so I've just seen some problems with this policy, where all grades are counted and you can't get rid of them. They're just stuck on you. So, that's the basics. Do you have questions?

Petersen: So Tim (**Kidd**) what you're asking of the Senate is you would like us to make a request that grades from transfer credit no longer be used to calculate the Cumulative GPA? Is that correct?

Kidd: Yes.

Petersen: We tabled it last spring. We asked the Transfer Council to do a bit more investigation and now we'll let the Transfer Council share a little bit.

Woods: Sure. We'll break down a few of the things Tim (**Kidd**) said first. The first item, what it states is that UNI uses the Cumulative GPA, which includes grades transferred in from other institutions in determining whether students maintain scholarships or are placed on academic probation, and achieve the necessary GPA for graduating from the University for given majors. So, there are a couple of

inaccuracies in that that I want to point out. One is that it's UNI GPA that is used to determine academic standing. So, a student being placed on academic probation, or whether they're in good standing, or suspension—that's all based on UNI GPA. So, that's not a concern unless we wanted to change our approach., but that is completely on UNI GPA. When it comes to scholarships and graduation requirements, that's really determined by each department. So a department can determine whether they want to use Cumulative GPA for a scholarship that they're awarding for example, or whether they want to use UNI GPA. So, we do have some University-level scholarships that do use Cumulative GPA as a way to determine whether students maintain those scholarships. And so we have some data to share on that. One of the pieces of that we wanted to break down was whether this change from using Cumulative to UNI GPA on these scholarships would have an impact on students, minority students in particular, and just students overall: Whether students overall would lose their scholarships if that change was made. So, Kristin (**Moser**) has that.

Moser: Yes, I do. Amy (**Petersen**), if you would scroll to the bottom, the very last item there: The UNI GPA versus the Cumulative GPA—if you can pull that up. I just wanted to clarify something Tim (**Kidd**) said earlier, about if a student gets an “F” at a community college, that credit does not transfer to UNI. We would not accept that within the Cumulative GPA. The credit itself does not transfer over. An example would be the student would have to take that course again here. Let's say it was an Intro to Business course, or some type of major course that they needed to take for their major, they would have to take it here to get the credit. So, as Kristin (**Woods**) mentioned, there are a few scholarships that use the Cumulative GPA, and we wanted to highlight a few of those for and as she

mentioned, just show you what the impact would be if we were to take away Cumulative GPA and use UNI GPA. The first one is the Distinguished Scholars Award. We see that for Fall '18 we had 725 students who received that award. So I'm going to talk you through this and what these numbers mean. The first row there, you'll see that of that 725, 592 had a Cumulative GPA of over 3.00. So 3.0 was the level for renewal for that particular scholarship. Another 538 had a UNI GPA over 3.0. So, to look at this a little bit differently, let's come then. When we look at this group of 725 students, 154 students had a Cumulative GPA that was less than their UNI GPA; 438 had a Cumulative GPA that's greater than their UNI GPA. And that's about 60% for this group. Our experience with Transfer Council we see a lot of students who are bringing in some pretty good transcripts from their community colleges and from their four-year institutions. Note that about 30% of our Transfer Students come from—our top feeders are the University of Iowa, Iowa State, and Wartburg. So that's about 30% of that transfer group. So, any questions about that, or how we have that laid out?

Kidd: Isn't the Distinguished Scholar for first-year students?

Woods: Yes. It is.

Kidd: So, they're not coming in..

Moser: But it's renewable.

Kidd: But they're not going to be like two-year transfer students.

Moser: So transfer/community college students. So the vast majority of our students come in with a lot of those community college credits, and so that's what we're counting when we look at Cumulative GPA. We could pull up another one as an example: So let's look at the Multi-Cultural Scholar Award for transfers.

And this is an area—the third one down—where we have--it's a smaller number because of multicultural students, and we know we don't have a huge number there, but we know it's a strategic priority for the Institution to recruit and retain these students, so we looked at a group of 43 students, and 41 of them had a Cumulative GPA above the 2.5 and 28% had their UNI GPA above the 2.5. When we look at those who would be impacted by this award, if we were to make the switch, about 30% would actually lose their scholarship if we were to take away the impact of that Cumulative GPA on that renewal of that particular scholarship. Another example of this, when students come in if they are transfer students, if they don't have that Cumulative GPA available, departments are not able to award any scholarships. That's sort of like a placeholder that they use until they're able to prove themselves here on campus. So, if the student were to come in without that, they would not be eligible for the variety of scholarships available to our transfer students.

Kidd: Could I comment on that please? Most universities, what they do is they use the Transfer GPA until the University GPA's been established.

Wohlpart: Again, in the departments, you're allowed to do that.

Kidd: Throughout the country. That's how things are done.

Wohlpart: Again, that is an option for the departments. The department gets to decide if this is my scholarship, I will use the Transfer GPA and then it goes away after that first semester and now we're using the UNI GPA.

Woods: I might ask you to share some data around when you say "most colleges" because when we looked at our peers, more of our peers do use the Cumulative

GPA, to some degree than those who do not. I would like to see that, because that's not been what we have found.

Kidd: Sure. Amy (**Petersen**), do you want to share that? I gave some things to Amy. Most of the places where you have Cumulative GPA being used for scholarships and such, they don't actually incorporate external grades in the Cumulative.

Woods: The last page is where it lists all of them.

Kidd: Yeah, but Cumulative doesn't mean Cumulative. Cumulative means what they earned at the institution for the most part. It doesn't mean these external grades.

Woods: It means UNI and Transfer GPA together.

Kidd: Here, yes, but not at Iowa State. Not at almost all the other schools. Amy (**Petersen**) Do you have the document I sent you?

Petersen: Your response? The PowerPoint?

Kidd: So basically I went through the information...(No, not that one, the information I sent you like a week ago.)

Petersen: I don't have that loaded.

Kidd: Oh. Okay. I went through all the universities, HBC's, all the ones in Iowa, all our peer institutions, and at most universities they don't incorporate external grades into the Cumulative, so even if it says 'Cumulative GPA' in terms of scholarship potential, that's not what it means.

Woods: Could you pull up my Excel sheet again? The one that I'm focusing on here—we have 1,2,3,4,5 and then I pulled in the Out-of-State Scholar Awards as well: That's five scholarships out of I don't know how many departmental scholarships we have. Tim (**Bakula**) do you have a sense of the departmental scholarships that we have—the volume?

Kidd: Most departmental scholarships that I know of probably use...

Woods: Tim **Bakula**. I'm sorry.

Bakula: No. Not off the top of my head.

Woods: My point is, these are five scholarships where we have this requirement, but departments have the flexibility with the rest of the scholarships to decide which GPA they would like to use for the department, so we don't want to impose that on individual departments. We want them to be able to make that decision.

Bakula: Actually just to add in, for the most part as Jim (**Wohlpart**) and Kristin (**Moser**) both said, our office from Financial Aid and Scholarships doesn't get too involved in what the criteria are for any college or departmental scholarships at all, so that's why I'm not fully aware of what actual number offhand.

Wohlpart: And so if we eliminate Cumulative GPA you wouldn't have that option. Departments wouldn't have that option. Just to be clear.

Moser: So looking at the very last, it's sort of a composite of all these scholarships that do require—that do use Cumulative GPA for an extension of the scholarships, so of the students who are eligible, or about 10% of students, or 118 students would actually lose their scholarship if this were to pass.

Kidd: May I add a thought, because some of these things haven't been corrected from long ago. I did look at your research and a lot of schools say these cumulative [GPAs] for scholarships but again, they don't look at external grades. They just use their own grades. Where I did see—there was one peer institution, I can't remember the name. I think it was a Minnesota one that did use external grades, or like Florida Gulf Coast University—at Florida Gulf Coast—they use external grades, cumulative grades, because Florida Gulf Coast does like we do here, they have two GPAs. So one of them for transfer students—they include all the grades, but for the first year-types, they don't include all the grades. And so almost no one uses external metrics for these kind of things except for UNI. That's all. I just think it..

Wohlpert: They did a lot of research and about half of our peer institutions use external grades to calculate Cumulative GPA.

Kidd: Amy, do you have that loaded up? I can send it to you.

Petersen: I don't. I'm sorry.

Woods: College of Charleston is one, and its loaded in the...It might not be blanket across all transfer scholarships, but there are specific scholarships. An example here for the minority students where they had the two different Cumulative GPAs that were responsible for the awarding of those scholarships.

Kidd: I'm sorry my information is not up there.

Woods: Part of the question is what is the primary concern—that we're out of line with peers, or that the impact on the students here...?

Kidd: Sure. Yeah. I'll tell you my primary concern is not to get rid of the whole GPA, it's to clarify is the most important, right? Because most departments have no idea. Two, we are out of line--not just with our peers but in general with how we use external metrics.

Moser: I would disagree with that. That's the challenge I'm having.

Kidd: I would love to meet with you and actually talk with you. It would be so much easier because then we could actually share information. It's hard if you don't.

Wohlpart: Well, this is the data and it's up on your website that the Transfer Council.

Kidd: I know and I sent Amy (**Petersen**) data from...

Petersen: And I apologize. Was it redlined? Was it this form?

Kidd: It was redlined, yes because I can include all the information. I can't say for certain it was The College of Charleston, but I believe they're one of the ones that take a "C" or better for credit and don't use external grades for the GPA. And so when you say "cumulative" it doesn't include external grades.

Zeitz: Amy (**Petersen**) Can you get in your email and open it up?

Kidd: Yeah. I mean Iowa State for sure, they don't use external grades. I know you have it set up there.

Moser: I think some of this is terminology. So I think for example in Item #1 on the list, you originally wrote that we don't use the UNI GPA in academic standing, there may have been some confusion. My point is, that it was cumulative UNI

GPA, so sometimes there may be places where it appears. The terminology is confusing.

Kidd: They just don't accept the grades at all. They just get the credit. That's it. They don't put the grades in.

Moser: In some.

Kidd: In almost all of them.

Stafford: When they use the term 'cumulative,' then what do they mean? Do they just mean cumulative from that school?

Kidd: Yes. That's it.

Moser: We have a UNI Cumulative GPA and then we have a Cumulative GPA that takes in transfer and UNI together.

Stafford: UNI Cumulative GPA is UNI's GPA?

Moser: Right.

Moser: So, if you look at a student's advisement report, they have their Transfer GPA, their UNI GPA, and then then their Cumulative GPA. There's always those three pieces.

Skaar: I think it might be good to go back to philosophy here in terms of when we are awarding scholarships, do we care about the entire academic record, or do we care only about what's happening on campus? Because it seems to me that there are clearly benefits to adding the other grades from other institutions in as a whole, but also I understand what Tim (**Kidd**) is saying in that can also be a

detriment to some students who have had a bad time and are trying to reboot. Right? Their life—and they're coming to UNI and trying to reboot. And then that stinks that they wouldn't be eligible for scholarships otherwise. So I think this is a matter of there are benefits and detriments on both sides, right? So then when we have that situation, it seems to me that we have to go back to the beginning and say what are the criteria here? What do we care about most? What are the criteria for these scholarships? Does it matter what they did before they got to UNI? Or, does it not? And then once we answer that question, then we can have this discussion about what is a Cumulative GPA, what is not a Cumulative GPA, and all of that kind of stuff. But it feels like we need to go back to that initial question as to do we really care about what happened before. Maybe we do. Maybe we don't. I don't know, but I feel like maybe we're getting away from that question in this discussion.

Moser: I think that's a very good point. So I think about some departments and I brought up four scholarships that use the Cumulative GPA. Like I said, all the other scholarship decisions are made at the department level. So, let's think about a department like criminology, who has a huge number of transfer students in their population. They can decide that 'Yes' that does matter, because they're bringing in a vast amount of credits that pertain directly to criminology, whereas another major who does not have that similar ratio might think it differently. But what I would argue is that I would like to keep it at the department level for that decision.

Skaar: I hear what you're saying, but there are still going to be those University-level scholarships that I still think we need to take into account.

Wohlpart: Tim **Bakula** can you speak to that? Tim (**Kidd**) is suggesting that this is very unusual that we do this—that we’re out of line with peers and with best practice?

Bakula: Yes. I guess just in looking at the semantics of cumulative and what it means and how it’s applied in this University would make a difference. I look at Iowa State and it says ‘Cumulative’ but they’re using that in a different way—to mean something else. I’ve never looked through their catalog to see how ‘Cumulative’ is defined there but I’ll take Tim’s (**Kidd**) word for it. I think just in terms of what we do in our office and how we recruit students and hope to retain them, one of the things that we’ve often went back to is how many students would lose a scholarship based on going away from Cumulative GPA. So I would agree that each department should probably have their own say in terms of how they want to give scholarships in their area. I wouldn’t want to tell any department how to do that unless you want to centrally administer everything, which we’re not in the business of doing quite yet, so we’ll leave those to you and I think for purposes of working with Admissions, I would like to continue to utilize the Transfer GPA towards the Cumulative level to help more students receive more dollars here and to stay on their scholarship award.

Mattingly: If we changed this policy, as Tim (**Kidd**) is proposing, is it true that 118 students would actually lose their scholarships, or would it just be a different 118 students that had scholarships?

Bakula: Well, some of them may not have been able to receive the scholarship. And if we’re going to change the policy here and still leave each department to

decide, I would probably say that Enrollment Management would still consider using a Cumulative GPA regardless.

Wohlpert: Let me be real clear. The Faculty Senate doesn't get to create a policy to determine this. You all can make a recommendation if you'd like to get rid of Cumulative GPA. That's not something that this body gets to decide. And in terms of scholarships, that is the Financial Aid Office. That's what we pay a Director of Financial Aid to do. So you all can make a recommendation that we stop using Cumulative GPA for these University scholarships, but that's not something that you all get to decide. This is not a policy decision that you get to make.

Petersen: And who does the recommendation go to?

Wohlpert: Well, if it's about these scholarships in particular, they go to Tim **Bakula**. If you wanted to get rid of Cumulative GPA, I suspect you're going to have a lot of faculty in a lot of departments very upset with you. That's my guess.

Choi: I'm just trying to figure out this table and I'm looking at the number of additional ineligible students using UNI GPA instead of Cumulative GPA. So is there any—basically I'm asking the same question that the Vice Chair (**Mattingly**) is [asking]: Is there any data about the additional number of students using UNI GPA instead of Cumulative GPA?

Wohlpert: That's a good question.

Moser: That's a good question. I don't have that.

Petersen: Tim (**Kidd**) I apologize again that I didn't have your document loaded. I'm going to go back to it and give you an opportunity to explain it, but first, Senator **Hesse**?

Hesse: I have a separate issue if you want to finish Tim's (**Kidd**) first.

Petersen: Okay. Let me give Tim (**Kidd**) a chance to ...

Kidd: This document: I called up several Registrar's offices to be sure--not all of them by any means. I've got more than this. I probably did about 40 places just to check it out because I thought I was going crazy. But, most places the policy is they accept a 'C' or better—in some cases a 'D' or better, or 'C-' or better as credit for a given course. The grades do not transfer in any way, shape, or form into the Cumulative GPA. That's just how it's done at most places that I could see. Some places they'd use Transfer Grades, especially for entry into let's say college for transfer students who came in with two years of credit. That was a different story. Most of these scholarships involve first-year students—not talking about traditional transfer students, right? The reason I say UNI is an outlier is because we don't allow students who have failed elsewhere to have a fresh start. If they have failed in a major different than their own, they're not going to retake those courses, right? So if they fail, like I had a student who failed in Biology—or I don't know what he was in, but he came here and he was looking for a major. Well, those 'F's' stuck. Why? There's no reason for it. If you're just taking credit as credit, well that's fine. If you just even rename 'Cumulative' to mean something that's more clear, like, I don't know—"Career" or whatever. Something where it's clear, because most faculty I've talked to didn't know—they didn't know that this thing was different. So anyway, I just...I feel bad. It seems like it's a way for people who know how and have the resources to go out and find the grade they want to

get. If you don't have these resources, like plenty of people I've known, something happens, right—you're not economically stable for whatever reasons, you drop out a semester. You might not even be aware enough to know that you have to drop your classes. Okay? You just cut out. What's the big deal? It doesn't matter. If you go to Google and type in "Do grades transfer into college?" No—the Google answer is "No," because it's very rare. And so the fact that we do it I think hinders people. There are many ways that we could adjust the UNI requirements, right? This is possible. This is not lowering of standards. This is making standards our own. That's all. Like what I discussed in my department what the grades should be for a particular class, we discuss in our department. This is something we take seriously. But this means that our grades don't matter. The grades that you can get elsewhere are equally valid, and I don't think that's fair to our students.

Petersen: Thank you, Tim (**Kidd**).

Hesse: This is a bit of a follow-up to Tim's (**Kidd**) last point. My main concern of this existing policy is that it hurts UNI enrollment. Right now, there's very little incentive for students to take their LAC's at UNI because at a community college the grades are going to transfer in. It's probably going to be easier. The credits will transfer, and it's 1/3 the cost. And I taught previously for ten years at a Community College in Iowa and I saw this first hand. Students are going there because it's easier and it was cheaper. And so my main concern again is with the—Well, we can't do anything about accepting credits due to articulation agreements. And we can't do anything about the lower cost of community college. But, at least we can say we're not going to accept the grade. So one thing that Tim (**Kidd**) has put forth and a lot of things have been put forth here—is that

we just treat all transfer credit like AP (Advanced Placement) or CLEP (College Level Examination Program) credit. It's just credit from somewhere else and that's it. I think that's worth discussing at least.

O'Kane: I'm wondering if there's any possibility of any kind of Academic Forgiveness for a semester like we now have on the books for UNI students. So maybe one semester could be forgiven.

Moser: Diane, (**Wallace**) Do we have that now?

Wallace: No, not for transfers. It's on UNI credits. Not for transfers. We're talking about withdrawals which would be internal at UNI.

Cutter: I just had a question which maybe Kristin (**Moser**) and Kristin (**Woods**) know—I don't know if Diane (**Wallace**) knows the answer to. How do we handle when our UNI students go to study abroad, or National Student Exchange? How does that credit system work?

Wallace: The Regents exchange, the Consortium agreements—those study abroads, they get a placeholder course and a certain number of hours, like 12 hours put in. Then when the transfer credit comes back in, then we change that placeholder course to a credit or a pass, with zero hours credit. So, it does show up as transfer credit.

Moser: And I know the same. I know we have a lot of students—we talked about scholarships and the impact on scholarships, but we have a lot of students who will go to Hawkeye over the summer and take maybe their Organic Chemistry

class that's really tough, or their Calculus class and they bring that in, and those credits transfer into UNI as well.

Kidd: May I respond to that? So if they take an Organic Chemistry class, which I guess is tough here, right? Is that necessarily a good thing for them if they're a chemistry major if they're taking an easier course?

Moser: Some take it over the summer. They might be taking it there because we don't have that. That's one possibility.

Kidd: I don't think Hawkeye offers Organic Chemistry.

Moser: That might not have been the best example.

Petersen: So, we've had lots of discussion, and in the interest of time I think we should consider a few options: We can call the question and we can vote on the proposed action. Or, we could also make a motion to refer it to a committee. I know Tim (**Kidd**) expressed an interest in working further with the Transfer Council. I hear some others perhaps may be interested, and other options that might be available that maybe I'm not aware of.

Wohlpart: My sense is the Transfer Council has studied this and put forward their recommendation. I could be wrong.

O'Kane: Are you looking for somebody to call?

Petersen: To make a motion to call the question.

O'Kane: I move we call the question.

Petersen: And the question is, “Therefore be it resolved that the University Faculty Senate requests that grades from Transfer Credit no longer be used to calculate a Cumulative GPA.” That’s the request for action.

Stollenwerk: Can we do an Overall GPA? I mean I guess I see merit in having an External GPA, a UNI GPA, and then an Overall GPA.

Wohlpert: If you get a second, you can have a conversation. You have a motion but not a second, and then you can have a discussion.

Stollenwerk: Second that thing that you said. [Laughter]

Petersen: So you want to amend?

Stollenwerk: I guess sometimes it’s useful to look at. If you see that the GPA is improving, then you’re like, “Oh, that person is really pulling themselves together,” versus if it’s going down.

Wohlpert: We already have that. We have a Transfer GPA, a UNI GPA, and a Cumulative GPA. We already have all of them.

Stollenwerk: So we’re just getting rid of it, is that the idea? Entirely?

Wohlpert: That’s the motion.

Skaar: The motion is to get rid of the Cumulative GPA altogether, so that departments wouldn’t be able to use it either, right?

Wohlpert: Yes.

Skaar: Just to clarify.

Petersen: We can have discussion on the motion, so go ahead Senator **Zeitz**.

Zeitz: I was just thinking: We also have a Program GPA, don't we?

Wohlpert: Yes.

Zeitz: Because in some cases I know that what you're concerned about is how they're doing in the program. So we have four different kinds of GPAs?

Stafford: Is that true?

Wohlpert: Yes.

Kidd: The Program GPA also includes external grades.

Petersen: Excuse me just for a second. My error. I did not get a second on that motion.

Wohlpert: Andrew **Stollenwerk** seconded.

Petersen: Oh, he did. Thank you. So further discussion on the motion to eliminate the use of Transfer Credit to Calculate Cumulative GPA?

Hesse: I'm not sure about Robert's Rules here, but is the committee option off the table now?

Gould: We could amend the motion.

Hesse: I get the sense that no one is quite sure what they're voting on right now in part because lots of different things are being proposed and it's kind of a mess.

Mattingly: The question has been called to vote on the proposal as it stands, which is that transfer credit would no longer be used to calculate Cumulative

GPA, which I think many people around the table know that that would create some difficulties for departments if that information wasn't available. Yet, if we voted on this proposal as it is, and it was turned down, there would be nothing stopping people from getting together and creating a new proposal using a question that would be a 'Yes or No' question to the Senate. This is actually a Docketed Item and not a Calendar Item, so we have to vote on it.

Fenech: But hasn't the question been called? Don't we have to vote now?

Mattingly: It's time to vote.

Gould: Unless Senator **O'Kane** withdraws his motion. I'm just giving him the option.

Petersen: All in favor of the Faculty Senate requesting that grades from Transfer Credit no longer be used to calculate Cumulative GPA, indicate by saying "aye."
[Silence]

Choi: One more question. I just want to make sure before I say "aye." We still can see the old school GPA? But just do not combine, right? We can still see the old GPA?

Petersen: The Transfer GPA?

Choi: Excuse me, the Transfer GPA, so still we can compare whether the student improved or not?

Wohlpert: Yes.

Choi: But we just do not combine the two scores.

Wohlpart: The only thing that's on the motion now is to eliminate the Cumulative GPA, the combining the two.

Choi: Just do not combine. As far as the old GPA still exists, then I say 'aye.'

Petersen: And all those opposed indicate by saying "Nay." [Many voices] And any abstentions? Hold your hand up for just a moment so we can catch it. So that would be Senator **Burnight**, Senator **Stollenwerk**, Senator **Smith**, Senator **Stafford**, and Senator **McCandless**. The motion does not pass. Thank you.

Skaar: So I have a question. So then would we need to put in a new proposal like say to—or do we do it here now, to say that we want the Cumulative GPA to be used for departmental kinds of things, but we want to request or recommend that the Cumulative GPA isn't used for University-wide scholarships. So then how do we transfer the other ideas that were talked about here into action?

Petersen: I would suggest putting in a petition. Making another motion, and then when it reaches the 'To be docketed' stage, we can choose to docket it. We could at that time also refer it to a committee for some further conversation so that the proposal is firm.

Zeitz: One last thing, and that would be it would be a terrible thing because we changed a rule, that students would lose their grants and scholarships. I would like to suggest that maybe that could be grandfathered in, if indeed that becomes a decision that they would be grandfathered in and they would receive them for the rest of the time as long as they were up to a certain degree.

Petersen: Certainly. Thank you Senator **Zeitz**. That might be conversation for the next motion petition.

McCandless: Am I correct—we can't change anything? Right? We can make a suggestion, right? Got it. Thank you.

Stollenwerk: I would perhaps recommend that we have Cumulative, External, and maybe a "Combined GPA," so that there's less confusion among people. I think that's the whole reason why this came up.

Stafford: The word 'Cumulative.'

Stollenwerk: The word 'cumulative' is ambiguous.

Petersen: I might suggest that if people are interested in putting forth another motion, that perhaps a small group get together to develop what that action and motion might be. Excellent. Thank you.

Petersen: The next items include the Modification to the Emeritus Policy, and we have three requests for emeritus status. We have about 20 minutes left. I'm going to suggest that we perhaps make a motion to move the three requests for emeritus status to the top of the docket so that we can ensure that we move through those requests in a timely way today. Thank you Senator **Stafford**, seconded by Senator **Zeitz**. Any discussion? All in favor of moving the emeritus requests to the top of the Docket, indicate by saying "aye." Any opposed? Any abstentions? Alright, our first emeritus request is Professor **Bergquist** from the Department of Biology. Is there any individual here that would like to speak? Thank you, Tim (**Kidd**).

Kidd: Bart was one of the key professors in the BRC –Steve and Bart and Bob and oh my God, Ginny were the people in the BRC when I came here as a physics professor in a strange building and I blew up all their power. I messed with the dean’s power sometimes. I blew up some circuit breakers, let’s say. I even actually shorted out a complete circuit like permanently. I was making do. It was really wonderful—they were all so welcoming. It was really amazing and to watch them all be emeritus now it’s sad. Steve (**O’Kane**) don’t go away. Bart (**Bergquist**) was telling me about his research on amoeba, and talking about doing time lapse photography with his students, and how he was getting his students involved in undergraduate research. It was really helpful to me because I came here from Brookhaven Lab and I came here from Illinois and it was rare to see a lot of undergraduates really involved in research. I did it myself, but it wasn’t very common, and so he taught me a lot about how to do that, and I’ve been working with him ever since--Intellectual Property Committee is the latest thing, and he’s just always been amazing in how he keeps the focus on student success in not just the classroom, but everywhere, and I don’t know how he was the ‘department of everything,’ but he did a good job I think. Thanks.

O’Kane: I’ll say something about him as well. I’ve known Bart (**Bergquist**) since I hit the ground here, too. I don’t remember how long Bart’s been here.

Petersen: 40 years.

O’Kane: Bart (**Bergquist**) was an absolutely integral part of our department. A lovely personality. Really cared about his students. Did a super good job with non-major’s classes in particular. I’m sure you all probably read what he’s accomplished in his time here. But, in addition to being a wonderful colleague of

mine in Biology, he's also been the Chair of Computer Science and the Chair of Industrial Tech. It's a real loss to lose Bart (**Bergquist**.)

Petersen: Thank you Senator **O'Kane**. Are there any other comments? You both did a beautiful job of covering what his department had submitted. So, if there's no more discussion, let's go ahead and vote. The motion is to accept the Emeritus Request for Barton **Bergquist**. All in favor, indicated by saying "aye," and any opposed, indicate by saying, "nay." Any abstentions? Senator **Smith** abstained. Thank you. The motion to accept the emeritus request passes. Our second emeritus status request is for Professor **Bankston**. Is there a motion to approve the request for Professor **Bankston**, Department of Communication Studies?

Hesse: I just had one question, first. There was nothing posted online about him. There were no forms. If you click on it, usually there's the generic form and some letter, but you see there's nothing.

Petersen: That would be my error. I didn't get it loaded. I apologize.

Hesse: I didn't know if you had it in front of you.

Petersen: I do have it in front of me. Would you like to set this aside?

Hesse: It would be nice to see some documentation before we vote on something.

Neibert: Or maybe give us the highlights.

Strauss: So moved.

Petersen: I certainly can. I think I just need a motion because then I we can discuss and I can give you the highlights. Thank you. Seconded by Senator

Mattingly. Would anyone like to speak before I read you the highlights? Is there anyone that knows? “Dr. **Bankston** arrived at the University of Northern Iowa in 1991. He is retiring after 27 years of dedicated service to the Department of Communication Studies, College of Humanities, Arts & Sciences. Dr. **Bankston** played a significant part in the growth of the electronic, digital media and graduate programs in the Department of Communication Studies and in 2001 he helped usher in the departmental move from the CAC in East Gym to Lang Hall and its professional grade television studios and production facilities, as well as playing a major role in the more recent curricular and programmatic changes from electronic media to digital media. He also played a large part in creating and fostering the Fast Forward workshops and helped them grow into fine events that they are today. He was a convener, a coordinator for the electronic media division committee, and also served as the Department Director of Grad Studies, doing considerable recruiting for both programs and assisting in the growth of both. He served on a number of committees across the department and college, including the College Senate for a number of years and chairing it as well. He was also part of the American Democracy Project Advisory Board, and was on the Advisory Board for Intercollegiate Athletics, Leadership Studies, and the Gallagher Bluedorn Performing Arts Center. He served on several departmental committees as well, including the PAC, co-chairing that group, and numerous search committees. Dr. **Bankston** also shared his scholarship with peers through publications and conference presentations, and acted as a respondent-reviewer and moderator for many panels. This brief biography does not do justice to the complete record of Dr. **Bankston**’s fine teaching, research, and service activities and his many contributions to his students, colleagues, and the discipline at large, but it does provide some highlights of his career.”

Strauss: Sounds good to me.

Petersen: Any additional discussion? Senator **Hesse**, are you satisfied?

Hesse: It's good.

Petersen: All in favor of approving the emeritus request for Ronnie **Bankston**, indicate by saying, "aye." Those opposed, "nay." Any abstentions? Excellent. The request for emeritus status passes for Ronnie **Bankston**. Our third request is for Professor Geraldine **Perreault**. She is also from the Department of Communication Studies. Is there a motion to accept her request for emeritus status? Thank you [Senator **Mattingly**]. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Skaar**. Would anyone like to speak on her behalf? Does anyone know Professor **Perreault**?

Wohlpart: For the time that I've been here, she ran the American Democracy Project and had half a dozen events a year; worked on bringing the middle school kids in on Constitution Day. She was very active out in the community as well.

Mattingly: She was the founding Director of the American Democracy Project.

Petersen: "She came to UNI in 1991, 27 years of service. Well known for her work in leadership studies and with the American Democracy Project. She was the Director of the Leadership Studies Program from 1991-2012 and then Chair of the American Democracy Project from 1996 to 2018. She taught courses in leadership, supervised the certificate and minor in Leadership Studies, supervised leadership internships, and developed programs and materials to recruit students. She chaired monthly the American Democracy Project, developed the agendas, coordinated the Civic Discourse and Opposing Views series, coordinated news

talks with University Book & Supply, and organized Constitution Day activities here at UNI. She taught many courses in Leadership Studies in the Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling, and Post-Secondary Education as well as in the Department of Communications Studies. She also served on grad committees in the College of Education. A major focus of her scholarship was on re-conceptualizing leadership, using friendship as a metaphor for relational perspective on leadership. She examined such issues as deception and leadership in civil civic dialogue. The University, the local community and her discipline of leadership studies have all benefitted from her dedication and commitment as evidenced by her record of teaching, scholarship, and service.”

Petersen: Any additional discussion? All in favor of approving the emeritus request for Geraldine **Perreault**, indicate by saying “aye.” Any opposed indicate by saying “nay.” Any abstentions. Thank you. The emeritus request is approved.

Petersen: The last item on our agenda is the Modification to the Emeritus Policy, Policy 4.21. This is a carryover from last spring as well, and the proposed action is that the University Senate proposes changes to add a mechanism to revoke the emeritus status as necessary. Is there a motion to approve? Thank you.

Mattingly: Who were the motions made and seconded by? Seconded by **O’Kane**. Moved by Senator **Varzavand**. Thank you. Discussion?

Petersen: And Tim (**Kidd**), this was petitioned by yourself. Do you want to speak to what you are asking?

Kidd: I can’t read it anymore because I’m blind.

Petersen: Do you want me to read it?

Kidd: I don't think it's much changed. I think it's something like a two thirds vote of the Faculty Senate. So the idea is to give some kind of process by which emeritus status could be revoked. I believe it's by a two thirds vote of the Faculty Senate. So, this would give of course a public hearing, so I doubt that any Senate would use this in a trivial matter—that it would have to be something serious—at least in my opinion—for someone to consider this.

Hesse: Just to be clear, since this is a UNI policy, the Senate does not have the final say on this. It has to go through the policy review process.

Petersen: We are just proposing the change. Our vote would be proposing this change that Tim (**Kidd**) has put forth.

Smith: Who would that proposal go to?

Wohlpart: It would go to Tim **McKenna**, General Counsel, and he would take it through the policy review process which includes several steps. Normally, a policy like that would come here, but if you all are the ones recommending it, unless it's amended it wouldn't come back here. They're finally approved, if the President gets feedback and the President approves it.

Cutter: I have a question. Is the vote on changing the policy or is it that exact language of revocation?

Petersen: The action that was proposed is to change the policy in order to add a mechanism.

Cutter: That's where my confusion comes from.

Petersen: And I think you're suggesting this might potentially might be a mechanism.

Kidd: Yeah, we would be adding that language to the policy.

Cutter: It seems like the vote would be made to add a mechanism, and that then is just a suggestion but you're not voting on that specific type of mechanism.

Kidd: No, you're voting on that mechanism. You can of course during discussion ask to modify the language. But at the moment, that's the vote.

Mattingly: Our vote would be on recommending this language to administration.

Petersen: That's what you're propping, yes.

Wohlpart: And Barb (**Cutter**) just to say if you all voted to recommend a revocation, I would bring it back here and say "What mechanism would you recommend?"

Cutter: I wanted to know because I had some questions about that language. I'm wondering about—my biggest concern is about the last sentence, "Actions or conduct protected by academic freedom should not be used to revoke status." I don't think 'should' is strong enough there, and I'm wondering what it means to engage in egregious conduct.

Kidd: So I have no objection to changing 'should' to 'will,' if that would make that more firm, or 'shall,' or 'must'—whatever legal term is appropriate. I know 'shall' is often used. And as far as 'egregious'—the point was not to make a list of things

for which you could be booted. That's not productive. The thing would be to let the Senate decide and hope that the future Senators would be reasonable people and not use it for trivial matters.

Mattingly: Wouldn't it be up to the Senate then to decide what behaviors were egregious using our judgement, and if we judged they were egregious, then we would vote to rescind someone's emeritus status? So the wording seems good to me.

Petersen: Is there any other discussion?

Smith: Would it also allow for an appeal process?

Kidd: There is an appeal process for all votes in the Senate through the full faculty. Anything which is voted on by the Senate can be appealed to the faculty.

Petersen: Thank you, Tim (**Kidd**).

Wohlpart: I'll also point out again, that emeritus status goes through the process: You all make a recommendation and it has to be signed off by me and the President. So, the same thing would have to happen here. We'd have to create a mechanism whereby the President would revoke this. Yours is a recommendation.

Koch: Where it says that the status could be revoked on the discretion of the University President—is that different from the faculty recommending it being revoked too?

Kidd: Could you read that part for me? I can't see it. I'm sorry, I can't see it.

Koch: The second section says "Emeritus status of a non-faculty..."

Kidd: Yeah, and that was something we discussed outside of this body. The Faculty Senate has no direct impact on non-faculty. So that was something that was recommended. I can't remember if it was you Jim (**Wohlpart**) or...

Wohlpart: No. That came from Tim. There isn't a similar process for staff that we go through here. There's no body that recommends.

Zeitz: Can staff get emeritus status?

Kidd: Yes.

Zeitz: Thank you.

Petersen: Is there a motion to call—or actually we could take a vote. We already had a motion.

Cutter: I do have another question because—and it's about the 'egregious conduct' thing again. I'm thinking of, and I don't know how many of you got the recent AAUP notice about the case of a professor at Rutgers who in his Facebook account was complaining about gentrification in Harlem and he made some comment like, "I hate white people. I'm a white person. I want to resign from the white race." And so he was called up by Rutgers Equity Office on this, and in his defense he said, "well this was satire. I clearly can't resign from the white race. It was just social commentary on gentrification." And while the Equity Office was... actually sent him a letter saying he was going to be disciplined, after a lot of outcry from various people, the president of Rutgers said that this case needed to be looked at again specifically, because it's not so much academic freedom as First Amendment rights to express your viewpoint on an important social issue that was not on campus—that it was his private Facebook account, and although

he found the specific comments not funny, he wanted to support the right of this faculty member. And the language that the Equity Office had used was that this professor's language hurt the reputation of the university. So, here you have a case where a number of people might find these statements egregious. Might say they would hurt the university, and might argue that well this was his own personal free speech, this wasn't academic freedom. Granted, he's not emeritus, but if one were, and that brings up the issue, right? If somebody's not here anymore, how is academic freedom even the point? So that's why I'm a little worried about what's 'egregious'? Is it things that are legal? Or just illegal? Because in this particular climate that we're in now there could be a lot of cases that this kind of thing could impact that we might not be thinking of. We might have specific other types of cases in mind—that you know that we could all agree on, but there could be cases like this where you might get a majority. You might get like a 60/40 majority and that's why the openness of this worries me a little bit.

Petersen: We leave at 5:00, so I need a motion to extend our meeting. If we desire to have some closure to this issue. Thank you Senator **Stafford** and Senator **Fenech**. A vote to extend our meeting by five or ten minutes? All in favor say 'aye.' Opposed? [One no vote]. The vote is to extend five minutes.

Mattingly: Okay, this language though says that any such recommendation would have to pass by a two-thirds vote—a super-majority, not just a simple majority so I think that might take care of it.

Wohlpart: And I would encourage you all to trust the future body—this group. It's awesome that through the faculty that this would be recommended. It's not an administrator making this decision.

Gould: Tim **Kidd** and I started working on this probably about two years ago now and the thought was at the time, and still is that 'egregious' is someone like Ted Bundy. [Laughter] They've been convicted of multiple...Just because sometimes there sometimes can be negative press surrounding people who are emeritus from universities.

Cutter: If I can make just one comment, that's why I mentioned the issue of 'illegal' as an option, like convicted of a felony or something.

Fenech: I just wanted to piggyback on what James (**Mattingly**) said, and if we try these cases, case by case, it's a good thing that we use a term as fluid as 'egregious'. I can certainly see Barbara's (**Cutter**) point, but as one of you at the top said, we're a relatively well-educated group of people here, and you know, it's like...what's that old adage? 'I can't define art, but I know what it is when I see it.' [Others correct 'pornography' [Laughter] I like that clause. I like the way it is for what it's worth.

Strauss: With all due respect, I find that the word 'egregious' is too elastic and in today's pointed political climate, the elasticity of that term could be stretched to the point of covering political disagreements, and I'm concerned about it. I think it could be abused. Even though we have an educated group, I think we also have a group if you look across the United States, of faculty who lean almost uniformly in a certain political direction, and I think you could easily conjure up a two-thirds

supermajority in that type of circumstance. I would agree with Chair **Cutter**, that this is a risky endeavor, and I oppose it.

Varzavand: One question: Is 'emeritus' as status from birth to death or is it during the period that the individual served at the institution?

Wohlpart: It's after you leave. It's after you retire.

Petersen: Until death.

Fenech: And even afterwards. [Laughter]

Kidd: Gretchen (**Gould**) found most of these I think, but we looked at the policies of other universities and most of them had policies where the president of the university can revoke emeritus status unilaterally. That's the common practice that we found.

Mattingly: I'm wondering if an amendment could be made whereby we choose a better word than 'egregious' that perhaps a little less elastic.

Kidd: Is 'moral turpitude' still there?

Mattingly: I hope not.

Strauss: It's my understanding, and Tim (**Kidd**) did research about this, the reason we're in this situation is we have somebody who's emeritus who was really a very bad person; that did some terrible things and I think is incarcerated as a result. And how many people really care that this person has emeritus status? Is it that big of deal that we have to have this policy?

Hesse: It is a concern when you Google that person's name, you see 'Professor Emeritus at University of Northern Iowa.'

Strauss: Really?

Hesse: I think it is.

Petersen: I want to call the vote. All in favor of the proposed changes, adding the revocation of emeritus status mechanism there, indicate by saying 'aye'...

Mattingly: With the amendment?

Petersen: With the addition of 'shall' to replace 'should'. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye.' And opposed? Senator **Strauss**. And any abstentions? Senator **Skaar**.

The motion passes. Excellent. Is there a motion to adjourn? Thank you Senator **Gould**.

Respectfully submitted,
Kathy Sundstedt
Administrative Assistant and Transcriptionist
Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Next Meeting: 3:30 p.m. Monday, Sept.24, 2018
301 Rod Library (Scholar Space)
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa