

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

9/08/08

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 8/25/08 meeting by Senator Smith; second by Senator Mvuyekure. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz had no comments.

NEW BUSINESS

Associate Provost Kopper presented information to the Senate on the Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook, noting that this is now on the UNI's website but there is still some work to be done.

Barbara Cutter, Administer Fellow, Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost/Associate Professor of History, did a great deal of work on this and highlighted some of the major changes.

Discussion followed and Associate Provost Kopper and Dr. Cutter answered questions from the Senate. Once this system is up and running there will be a link on UNI-Online to the system so everyone is aware of it.

Select Faculty Representative to Intercollegiate Academics Fund Committee - term one year (to complete the 2-year term of Former Senator Paul Gray)

Discussion followed with Dr. Barbara Cutter, Intercollegiate Academics Fund Committee Chair, providing information about the workings of the committee.

Senator Soneson nominated Senator O'Kane.

Senator O'Kane accepted the nomination.

Motion by Senator Schumacher-Douglas to close nominations; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

Motion to elect Senator O'Kane to the Intercollegiate Academics Fund Committee for a term of one year to complete former Senator Paul Gray's 2-year term passed.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Assess the relationship between the curriculum cycle and the ad hoc program review process

Chair Wurtz stated that she wanted to emphasize that this is for discussion only in an attempt to see if we need to set things in motion for a more formal consideration of this. The question has been raised that if we are going to engage in the program assessment it will have curriculum repercussions. Any curriculum efforts set in motion now may become pointless based on the outcomes of the program assessment. The question is, should we go ahead with curriculum as usual and go through the process realizing that we may end up approving a program that is then recommended to be cut, dropped or merged into something else?

A lengthy discussion followed.

Chair Wurtz summarized what has been noted so far, that yes, we need to be focusing on a lot of "housecleaning" and cleaning up

of things that we know we're not going to be moving forward with, that anything involving adding elements should come under careful scrutiny and if it is a matter of accreditation then there is good reason to be adding. But that any other form of additions should be undertaken with great caution and might be warranted to hold off on them.

Discussion continued.

Chair Wurtz concluded that the Senate does not have to do anything.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas asked about Faculty Senate alternates and their place in the senate. Discussion followed.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING 9/08/08 1650

PRESENT: Jeffrey Funderburk, Deirdre Heistad, Bev Kopper, Julie Lowell, James Lubker, David Marchesani, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Steve O'Kane, Phil Patton, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Katherine van Wormer, Susan Wurtz, Michele Yehieli

Absent: Megan Balong, Gregory Bruess, Phil East, Mary Guenther

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 8/25/08 meeting by Senator Smith; second by Senator Mvuyekure. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker had no comments but did note that he hopes to have an update for the senate by the next meeting on the assessment process.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz had no comments.

NEW BUSINESS

Associate Provost Kopper presented information to the Senate on the Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook, noting that this is now on the UNI's website.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that this was brought to the Senate last spring and since that time there have been extensive reviews. Barbara Cutter, Administer Fellow, Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost/Associate Professor of History, did a great deal of work on this and highlighted some of the major changes.

Dr. Cutter stated that she wanted everyone to be aware that the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) asked for input from the Graduate College Curriculum Committee (GCCC), department heads, department secretaries, the Academic Affairs Council, as well as the Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC), trying to get input on changes from as many people as possible. One of their major goals was to try to make it easier to read, more user friendly and to clarify things that were confusing. They also updated it to reflect new policies and procedures, such as no new extended programs and shift to a minimum number of credits for a degree. They had to integrate new Board of Regent (BOR) forms, form

changes, and the GCCC was added to the list of groups even though they were part of the review process.

They also gathered a lot of supporting materials in Appendix D, Dr. Cutter noted, for information on the history and rationale for certain changes. Such as, when the Faculty Senate decided there would be no new extended programs there was a lot of discussion on what exactly this would mean; could extended programs be re-stated even if they remained extended. Yes, however, they cannot increase their hours. So there would be no confusion on what the Senate intended with this policy they included supporting documents.

Because the Faculty Senate requested it, Dr. Cutter stated that they asked the LACC to clarify their place in the curriculum process, which can be seen on page 5 of the new handbook. There are two ways that the LACC participates in curriculum review. First, they receive, review and respond in consultation on proposals involving specific LAC courses. And a new form was developed by the LACC to be used when revising the structure of the whole LAC program, "Revisions of the Liberal Arts Core." Two versions of this proposal must be submitted, Preliminary and Final. Before the proposal enters the whole review process consultation with the LACC is held, with the LACC giving them feedback and then consulting with all the relative campus constituencies, developing a final proposal that goes through the entire regular curriculum process. This clarifies what happens if you want to add or drop an LAC course, or if there is a fundamental structural change.

Associate Provost Kopper continued, noting that they wanted to find a central place that was open so all the information could be housed in one place. Thus, the Curriculum Process Review website was developed. A variety of information is incorporated, including all the committee members and their emails so anyone can contact them. They had discovered that once committee members were printed in the handbook it was outdated. This way there is a central place that everybody can check to see who's on what committee, including both the UCC and GCCC. This also lists the duties of the Committees as well as the curriculum change timeline. We are now entering in our normal curriculum cycle and this gives the timelines for the Faculty Senate, the departments and the committee work, etc. A General Curriculum Review Process Diagram is included at the beginning of the handbook. There was a change in this process and the policy last spring in that when all the curriculum packages leave the Provost's Office, anything going forward to

the Iowa Coordinating Council for Post-High School Education goes to the President's Office first.

Associate Provost Kopper also noted that the UNI Catalog is also on the website. Information listed there relates to programs, graduate and undergraduate, academic regulations and information related to the catalog, both new and old.

One of the things that the UCC did at the end of the academic year, Associate Provost Kopper stated, was to meet with Dewayne Purdy, University Marketing and Public Relations, to develop the UNI Curriculum Online System website and the ITS Information Systems people relating to the online curriculum system. There were a variety of changes, updates, and glitches they wanted changed on the system to make it more user friendly. That link is not yet ready because the main IT person that does this was affected by this summer's flooding and has not gotten caught up on this work.

The biggest change to this system is to try to have an electronic consultation system. It will become much easier for everyone to do consultations and keep track of them. They also want everyone to be able to see the curriculum changes so it will be an open, transparent process. A tracking mechanism is also planned. The hope is that this will all be up and functioning by October 1. At the college meetings the first week in October IT people will be there to demonstrate the system and the new changes. Once this system is up and running there will be a link on UNI-Online to the system so everyone is aware of it.

In response to Senator Funderburk's question about the link for the review process, if it would also be available through MyUNIVERse, Associate Provost Kopper replied that you will be able to access it through both MyUNIVERse and the UNI-Online link. They will make this information more public once the system is up and running. Right now it can be accessed through the Provost's website

Senator Neuhaus asked if there is currently an address associated with UNI Curriculum online.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that it is a password protected site and will take you to the CAT ID. If you go there now you will find the old system.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas asked if everyone will be able to look at these but only certain people will have access to make changes? Will only certain people have access to filling out forms, such as departmental secretaries versus faculty?

Associate Provost Kopper responded that they haven't touched that whole system in terms of who in departments will have access. That will be up to the individual departments. They have talked about having a reader type system so anyone can look at curriculum packages as they're being developed so there will be no surprises, which came from input they received

Senator Schumacher-Douglas continued, noting that there would never be a "private draft." This way people will know what's coming down the pipe and can see what changes and revisions have been made.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that she's not sure how that process will be done.

Senator Heisted commented that she thinks doing the consultations on line is brilliant and would be really helpful for everyone. She wondered about the General Curriculum Review Process, if the Pre-Approval for new majors is a new addition?

Associate Provost Kopper responded that yes, it is a new addition. This is mixing our curriculum along with the Board of Regents (BOR) policies. When a department thinks about developing a new major, that has to be put in the pipeline that goes to the BOR and Council of Provosts (COP) so they are aware that this is in the works. This can be done at any time, however they are reported annually to the BOR. This is included because they want people to know that at any point a new major is seriously being contemplated it should go to the Provost's Office so it can be reported to the BOR.

Interim Provost Lubker commented that the reason this is done is that in the past there have been some full blown proposals coming from faculty that have involved a lot of work only to be rejected by the other two Regents institutions at the COP meeting. This allows everyone to take a look at proposals before a lot of work has gone into it and find out that there's going to be a fight early in the game.

Senator Heistad asked if there is a pre-approval form or is it more informal?

Associate Provost Kopper replied that it's more of an informal situation but we do need to provide as much information as we can to the BOR and COP.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that this all is new and asked for feedback as faculty use and review this handbook and the process.

Chair Wurtz commented that it is obvious that a lot of work has gone into this.

Associate Provost Kopper responded that Barbara Cutter, Coleen Wagner, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Diane Wallace, Registrar's Office, the UCC, the GCCC, Victoria DeFrancisco, former Interim Associate Dean, Graduate College, all put a lot of work into this effort.

Chair Wurtz thanked Associate Provost Kopper and noted that good quality work is always appreciated.

Select Faculty Representative to Intercollegiate Academics Fund Committee - term one year (to complete the 2-year term of Former Senator Paul Gray)

Chair Wurtz stated that the Senate needs to select a member of the Faculty Senate to serve out Paul Gray's term on the Intercollegiate Academics Fund Committee. This requires a senator, as Dr. Gray is no longer on the Faculty Senate.

Senator O'Kane asked if this does in fact require a Faculty Senator, we cannot appoint a faculty member?

Chair Wurtz replied that that is what she has been given to understand.

Senator Soneson nominated Senator O'Kane.

Dr. Cutter noted that she is the chair of that committee and described what they do, saying that it is basically giving out money to students to travel to conferences or competitions where they are presenting and to conduct research. It is a fun committee to serve on and meets once a month during the academic year.

Senator O'Kane asked the workload is in terms of reading proposals?

Dr. Cutter responded that in the past the committee has only sent out the research proposals to be read; a short description confirming that a paper has been accepted is all that is sent out for the other applications. The travel money is more about how they got the paper accepted, is this an academic event, are they presenting, etc. which can be looked over very quickly. The research projects also contain a one-page narrative that committee members read.

Senator O'Kane accepted the nomination.

Motion by Senator Schumacher-Douglas to close nominations;
second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

Motion to elect Senator O'Kane to the Intercollegiate Academics Fund Committee for a term of one year to complete former Senator Paul Gray's 2-year term passed.

Senator Mvuyekure stated that he had received an email stating that the money allocated to students had been reduced from \$500 individual to \$400. He asked Dr. Cutter how that will impact students that normally go to conferences?

Dr. Cutter replied that it was a really tough decision for the committee to make, to reduce the allotments. The Intercollegiate Academic Fund Committee lost \$20,000 in funding and with the high price of travel it will impact students. The committee did not want to go through all the money in fall semester and not have any money to allocate for spring. Students many times find out in February that something they have submitted has been accepted for a March conference. This was the most equitable way they could figure out to continue to fund students at a rate that wasn't minimal. \$400 would help but students would have to do more cobbling together to meet their expenses. In past years when the Committee's budget has been cut they have run out of money before the fall semester ended and they really thought that would be much worse. They were trying to make the best of a tough situation.

Senator Mvuyekure asked if there were limits for the group award of \$6000?

Dr. Cutter stated that the awards are \$400 per student maximum, and \$6000 per group maximum. If there were three in the group the maximum would be \$1200; if the group was much larger, such as 25, the maximum would be \$6000, \$400 per student up to the

\$6000 limit. This was a compromise to manage funds because they didn't want to be unfair towards colleges and departments that tend to have large groups but they also didn't want them to use up all the money.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Assess the relationship between the curriculum cycle and the ad hoc program review process

Chair Wurtz stated that she wanted to emphasize that this is for discussion only in an attempt to see if we need to set things in motion for a more formal consideration of this. The question has been raised that if we are going to engage in the program assessment it will have curriculum repercussions. Any curriculum efforts set in motion now may become pointless based on the outcomes of the program assessment. The question is, should we go ahead with curriculum as usual and go through the process realizing that we may end up approving a program that is then recommended to be cut, dropped or merged into something else? The original proposal was that maybe we need to set a moratorium on curriculum, set everything back by a year, extending the current catalog, which creates some logistic problems. It has also been suggested that we consider endorsing the understanding that for this curriculum cycle it would be ok to remove "dead wood" courses, tweaking and bringing current courses up to date. However, adding courses would become problematic and you'd need to think very carefully before pursuing it, and adding programs would just not be a good idea. For the Senate to take action when it has not been brought to us is premature and we need to let the rest of the campus know we're looking at this. This is the beginning discussion; do we want to push to carry this forward in a more formal way, and if so, how?

Senator Soneson stated that he believes there would be a problem with postponing the whole curriculum cycle process. For one thing, the UNI catalog is coordinated with the curriculum cycle and if we push it back a year we would either have to do a one-year catalog or have to let everyone know to use the old catalog for another year, which would be awkward. It's hard for him to see how we could just put it off.

On the other hand, Senator Soneson continued, maybe we could be thinking about this and recommending that departments keep in mind that we're going through this program assessment process.

With that in mind, departments need to be very conservative in any new proposals they might offer at this point. Unless it's something that's been in the works the last five years or there are very, very good reasons, it might be good not to plan to introduce anything new. When this was done in the College of Humanities of Fine Arts (CHFA) five years ago or so Interim Provost Lubker who was Dean at that time said no new courses unless you drop an equal number of courses, an exchange keeping the number of courses the same. That might be one way to think about it. We could continue the current curriculum cycle and still ask people to be a little bit more conservative in the planning, given the fact that we're through this process right now.

Interim Provost Lubker added that irregardless of any assessment process that a conservative stance is taken to the addition of courses if courses are not dropped. When you've gone before the BOR, saying that your university is in trouble and needs money for faculty, etc. and then announce that you're adding a hundred more courses than are being dropped, the BOR doesn't look at that very kindly.

Associate Provost noted that the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Steering Committee asked her as chair, to express their reservations and concerns about postponing the curriculum review process related to re-accreditation. Criteria related to student learning and student teaching environments talks about regular review of our curriculum and our academic program reviews. Essentially if there was any delay in our curriculum review cycle we would have our site visitors on campus dealing with a 2008-2010 catalog that contains curricula that were developed Fall 2006 by departments.

Dr. Siobhan Morgan, LACC Coordinator, stated that one of the items included in the Self Study Accreditation is the current catalog. We would be sending to the accreditors a copy of our most current catalog. When they're here in 2011 with a catalog dated 2008-2010, that wouldn't go over very well.

Senator Yehieli noted that it would be challenging for us to have this discussion about whether we should do the curriculum changes as such concurrently with the assessment because we need to know what the implementation date might be for the actual changes. It is her understanding that the committees are meeting this year and making recommendations but what would the actual implementation date be?

Interim Provost Lubker replied that that's a good question. He would be looking for something from the task force or committee the middle of March or first part of April, and that would be too late to put it into place by the fall. However, between now and then we can be looking very hard at courses that haven't been taught for a long time and they can be combined, reduced or changed in how they're offered or eliminated right now. We could also get results from that committee that suggests the merger of two new programs, which could happen immediately. A lot of those decisions will be in someone else's hands as he'll be giving this report to the next provost and that person will have to make the decision on the implementation of it. His expectation is that this person will be very gratefully to have something all put together when they come in to help them better understand what we need to do.

Senator Yehieli commented that then some of the smaller "housecleaning" activities can be done immediately, but the larger realignment might take longer.

Interim Provost Lubker continued, that he doesn't anticipate this resulting in the elimination of programs but it could happen. He does anticipate the merging of programs, making a more efficient system.

Senator Heistad noted that it doesn't feel right to her to send out a message from the Senate saying that we should "stunt" future curriculum development based on the program assessment, as there are programs that have very specific needs and desires that need to be added. When those packets get to the UCC it seems that that could also be the moment when some of the lighter "housekeeping" might be done. If there is a message from the Senate, maybe it would be that there has to be a little bit more flexibility with last minute consultations that could come up probably next year when the UCC starts working through each individual packet.

Senator Marchesani stated that you also have to be mindful that accreditation is going on by departments for different reasons such as certifications. We don't want to stunt that option for departments and if we are looking at suspending or delaying the process we need to be mindful of that.

Chair Wurtz summarized what has been noted so far, that yes, we need to be focusing on a lot of "housecleaning" and cleaning up of things that we know we're not going to be moving forward with, that anything involving adding elements should come under

careful scrutiny and if it is a matter of accreditation then there is good reason to be adding. But that any other form of additions should be undertaken with great caution and might be warranted to hold off on them.

Senator Neuhaus noted that the other thing you could say, which will test this whole institution, is how aware all the different parties are of the parties as they're acting together with? It's reminiscent of Civil War battles where a general splits his army three ways and plans for them to meet up again, it usually didn't happen. We could also just state that everyone needs to be aware of the other processes that are going on campus. We can caution but if you're aware of that process that is going to caution you right there. It's always been a given that you put something large forward with a certain amount of caution and a lot of forethought. Everyone needs to be aware of all these processes that are going on, this assessment, the accreditation and the curriculum cycle. And these three are going to have to somehow learn to "dance together" real well.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas commented that she has an issue with the wording. In her department they have a new nationally recognized program that faculty initiated, that has been in the works about ten years, that has been funded, and that faculty have been hired for to begin in January. In past years the caution has been that a strong rationale is necessary for the proposal. "Consider carefully" may cause more concern among faculty.

Senator Yehieli asked if the concern was related to faculty recruitment and retention, and that the worry may be that this new program may not happen.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas added that the feeling for new, incoming faculty may be that the university is not committed to this initiative before they even begin.

Senator Heistad asked if it is tradition that each time we enter into a new curriculum cycle that the Faculty Senate makes a statement concerning what's expected, what's not? Is this something that's considered every year?

Chair Wurtz replied that it is her understanding that no, that does not usually happen. The reason the question was raised this time was because we are looking at the program assessment and we are aware that our programs are going to look different in the very near future.

Senator Heistad noted that with that said, then we are aware of it and the Faculty Senate has no reason to reiterate it. The messages that faculty have been getting for the past eight years are the same, the message hasn't really changed when it comes to curriculum.

Senator Yehieli stated that this has already come up in her division which was going ahead with the regular curriculum cycle and she and several colleagues asked if they should even be proposing new stuff, is this the time to do this? They were unaware of how to proceed. Some faculty are following this very closely and others seem to have absolutely no idea about the whole assessment issue.

Senator Neuhaus reiterated what Senator Yehieli stated, that he has talked with a number of people who have backed up a little bit on this but at the same time, as he understands the programs assessment; some programs will come out being more emphasized than they are now. If we begin to know what some of those programs are and to communicate and consult with more people on them, then awareness of them will be raised. We don't want to caution so much that everybody just quits but at the same time we don't want people to feel overly optimistic. Mostly we want them to be aware of what's going on because it's different than it's been in years past.

Senator Smith noted that since the curricular review process we're getting into includes not just adding new programs but supposedly eliminating or changing old ones, which, if anything, is the thing that we have been remiss or inadequate in. We should not in any way dissuade or discourage people from proposing what they feel are justifiable new programs. We have to make sure the standards of justification are very significant. He's not sure that the Senate has to say anything but if it were, it would be for faculty to be more focused on what they could take out of the curriculum than they have been in the past but not to feel discouraged from potentially adding new things that they feel they can justify.

Senator Lowell stated that she is really concerned about the timing of this assessment so close to the accreditation process. If we're going to be slowing things down because we don't know what's going to happen as a result of this assess and then having these people on campus re-evaluating the whole university, we're going to be in the middle changing or slowing

things down because we're not sure. The time of this seems bad to her.

Interim Provost Lubker responded that the work on this will be done and a recommendation made by the end of this academic year. That will be doing what the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) wants in a way, a very, very vigorous curricular review. They will know that we have looked at our entire curriculum in the way that it works together, including the LAC. We will have looked at the system and made decisions, recommendations, and hopefully actions. If he was a HLC site visitor he would be deeply impressed by this.

Senator Funderburk commented that it strikes him that the time frame is not actually problematic in that the reports from these task forces can't be acted on until next year. The curriculum cycle is just developed this year and next year is for the approvals. If we are sending any message it should be to know that this is going on and to do your work as normal, with the understanding that this may come but certainly not to stop forward progress because we are reviewing things.

Interim Provost Lubker added that as long as there is communication going on these will be symbiotic behaviors, we'll be acting together and all these things will be related. And we'll have to be communicating. It will work well together but it will take a lot of communication.

Chair Wurtz asked if any action, a public relations type of statement from the Faculty Senate, would make any difference in any of this?

Senator Heistad noted that she has changed her mind, that earlier she had said that she didn't think a statement was necessary. In her department some faculty were going ahead with curriculum as they do every two years but some were wondering if they should go ahead with it. She's convinced that something does need to be said so there is a clear message that yes, we should be reviewing curriculum this year as we normally do every two years.

Interim Provost Lubker added that addressing the curriculum doesn't necessarily mean adding courses. It could just as easily mean taking courses out and cleaning up the curriculum.

Chair Wurtz asked if it would make sense for a co-authored letter from the Faculty Senate and the Provosts Office, to say

thanks for the new Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook and make the statement that any curriculum action this year needs to take into consideration that we don't know what our programs will look like in the future and that decisions be made at the department level with that in mind.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that it does make sense and that the UCC will be meeting Wednesday with the college meetings the first week in October. The UCC would be happy to provide any assistance in this.

Chair Wurtz noted that she's not sure if there is a need for any type of official motion for the co-authoring of a letter.

Senator Funderburk added that once the minutes of this meeting are published to the faculty then this whole discussion is out there and that should take care of it. His sense is that we go ahead with the process as normal with the understanding that this is out there on the horizon. Some departments may sense that they're going to be effected while others may sense that they're not going to be effected.

Associate Provost Kopper also noted that the UCC, on Wednesday, will be setting dates for the college meetings. When those are published that will indicate that we are moving forward.

Senator Heistad stated that the UCC also holds quite a few informational meetings with the colleges. That's where people hear the message that if you're going to add you've got to drop, they hear that message over and over again.

Chair Wurtz noted that we do need to be careful that the rhetoric of "if you're going to add you need to drop" will tend to get people where you didn't want them to go. This program assessment is not about money. We want to be careful that we don't attach that rhetoric and turn the program assessment into "it's all about cutting." While if you add "to also drop is a good idea," to tie the two together may undermine what's trying to be accomplished.

Interim Provost Lubker added that not adding more than you drop has been around for a long time. Why he instituted it as Dean was in response to a passionate plea from former Provost Aaron Podolefsky that we do it.

Chair Wurtz asked if it was the understanding that the UCC would be very much aware of this as things move forward with the upcoming program review at the front of people's awareness?

Associate Provost Kopper noted that the UCC will be meeting Wednesday and setting up dates and times for the college informational meetings. When they look at the proposals and as they come forward, adding and dropping courses is part of it but it's also about continuous improvement in faculty reviewing their curriculum. That has been the intent of the UCC, which won't see those for another year.

Chair Wurtz continued, as they have their first meetings with colleges and departments, will that mechanism be sufficient to monitor awareness and keep it in the forefront?

Associate Provost Kopper responded that after Wednesday's meeting there will be all kinds of information out to the campus and they should be aware that they are moving forward in the curriculum cycle. The general message is to review your curriculum for continuous improvement along with the "nuts and bolts" of the process.

Chair Wurtz asked if we can add to that typical message for faculty to keep in mind that our programs may be changing.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that it is her guess that should already be in people's awareness, from the message that Interim Provost Lubker recently sent to faculty.

Chair Wurtz concluded that the Senate does not have to do anything.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas noted that her college complies with the idea of having alternates identified as stated in the By-laws. As a friendly gesture, would it be possible for those alternates to be included on some kind of listing so Faculty Senate Secretary Dena Snowden can have nametags made for them and that they can be acknowledged as alternates.

Faculty Senate Secretary Dena Snowden noted that she does make nametags for alternates as soon as she's made aware. She does not include them on the mailing list because she assumes that senators will get the necessary information to the alternates.

Chair Wurtz added that as alternates are faculty members they will get all the information the regular faculty members receive. She also reminded senators to inform Dena as to who their alternate is.

Senator Funderburk stated that it strikes him as odd that the senators choose their alternates; it should be a college decision as it is a college representative.

Chair Wurtz remarked that it has been tradition for senators to seek out a colleague who will agree to act as an alternate if they can't make a meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Neuhaus to adjourn; second by Senator O'Kane.
Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary