

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
10/09/14 (3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.)
Mtg. #1797

SUMMARY MINUTES

1. Courtesy Announcements

Provost **Wohlpert** reported that Co-Chairs are established and committee members are needed for a three-year commitment on the Higher Learning Commission Committee. Consider a self-nomination, or direct nominations of other individuals to Kristin **Moser**.

Faculty Chair **Kidd** spoke about promotion, revenue, writing, and scholarship--four areas of the survey he sent to faculty. Survey results indicated (1) Promotion: UNI needs to publicize more the successes of students, faculty, and alumni. While student success is often recognized, alumni success and faculty scholarship could be better recognized. **Kidd** suggests a centralization of faculty successes that could be shared with legislators, and work with the Foundation who track alumni. (2) Revenue: **Kidd** believes external revenue sources are needed as State appropriations account for only half of University costs. He suggests targeted recruitment of out-of-state students, especially where open spaces exist. He suggests more collaboration with the Foundation to obtain academic funding for faculty and students, as the Foundation does for athletics. Further, extending and establishing intentional, durable partnerships with industry helps both students and faculty. (3) Writing: Students coming from Community Colleges or Community College partnerships with high schools have credit in writing but not necessarily writing ability. He suggests UNI have a writing entrance exam, seeing it as a service for students and faculty. (4) Scholarship: **Kidd** suggests improving faculty scholarship in three ways: a full review of summer work policy, that the RSP Office hire a person with grantsmanship experience, and that faculty be allowed to have concurrent grants and Summer Fellowships. (See Transcript pages 7-13)

As part of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, Vice-Chair **Petersen** encourages faculty to complete the survey and provide feedback on the survey recently sent to faculty.

Chair **Walter** commented on insurance, with Dr. Colin **Weeks** also weighing in. (See Transcript pages 16-20) He also requested feedback about Graduate College representation on the Faculty Senate.

2. **Summary Minutes/Full Transcript** Sept. 25, 2017 (**Gould/Skaar**) Passed. One abstention.

3. **Docketed from the Calendar**

1350 2018-2019 Curriculum Proposals for the College of Business Administration. (**Hakes/ Fenech**) All aye. <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/2018-2019-curriculum-proposals-college-business>

1351 Academic Forgiveness Policy Proposal. (**McCandless/Strauss**) All aye. <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/academic-forgiveness-policy-proposal>

1352 Preparing for HLC: General Education Review and Revision at UNI. (To be docketed at next meeting) <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/preparing-hlc-general-education-review-and-revision-uni>

4. **No New Business**

5. **Consideration of Docketed Items**

1346/1234 Re-Consideration, following corrections, Emeritus Requests for Mike Klassen-Marketing <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-requests-mike-klassen-marketing-cynthia-goatley>

**** (O’Kane/Mattingly) Passed.**

1347/1235 Reconsideration of University Writing Committee Proposal <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/reconsideration-university-writing-committee-proposal>

**** Recommended to be sent to the General Education Committee. (See Transcript pages 22-44.)**

1348/1236 Strategic Plan Metrics

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/strategic-plan-metrics>

**** Additional faculty input will be sought through a public forum in November.**
(See Transcript pages 44-55.)

1349/1237 Draft policy for Posthumous degree and in memoriam certificates.

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/draft-policy-posthumous-degree-and-memoriam-certificates>

**** (Fenech/Strauss) Motion to be moved to the next or future Senate meeting, depending on availability of personnel.**

6. Adjournment (Campbell/Hakes)

Next Meeting:

Monday, October 23, 2017

Scholar Space, (301) Rod Library

Full Transcript follows of 58 pages including 0 Addendum

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**
October 9, 2017
Scholar Space (301) Rod Library
Mtg. #1797

PRESENT: Senators Ann **Bradfield**, John **Burnight**, Russ **Campbell**, Seong-in **Choi**, Lou **Fenech**, Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Senators David **Hakes**, Tom **Hesse**, James **Mattingly**, Amanda **McCandless**, Steve **O’Kane**, Vice-Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Jeremy **Schraffenberger**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gloria **Stafford**, Chair Michael **Walter**. Also Associate Provost John **Vallentine**, Provost Jim **Wohlpert**, Interim Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**, Faculty Chair Tim **Kidd** and Tristan **Bernhard**, NISG representative Tristan **Bernhard**.

Not Present: Senator Bill **Koch** and Leigh **Zeitz**; President Mark **Nook**.

Guests: David M. Grant, Becky Hawbaker, Jerilyn Marshal, Joyce Morrow, Colin Weeks.

CALL TO ORDER AND CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Walter: Let’s get started. It’s 3:30. Let me draw attention first, above all to Russ Campbell’s tie which has La Nina, La Pinta, and the Santa Maria. That is a nice tie.

Campbell: It looks like there’s too much structure in these ships, and two of them had no structures at all on the deck. And one just had a room for Columbus on deck.

Walter: And they haven’t been eaten by ship worms yet, either. Let me call for Press Identification. Do we have any members of the Fourth Estate here? Not

today. I'll have our guests introduce themselves in a little bit. I would call on President **Nook** to present comments, except he's not here and probably will not be here?

Wohlpert: He's at the Educator Preparation meeting. He will be here maybe after he gets done.

Walter: Next in the batting order it's going to be Provost **Wohlpert** with some comments.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST JIM WOHLPART

Wohlpert: When I came two years ago one of the first things that Russ **Campbell** let me know when I met him—the very first thing he let me know, was that Wright Hall would have its 100th anniversary in 2017. And he reminded me about that every single time that I met him. [Laughter] Russ (**Campbell**) helped us pull together a really phenomenal celebration for Wright Hall this past Saturday. The room was packed. I don't know how many people in the room. It was packed, maybe 100 people in the room? It was really well organized. There were great comments; a lot of emeritus faculty, students from the past, community members. Really well done.

Campbell: I would just like to mention that when I mentioned it, I said it would be nice to have some new furniture to celebrate...

Wohlpart: Which we bought this summer.

Campbell: I was told that some of it was used furniture from Schindler—from the old Schindler before the renovation, but it was in much better condition than we had at Wright Hall, and I appreciate it. The faculty appreciate it. The students appreciate it.

Wohlpart: Yes, see with the Provost, you have to clarify: Do you want new ‘new’ furniture or new ‘used.’ [Laughter] It was new for the building.

Campbell: I want anything that’s better than what we had.

Walter: Everyone appreciates a good Norman Miller. Nice chair.

Wohlpart: Thank you for your efforts. It was very well done.

Campbell: Thank you for the furniture.

Walter: I think we we’re kind of expecting you to comment on the Faculty Evaluation and the HLC Subcommittee.

Wohlpart: The Faculty Evaluation Committee is meeting and has sent out a survey which I thought was very well done, to begin to gather feedback. I really appreciate that initial effort to go out to the community. We will see lots more of that. The Higher Learning Commission Committee, the co-chairs have been

established and that email went out. I would strongly encourage you all to think about joining one of the subcommittees, expressing an interest. It is a three-year process. It's not going to be anything that we have to rush with, so there will be plenty of time to learn; to dig deep—think thoughtfully about the criteria for HLC. And you can send your nominations for other individuals to Kristin **Moser**.

Walter: Thank you. Faculty Chair **Kidd**, I think you have some comments on the Handbook if nothing else.

Kidd: Handbook?

Walter: Did I get that wrong?

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR TIM KIDD:

Kidd: Yeah. We just went to that tiny, tiny little meeting. That committee hasn't met. Friday, right? So after that, then we can comment on that. Couple comments on that survey I sent out just to gather information. So the two things that came up are the two things that probably always come up, which is that UNI doesn't seem to be expressing--singing its own praises I guess, to the world as well as it should be. And of course revenue, which makes sense because of course the State doesn't seem to be increasing our budget anytime soon—or not, not cutting our budget. On the one hand, the story—I don't know exactly how this can be improved but one thing which I hope to talk more with Jim (**Wohlpart**) and Mark (**Nook**) is centralizing our information. I think right now we do a pretty good job actually of promoting some current students. I know I've had a few research

students hit the front page of UNI. I've seen a lot of that. I think it's great. I think that's really important for when people look at the school. I've seen less about faculty and less about alumni. I think that—and this is coming from talking to some recruiters--faculty/recruiters who I met a couple of weekends ago, that two stories which are not getting out as much are: What do the faculty do? Say in terms of scholarship and outreach. And also, what have our alumni done? I think on a department by department basis, some departments do a good job and some departments don't, and it's a matter of time and commitment to this kind of effort. Keeping track of our alumni is not easy. So I'm hoping that with the alumni, we might be able to partner more with the Foundation, because they do a good job of keeping track of alumni. And as far as faculty, maybe some kind of centralized location, because when legislators ask questions, it's good for people who talk with legislators, to have that information handy.

With regards to revenue, I know that recruitment of out-of-state students has increased, and I think this is an important avenue personally. Mainly because of just how little the State appropriation covers the cost for our students. I guess it's covers half, with in-state tuition expected to make up the remainder. Now one aspect of revenue that isn't always discussed in recruitment is the fact that there are open spaces in some areas and not in others. And so it might be interesting to actually target recruitment, not just as a carte blanche, "Let's get more students," but also "Where do they fit within our current resources?" Or do we need to expand our number of faculty in certain areas to accommodate more students? That actually makes sense fiscally. And then of course besides the Foundation, maybe helping the Foundation look at more of the academic side. I think Athletics and the Foundation are working amazingly well together. Their budget's

increased dramatically in the past ten years, and it's not from the General Education Fund, it's from their pursuit of alumni and donors. And, I wonder if that might be extended to the academic side. A lot of schools have Endowed Chairs and things like this. I don't know that UNI has all that many. I'm not sure, to be honest. The other aspect of course is external funding. I'll get to that more in a second. External funds do a lot, not just to provide money for faculty to do research in the summer, but also to provide money for students—to give students opportunities. I've had a lot of students work for me, and the reason I've had that opportunity is I can pay them so they don't have to work three jobs. They can work two jobs. Yeah. They need the money. They need to work in the summer and some need to work during the school year. This is important. I would say that probably on salary—I wouldn't say we're half and half faculty and students, but as far as time goes, oh my God, yes. I'd say three quarters of the paid time goes to students. I just happen to make more per hour than the students do. I pay them as much as Kwik Star at least, so that's not too bad. Another thing is partnerships with industry. I think there are some sporadic and really powerful partnerships in industry. For example, in my department, we had a partnership with John Deere for a while about getting interns, and we've also had I think student groups have had partnerships with industry for funding different projects. We even have some faculty who are paid with industry money. I think in Chemistry Jeff Elbert works at least in part in the summer. So a lot of this is sporadic. It's not as intentional as could be, and it would be nice if this again were centralized so that we could work from some kind of common position. For example, we might find that 'Hey, John Deere wants this.' Well there's three more people that might work in this area. The other thing that came up was writing. That was a topic that came up. Are we

hearing from the writing committee today? Yes, so I can wait on that. One aspect that's always concerned me, at least in the past few years as I've had more freshmen—I'm teaching a freshman class, is that a lot of students seem to come in with credit for the writing course—the first class in writing, and it's not from AP classes. This is writing credit from Community Colleges or, Community College partnerships with high schools, and what I found is the level of writing ability for these students is very... uneven. (I need politically correct words sometimes.) These students have credit in writing, but they don't necessarily have writing ability. That's not good. For my classes—where I'm trying to teach abstract writing and technical writing, not as a professional writing instructor, but as part of the laboratories. And I've heard other people talk about this as well. So, I don't know if this is possible. It seems like it should be given advances in software, why don't we have a writing entrance exam or something like that? An entrance exam. And of course people laugh because it was probably done 20 years ago. When I went to school, I had a writing exam. I had AP credit in an English course so I had credit in the class, but if I did not pass that writing exam, I would have been put into the entry-level course. It didn't matter whether I had AP credit or not, and I was very surprised when I first came here that there was no math entrance exam or writing exam. I think at the moment Calculus I is doing much better with a math entrance exam. I think the—maybe correct me if I'm wrong, but the 'D' and 'F' rate has dropped dramatically. I think this is a service for students as well as faculty because then we can have students who will actually take a remedial class if they need it. They get the skills and then they can succeed in the rest of their coursework. At least now with smart phones, I don't have to deal with text-speak in my classes. But at one time I even had a lot of 'R U there?' with R U as part of

the paragraph, which I thought was sad. We'll hear more from the Writing Committee, I'm sure.

The last area was in scholarship. And this is an area I complain about a lot because that's my job—is to complain. Here, there's three areas, and I'd like to--- again I'll present these. One is there is a policy on summer work from the RSP Office, and I think that policy needs to go through the full policy review process. It affects faculty a lot, and I think it dis-incentivizes a lot of research. The other area is I think it would be good to have someone with academic—as in grantsmanship experience in the RSP Office, because that's what most RSP offices have. Most RSP offices are run by people who have grants, are on grants, are still getting grants, and I don't think we have that experience in our office. I think that hurts, because I think the people in there are probably good, and the ones I know are definitely good, but that's not their forte. They don't work in obtaining grants. They don't work in administering them the way we do, and so I think if people had some experience in that area, it would really help out. And a third area is one of my own pet peeves: It's Summer Fellowships. These are wonderful, wonderful opportunities for faculty to do summer research. In fact, it's not a common thing. This is not given everywhere by any means. However, there's one aspect of it which I think could be improved with a slight change, and I'm sure there are negative consequences, but that is that right now if you have a second grant, you cannot use a Summer Fellowship in conjunction with that grant. And the reason this hurts is because Summer Fellowships could be used for cost-matching for many grants. Many grants require cost-matching. Not NSF, but many grants do. So, we can't do that if you want to achieve 100% salary. I think it's just kind of silly. The original intent, from speaking with people over the years, was that you

didn't want to have people who were teaching a class also do Summer Fellowships at the same time. This makes sense to me. But, I don't understand why if someone has a related grant and a Summer Fellowship, they couldn't combine those in order to achieve full salary. I don't understand the full rationale for that, and no one's explained it to me. That's all, and I promise I won't have this many comments ever again. [Laughter] Thank you.

Bernhard: I wanted to speak from my experience, which is a little closer to high school than you guys. [Laughter] And that is that at my high school, it was definitely seen—kind of touching on the writing theme here—it was definitely seen that if you wanted to get writing out of the way, if that was something you weren't very strong at, that you would do the Community College partnership because there were ways to get that credit regardless of skill level. It's a disservice to students, and something I was passionate about. But it's a disservice to students because those students don't develop any writing skills through a lot of those courses. I'm sure not all Community College courses are equivalent, but at least where I came from, that was the case, and it was very different than AP, despite those two being kind of counted on the same level. The other thing that's really nice about AP is that they already have to take the test essentially, a test that I imagine would be pretty similar to what UNI would administer if they did a writing test, and that it's expenseless for the University. That's really nice because the students pay for that. But also, the test they give for that is writing on the fly. There's no way to really cheat out of that score, and it's pretty difficult to get a 4 or 5 in a writing exam for AP. I think those two things are seen as the exact same

level at the University, but to Tim's (**Kidd**) point—they're not the same in terms of ability in my opinion.

Kidd: Thank you.

Walter: Other comments on that? Those are great comments. I've often thought that our articulation agreements and various transfer agreements could use a little bit more scrutiny.

Kidd: I can comment on one thing that Iowa State does: I'm not sure if it's for writing to be honest, but for example for calculus—because I'm Physics so I know about calculus. So, if you have credit in Calculus I, at a school other than Iowa State, in order to take Calculus II, you must pass an exam. So while they do have articulation agreements, and you get credit for Calculus I, you cannot progress until you pass the exam to enter Calculus II. It doesn't matter if you come from a Community College, UNI, or Harvard. You must pass their test. I think this is not a terrible idea. From being at a Board of Regents meeting, I don't think the Community Colleges like it. But in my opinion, if you teach your students appropriately, and give them an appropriate grade, they should have no problem passing such an exam, and so it shouldn't be a worry. There's my high horse. I'll get off.

Walter: No. Very worthwhile comments. Anyone else care to comment on that before we move on?

Campbell: You just remarked that Fred **Abraham** had problems with the mini-mesters and he figured out how to implement a test for giving credit in the Macro or Micro courses for people who took them on the mini-mesters. I don't remember exactly how he did it, but that was it had to be consistent somehow or other so it wasn't violating articulation agreements. But he managed to do it.

Walter: Okay, so Chair **Kidd**'s comments and now my comments. I want to ask our guests to introduce themselves.

Weeks: I'm Colin **Weeks** from Chemistry.

Marshal: I'm Jerilyn **Marshal**. I'm from the Library

Grant: And I'm David **Grant** from Languages and Literatures.

Walter: Welcome all of you. I think I may ask Colin (**Weeks**) to say something in just a moment.

Morrow: I'm Joyce **Morrow**, the University Registrar.

Walter: Sorry, I missed you over there. Becky's (**Hawbaker**) is also a guest. I'm so used to sitting next to you at meetings.

Hawbaker: I'm in United Faculty and what are we called again? SPAC. SPAC is the Strategic Plan Action Committee.

Walter: I think in terms of comments, this kind of falls under comments from me. I've got a couple of different categories here I to ask Amy **Petersen** to speak first. This is basically about Faculty Evaluation.

Petersen: Sure, just as Provost **Wohlpert** noted, our Faculty Evaluation Committee is meeting on Monday mornings and we are off and running. You all should have received a survey in your in-box today and I encourage you to complete that survey to pass it along, and to encourage others to complete that survey. We are very interested in all of the feedback that we can gather from all of you about your experiences, your impressions about faculty evaluation.

Vallentine: It's going very, very well. Three excellent faculty and three administrators.

Wohlpert: Three excellent administrators, yes? [Laughter]

Vallentine: Well, I'll let them decide that. [Laughter]

Petersen: There's more information about the process on our activities posted on the Provost website as well.

Vallentine: It's under a heading called 'Faculty Initiatives.'

Wohlpert: Was the page live yet? Because last time I checked today it wasn't.

Vallentine: The email was sent.

Walter: I have some comments on the current health care insurance cost determination process, which is not really a Faculty Senate matter, except that it involves all faculty, and except for the fact that what I've observed so far, several people have come to me with the impression that somehow the Faculty Senate is going to be the only voice of the faculty—with the Union in its current condition, which is good and strong as far as I'm concerned—so I don't want anybody to get that impression. But, I did ask people for a quick outline of their main concerns. Dr. **Weeks**, do you think you'd be able to give us just an abstract of what you wrote, instead of reading the whole thing?

Weeks: If you'd like me to do that, I can.

Walter: Very quickly?

Weeks: Okay. The concern I have is the data presented from the HR handout on why they are proposing changes to the health care insurance costs. Of the four factors that I mentioned, only one is significantly changing from this year to next year.

Walter: Would you mind moving up to...next to Dr. Lou (**Fenech**) here so you can get on the mike [microphone]?

Weeks: Only one of the factors listed is really changed from this year to the next, and that is the projected increase in adult care expenses for next year's

population nationwide—6.5%. The other factors listed—there's no evidence given that they've changed substantially from this year to the next. There's a comparison on areas where we have high health care costs that average what other health care costs are, compared to other universities. Okay, they're higher, but there's no way to indicate why these are changing. Probably the main reason we're higher is we've got an older demographic. The areas where we have higher expenses are conditions that older people are more prone to.

Walter: And that hasn't changed?

Weeks: That hasn't changed. So it's not most of **what I've presented**--it doesn't explain why it needs to change this year to next year. Yes, health care costs are going up, but the **big change** doesn't explain the detail of why. The things the compared to other universities as in other universities isn't changing a lot from year to year. That doesn't explain some of the big changes that are proposed.

Walter: A parameter that doesn't change, doesn't really give you cause to blame that for a change.

Weeks: And the other concern is there's another factor that's not mentioned at all on the handout on the HR website, which is Merit staff is proposed to be put on the same plan as faculty and P&S. Now, to be very clear, I think Merit employees should have good health care, and if that's going to affect our costs, okay. That's something we need to talk about. But by completely leaving out a major factor that could be very important, you're not going to get meaningful

feedback. HR asked for feedback in the email they sent out. How can we give useful feedback if information is being withheld?

Walter: Thank you. I agree with your points, in particular the one of the parameter where there's no change and that they were blaming that for change. That just made no sense. But I think in the spirit of clarity and transparency and openness, this was not handled this terribly well. A lot of people are frustrated about it. But again, I want to emphasize that the Faculty Senate isn't really the voice for that. That's more of a Union matter, but still there's no reason why we can't discuss this at further length if we need to. We had a conversation last week which didn't quite get in it time to get this on the docket and honestly, I'm not really sure if it's appropriate for this body anyway. But thank you for showing up today. This is probably better than me reading your entire statement, which is really well written.

Strauss: I'm not sure I agree with your position. As I understand it, United Faculty and their sole province now is the 1% raise that we're considering from year to year. They do not have an official privilege to speak about health insurance. They can make noise about it if they wish. And faculty do get an official voice on issues like this, and it may be up to the Senate to start stepping in and making commentary on these types of things.

Walter: Somehow, I expected somebody to say that. I didn't know it was going to be you, Senator **Strauss**, but it's one of these inevitable things. No one else is going to address this, and then where are we?

Hawbaker: May I address that? I think we try to ‘stick to our knitting,’ as Joe (Gorton) would say if he was here. United Faculty doesn’t step into curriculum matters—that is the primary responsibility of the Senate. But, we spend a lot of time talking about this in our new Faculty Handbook to try to delineate the specific areas of responsibility. Certainly we’re not the sole arbiter or whatever, but United Faculty is primarily responsible for not only salaries, but also our working conditions and other labor-related matters. I encourage all of you to attend our emergency meeting on Wednesday about these changes in health care, and I intend to on our Faculty Handbook Committee, to write stronger language into the kind of consultation that should take place when changes of this magnitude are undertaken. We learned of these changes less than a week ago—or about a week ago. There’s a lot of minutiae; a lot of details to dig into, and we were presented with two options with not enough data to understand where those options are coming from. Got later data, but still—there’s not enough there. There are other solutions that appear not to have been pursued that we believe should. So, after lots of joint work on our labor-management commission, or committee on the insurance, this was predictable. This was a direct outcome that should have been known whenever the decision was made to absorb AFSME, and yet there was never any shared governance or consultation. And I think that’s the issue that is overlap here for Faculty Senate—is shared governance, as an area that we all have a shared interest in, and ‘skin in the game.’

Walter: So hopefully, I didn’t commit an impeachable offense by bringing this up. But I think this conversation is useful. The meeting is in Maucker Union Ballroom on the 11th at 4 p.m. Other comments very quickly? None. Okay. Calendar Item

1352, preparing for General Ed I just mentioned to Provost **Wohlpart** that that came in a little too late to be posted in the official agenda, but we'll move that on to a docketable item next meeting in all likelihood, because you haven't had enough time to look at the text involved with that, so it's not really allowable for this meeting, so we'll catch it as soon as we can. The other conversation that's been bumping around a little bit which doesn't even have an item, but I thought I'd just bring it up because I can predict that it will be brought into Faculty Senate, is Graduate College Representation on Faculty Senate. A lot of us have appointments in the Graduate College. You could argue that there is Graduate College representation here. I've spoken with Scott **Peters** about this a little bit. He's been thinking about it. He and I chatted very briefly about it, and it's probably going to come up as an item. So if you have opinions on that, send them to me and we'll petition this for discussion. Does that sound okay? Okay good. Alright. So what we need now. I don't have the minutes posted, but they've been posted for several days. Would you be willing to vote on that without me having to post the whole darn thing on the screen? So, what I need now is a motion to approve the Minutes for September 25th. Moved by Senator **Gould**, seconded by Senator **Skaar**. Any discussion? Okay. Calling for a vote, all of those in favor of approving the minutes from September 25th, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain, 'abstain.'

O'Kane: Abstain.

Walter: Senator **O'Kane** abstains. The motion passes. We have a couple of items to consider for docketing. We have a couple of items up here—calendar items to

consider for docketing. 2018-2019 Curriculum Proposals for the College of Business Administration. The text has been up there for the required amount of time. That is Calendar Item 1350. I guess I should have written in which docket item that would be, but I can correct that later. I'm going to guess that it will be Docket Item 1238. I think. I have had to correct this a couple of times, so stay tuned. May I call for a motion to move Calendar Item 1350 as 1238 Curriculum Proposals for the College of Business Administration? So moved by Senator **Hakes** and seconded by Senator **Fenech**. All in favor, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain, 'abstain.' The motion passes. Next, the Academic Forgiveness Policy Proposal, Calendar Item 1351 which would go in as 1239. Academic Forgiveness Policy has been posted for the required amount of time. May I hear a motion to move Calendar Item 1351 in as Docket Item 1239? We have a tie. Senator **McCandless** moves. Senator **Strauss** seconds. We will vote for this. All of those in favor of moving Calendar Item 1351 in as Docket Item 1239 please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain, 'abstain.' The motion passes. Okay, so let's see. A little further embarrassment for me. You're probably getting used to this by now. I have the Reconsideration of the Emeritus Request for Mike **Klassen** from Marketing. We bundled that last time and passed everyone. Then it was pointed out that Mike **Klassen** had not completed correctly his application for emeritus in that the top several items in his history, UNI were not included. That has been corrected. Now I will go ahead and ask you to approve this. I just didn't scan it and put it up there. So if you'd rather wait on this, we could do that.

Campbell: Did it show 20 years of service in Higher Education?

Walter: Yes, it did. Basically I'm sorry I should have put this up here, but it slipped my mind. He has corrected it. I got the paper back, so I would call for a motion to approve Docketed Item 1346, a redo of the emeritus request for Mike **Klassen** in Marketing. Moved by Senator **O'Kane**, seconded by Senator **Mattingly**. All those in favor of approving Docket Item 1346, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain, 'abstain.' The motion passes. Now we have Docket Item 1347, Reconsideration of University Writing Committee Proposal.

Skaar: We did not talk about 1352 which is on the agenda to put into the docket. Were we skipping that for a reason? Consideration for Calendar Items 1352?

Campbell: That's what you said came on the docket [agenda] too late to be docketed.

Skaar: Okay, sorry. Got it. I was confused.

Walter: Yeah. I got that from the Provost but I couldn't in good conscience because we have to have three working days for that hypertext to show up and be visible to everybody.

Skaar: Yes. Got it.

Walter: So, we'll catch that next time. Will you state your name again please?

Grant: David **Grant**, Languages and Literature.

Walter: And you are going to give us a lead off for discussions of the Writing Committee? There are some handouts going around.

Grant: There's a handout that I'll reference in a little bit. I appreciate your time and attention again, especially since we were just here last spring. I've read some of the discussions that have occurred during our docketing request, so I know that there was some confusion as to what we're doing. And I understand the situation isn't clear to everyone. However, as I read those over, in some measure, I think Faculty Chair **Kidd** said it right: There's a matter of specifics for curricular action here that we're wondering about. We have a holistic endeavor as Chair **Kidd** said, and we're trying to figure all these pieces together. I think our specifics are quite clear and have been affirmed by this very body generally in 2014 and more specifically last spring. We understood that we needed to go before each College Senate and departments as part of the usual curriculum consultation process. So to that end, we met with then Associate Provost **Dhanwada** about the curricular process, about LEAPfrog, and the sundry details of getting our ducks in a row.

As part of the discussion, we identified departmental consultations from every academic department as a major barrier on two grounds: (A) Committee members are already aware of some departments that will reject this proposal on resource grounds and (B) The pending implementation of a new University Learning Goal or LAC in Communication is potentially at odds with an increase in writing requirements for both accreditation and assessment purposes and coordination is needed. So in short, while Faculty Senate affirmed one thing, the

Provost's Office appeared to counsel something quite different, and we are in the crosswinds. Meanwhile, our students experience writing far less diverse ways than our peers at similar institutions, as our 2014 report specified, and as it specified the modest resource needs and challenges before us: incentivization, development, and assessment of progress and the like.

In addition to this specific luffing of our sails, we also see very stormy portents some of which Senator **Kidd** pointed out. Since 2014, resources for qualified writing oversight have all but disappeared. And I want to stress "qualified" since such qualifications exist as separate and often independent contractual job specifications where a qualified candidate must have a doctoral degree in written composition, not literature or linguistics. The coursework and training for these persons is vastly different from their literature, creative writing, and linguistic counterparts, often entailing cross-disciplinary offerings in other areas like education or psychology.

So, we have a large first-year communication and writing program that has no input at all by anyone with a doctoral degree in composition or communication for that matter. Oral communication for that matter, or communication on its side fares slightly better on campus since it has a dedicated tenure-track faculty member who has course reassignment to help shape curriculum and assist in pedagogical training. English has no such contractual obligations, and, indeed, since 2015 the course reassignment for the writing coordinator has disappeared. The point here is not that we're only out of line curricularly, as our reports have shown, but we are also out of line administratively. According to the National Census of Writing, which is part of the handout I handed out there, 86% of 4-year

institutions had an official writing program, and when that is filtered to Master's-level institutions like UNI, it becomes 93%.

These programs are served and achieve excellence because qualified tenure track people are given resources to insure their process. The work is hard, bureaucratic, and often invisible, yet it is a central feature at most colleges and universities.

Again, the national Census on Writing found that 51% of institutions had a First Year Writing Director as the primary person responsible for administering writing requirements. When filtered again for Master's-level institutions, it jumps to 62%.

Understanding writing may not always be difficult, but understanding learning to write is. Understanding how teens and adults learn more about producing written text is sort of like quantum physics in that it uses the very medium it studies in order to understand other phenomena. Rather than using electromagnetic forces to study other electromagnetic phenomena, we instead use language to study and assess other language practice. Like quanta, these are rarely direct apperceptions. It is not simply a matter of right or wrong formal features, but about a social inheritance, one's linguistic and written practices bequeathed by history and society. Such an inheritance is always flawed, leaving out as much as it contains; it is never impartial. And how one inquires about that complicates that partiality.

We live in a world where accounting for our own partiality is requisite. I want my students to do more than reproduce formal features according to some rubric. I want them to write consequentially, be that for themselves, their family, their faith, the civic duties, or whatever their purposes may be. I know my adjunct

colleagues who teach our freshman writing courses alongside me feel the same. But we cannot accomplish our goals if we reduce writing to skills on a rubric. We must recognize that the rubric and what we desire are not always exclusive of each other.

I have asked for over two years now that the LAC website list the full outcomes of LAC 1A, the writing requirement as approved by the Department of English before my arrival. It currently leaves off outcome 2.b., “the ability to recognize in one’s own writing possibilities for improvement.” I feel of all the outcomes, this is the most important, which is why this outcome was assessed in 2013. It is the heart of process, which is the heart of learning writing, and of learning to write. Yet, the absence of this outcome sends a chill up my spine as it forces us more and more to consider only the formal features of writing and not the processes students use. It treats writing as a noun and not a verb. Composition studies has over 60 years of replicated empirical research pointing to this trend as a very bad idea. Yet this is where we are headed as the Writing Committee remains stalled in the cross wind.

I hope these remarks suggest several avenues that are possible at this time. One possibility I hope does not gain favor is to do nothing. At the very least, I think we want some positive news for the HLC on how we learned from our last accreditation and are taking concrete steps to enact what we learned, or in assessment parlance, we closed the loop. As the chair of a body whose job it is to facilitate and coordinate, I need to listen more intently on which way we might point our bow and fill our sails. Less metaphorically, I want to hear more clearly about our direction and how to gain our required resources. Writing is a

University-level priority and so it requires University-level resources and shared governance among us all. I look forward to hearing how we are to manage this and have this discussion so we can actually get something accomplished in the years ahead. Thank you.

Walter: Thank you, very much. Comments?

Kidd: So who directs the First-year Writing experience at the moment?

Grant: It depends on how you cut the mustard there. There are two adjunct term—contractual term people who have this as part of their service. From what I hear, there's not a lot of shaking going on there. It worries me that because they are term, they do not have tenure-track protection, they are at the whims of administration and what the administration wants in terms of shaping and delivering the curriculum.

Campbell: How many faculty teach that I-A, and how many of them are tenure track?

Grant: We have I believe ten—around ten sections, and Cornerstone has 18. Something like that. I would say, I don't know the current Cornerstone makeup-- maybe one or two tenure-track faculty.

Campbell: So, most of the faculty are adjuncts?

Grant: That is correct.

O’Kane: I believe in the materials that you have up here that I read this morning that you’re proposing there be two additional classes that—I forgot the terminology—‘writing intensive,’ or something like that.

Grant: Writing enhanced.

O’Kane: I just wonder whether the departments have the resources to implement that?

Grant: That’s why my statements are focused on resources. We can sit and say that we want lots of things, but we need something to back it up. We need to incentivize.

Walter: So how would Faculty Senate move this forward so that we can do something constructive? Are we looking to approve these proposals? I just clicked on this bottom one here. I assume that’s the one that Senator **O’Kane** was talking about: Writing Committee Final Recommendation.

Kidd: I was going to say, could you present specific proposals from your document? Instead of just saying, ‘Hey, what shall we do?’ A body like the Senate answers yes or no questions. This is what we do. I guess not ‘we’ anymore. I’m not in the Senate. But this is how a Senate body works. Third options are actually not really great for answering. So, could you present a specific question for the Senate to consider? Such as, would the Senate recommend that there be a First

Year Writing Director, and that person receive a course release if there are course releases available. These are the kinds of questions we can answer.

Grant: I think what our committee is really wondering here is like I said, the faculty body says one thing and Provost's Office says something different. So can you guys give us some sense on one direction instead of two?

Kidd: That's not a specific question.

Grant: But we have approval for doing for the Writing Committee Final Recommendation that you approved last spring.

Kidd: Sure. So then what resources do you need to accomplish this goal?

Grant: We need a budget.

Kidd: No, what do we need?

Grant: Given our meeting with Associate Provost **Dhanwada** last spring, committee members knew that there's some departments that wanted resource grants. So those departments are going to have to be promised some resources. They're going to have to have either some committees that go in and look at their curriculum and say, "Here, this is identified where we need to have some writing in, or to retool some of those courses." They need to figure out the number of instructors and what kinds of student body will populate those courses so that

they can handle whatever writing they need. They need to shift teaching loads around. Those kinds of things, right? We can gather a lot of that from department to department as we go along, but we were asked by Associate Provost last spring not to do that. To wait on the HLC reaccreditation process rather than double down ...everyone's going to get sick of writing. So don't do it.

Campbell: I think I mentioned this last time when we quickly ran through with that. I don't think anyone wants to deal with a curriculum matter right away. And a compromise would be, "Yes, ask for a Writing Director or tenure-track or Director definitely, but ask department to department within two years to identify which courses are writing-enhanced as they stand now, and what would be necessary to get more before we try to get a curriculum requirement of two upper level enhanced courses. That would be a reasonable phase-in with progress with a mandate to identify what you have, and identify what you would need to do if this were going to become part of the curriculum.

Grant: Your recommendation would be then that we ask for a Writing Director and then that person would be responsible for gathering or making the departments report to them those courses. Is that correct?

Campbell: It's hard for that person to be responsible. I think maybe the Provost would have to ask the departments to make sure they supply that information with a firm deadline of one or two years, which courses are writing-enhanced and what they...and work with them as to what they would need to do to get more writing-enhanced courses.

Walter: Comments from the Administration?

Wohlpart: Sure. Let me say first of all that coming out of the background of English I very strongly support the ideas that are in this. I just want to make sure that we're not doubling over our processes, and I don't know exactly what Kavita (**Dhanwada**) talked about. If we are going to launch a conversation about revising General Education, this conversation should fold into it, and one of the things I strongly encourage this part of that conversation is what oversight administrative coordinator resources would be needed for that. I would prefer for us to have a systematic, holistic, intentional conversation about General Education rather than taking it piecemeal. So, what I have suggested, in fact I think I said it here, is that this proposal should go to that Gen Ed Committee for very serious consideration and involvement in how we think about what we do in General Education. Now, that only answers the first half of the question. The other half of the question is 'What happens at the upper level in the programs?' and that's really a philosophical question for this institution to embrace and I think have a conversation about. Michael, (**Walter**) I'm not sure that—or Tim, (**Kidd**) I'm not sure that this is not the body to have that conversation. You all direct curriculum. And if you all say 'We embrace as the Faculty Senate, who oversees curriculum, the idea of the writing-enhanced courses at the upper level, we could then give a Writing Director—if that's what we decided to do, the authority to begin to ask those kinds of questions. I just want to be careful about not doing things piecemeal. I would like us to do things in systematic ways. We're going to launch this conversation about Gen Ed. You all have done a ton of work. This could be the

first report that goes to that Gen Ed Committee. You should be invited to come present. You should be involved as a committee that's done work to inform what they do. That would be my suggestion.

Walter: It's a good suggestion.

Skaar: If we're going to have that conversation, and I agree, given that over the past couple years we have tried to be the body where we have some of these deeper conversations, I think this is a good one to have. One of the things I think about at least that we're hearing over in the College of Education is an issue with class size—increasing class size. And if we're going to have this philosophical discussion about writing-enhanced courses, that's going to impact class size. Because if you're going to grade a lot of writing, you have to have a smaller class size. So I think it's correct that we need to have not piecemeal conversations, but holistic conversations, because we can't be talking about class size at one side and increasing class size in another side, saying, "Oh but we want writing-enhanced courses." We have to get our philosophies straight.

Kidd: From a curricular point of view, I don't know if all programs will be able to come up with two writing-enhanced classes. I'm not saying...I don't know if that would be possible. I'm not saying it's impossible, but I don't ever like the idea of imposing the will of the University to have a department figure out how to meet that goal. Does that make sense? I think it's good to have a goal, and I think it's good to allow departments to meet that goal. But, I don't think it's good to impose it on every department to meet this goal. In Physics we write labs, so I'm

pretty sure we could do it. But, I'm not sure if Industrial Technology could. I'm not trying to disparage Industrial Technology—I just don't know.

Grant: To be clear, in the discussion last spring we did say it didn't have to be in that department, just in the program somewhere.

Kidd: I apologize. I don't remember from last year. A University level course.

Stafford: One thing that gave me pause was that it needed to be an upper level course. I think that if it could be across all four years, it might make some programs much more able to achieve that.

Grant: Could you clarify the distinction between upper? Just simply because in English 3 or 400 hundred level, that's all sort of you take it as you get it. There's not a declared regimen that you do 3,000 level and then 4,000 level. I just want to hear more.

Stafford: Could it be a freshmen level course? Could it be a sophomore level course within your program?

Wohlpart: Since I have a great deal of experience with this, the problem is, you don't want to be teaching them how to write like freshmen when they're seniors. And when you think about writing, it should be scaffolded so that it grows and builds so that the skills are being built towards the other end. To go back to Tim's suggestion, I think that you need to have a philosophy or orientation, but then

allow programs to figure out how this makes sense. How does it make sense in Physics to be writing at the upper level? How do you build on what happened in Gen Ed? How do you do that in Sociology? How do you do that in English? How do you do that in Music? To ask every program to grapple with developing written communication skills at the upper level would be a phenomenal thing to do, but it needs to be open to the programs and it needs to grow out of the programs. First, we need to establish what that is that happens in Gen Ed very clearly and what level they're at.

Campbell: I'd like to say I misunderstood Senator **Stafford's** question. So I would like to pose it the way I understood it, which is, if you want two upper level courses, with 20% time devoted to writing, could she or we instead have four upper level courses with 10% time devoted to writing? That might be an alternative which is why I think before we write any curriculum, we should ask each department, "Can you meet this? What would you need to meet that?" and then one or two years we could form specific curriculum things making the intent clear.

Grant: That makes some sense. We've been charged by your vote last spring go ahead and to make a plan; to start making this reality. So I think Russ (**Campbell**) that your shifting it around to asking questions, which we interpreted was more data gathering, and I think maybe Kavita (**Dhanwada**) was thinking "Oh, gosh this is doubling efforts. Why not just let LAC process take care of that, and you guys take a step back," which was enormously frustrating for us, because we were told again, "Don't do anything." So I think that's helpful.

Wohlpart: I wouldn't ask you to step back, but I would say step forward and work side by side with the Gen Ed Committee and inform them.

Grant: We can certainly do that, so it's good to hear. Now I'm starting to see that there is a little bit more parallelism (to use a literary term) between some of the directions that we're going here. But I'm also open to listen to any other things.

Kidd: I'm sorry I'm talking so much today. I have a real problem if the writing curriculum is decided by term and temporary faculty. That to me is a serious mistake. Not because they're bad people who don't know what they're doing, but because they might not be here next semester. There's no guarantee. So who decided that that would be a good idea?

Schraffenberger: I think he's referring to the Cornerstone Program, and not any kind of all First Year writing.

Grant: That's still the dominant means of LAC instruction. We could go into something that Tim (**Kidd**) brought up, and there's 11 different ways to satisfy that. There's an awful lot of things that need to happen, part of which I think is some tenure protections for whoever is faculty oversight of that body.

Wohlpart: Let me just say that that's not the only place where we have term faculty or temporary faculty overseeing things that should not be overseen by term or temporary faculty. We have that across this institution. We need to have

a systematic conversation about what these things mean, and how we're going to address them. It would make things a whole lot more coherent.

Kidd: I think we can make a recommendation about writing maybe even today? I really don't think that's a good thing. Again, it's not because I don't think whoever's doing it is qualified or not. That's not the important thing. For example, I've heard some adjuncts have been here for like decades, which scares the hell out of me. Not that they're bad people, but at some universities they have like a five-year limit. If you're an adjunct for five years, you're hired. Three years—whatever it is. Your term. That's it. I'm surprised we don't have that here.

Wohlpart: We're going to talk about it. [Laughter]

Kidd: That's good.

Wohlpart: It's got to be part of a system.

Kidd: I'm not saying we would decide that here. That's crazy. But I do think that whoever—I don't even understand—Writing is a curricular matter. And so why is there's not someone from faculty directing this effort?

Wohlpart: Tim (**Kidd**) again, I'm sorry to say this. I can think of three or four off the top of my head—places where we have term or temporary faculty overseeing, coordinating courses, groups of courses, programs. It's how this University has evolved and how we have dealt with workload coordination and oversight. We need to have a systematic change for it. That's part of the reason it got written

into the Gen Ed revision, is management oversight coordination of the Gen Ed Program. Something comprehensive, so that we're doing the same thing across all of our courses. That's something that we've got to look at, and that's going to take resources.

Kidd: I understand—absolutely. This is an area where faculty seem to think there are resources and need to put resources.

Wohlpart: There will be.

Kidd: I just think that we could—as a body, the Senate does not of course demand resources. It does not tell Administration what to do. But the Senate can ask. The Senate would like to ask, should be have a conversation—a direct conversation, about having Faculty Writing Director, and be given the resource to have that happen? It sounds like it's what—a course release?

Wohlpart: So again I want to say, that's going to come to you. That's how the Gen Ed Committee charge is written: That's going to come to you. So I would encourage you all to do is to have oversight of this stuff and say, "No we need this. We need this," as that comes forward so it's done systematically. That will come to you.

Kidd: When?

Wohlpart: Well, as soon as we can get the Gen Ed Committee up and rolling and rocking.

Grant: Maybe if you can clarify those resources a little bit, so we know what's on the horizon? As I said, we're kind of adrift. I don't think doing nothing works for stalling stuff too much longer is really tenable. I'm getting tired. Since I don't have a course release anymore, I've really retooled my research agenda into something that looks more like traditional scholarship. And like most Writing Program administrators, Jim, (**Wohlpart**) I'm sure you know, there's a sense of relief at the end. "Thank God I don't have to that work on this anymore." Right? Others go on. They love it. That's part of your path, too. I love this stuff. I'm going on to be an administrator, right? That's great. We need people who can do that. But yeah, I've been doing it for ten years, alright? And to look at these things, and see things like these students that are coming in who are told, "Yeah, this is the easy way," or "Don't do the AP because it's too much." I think it's morally reprehensible that we don't do anything, and as much as I love the values of trying to go through and work with a committee all from the ground up, I still think we've got to do something, because I think it's a moral imperative that we have. I'm not the person to be any kind of Writing Program Director, but for example, can you clarify your resources, Jim (**Wohlpart**)? If we said, or if the English Department said, "Yes, we want to hire someone, and part of their contract would be a Writing Program Directorship," would you approve it?

Wohlpart: So David (**Grant**) we have a process here at UNI that I established when I came in. Departments put their resource requests together. They go through department heads, they are discussed very transparently, very collaboratively and inclusively. The Leadership Teams in the colleges—the deans

then bring them in and discuss them, and that's where the decisions are made. So if this is a priority, it needs to come up through the faculty; through the department, and needs to be discussed in the department head and at the dean's level. That's a very different process than has existed, and I understand your frustration and you want to get this done. The Gen Ed committee will add a great deal of weight to that.

Walter: So the Gen Ed committee is still taking on membership and participation? Or is it pretty much formed up already?

Wohlpart: No, we formed it. We have a draft that you all are going to bring here and hopefully approve that committee. But who they reach out to and talk to and work with is going to be up to them.

Walter: So, when it comes to that—a very specific proposal hopefully can come out of this in the short term, and land in this room and we can talk about what we like about it and what we don't like—but specifics. And once that at a curricular level is approved or not—or decided upon—then it becomes imperative that administration fill those needs.

Wohlpart: That Gen Ed—I asked for comprehensive review. I asked for administrative review. Is the LACC the correct oversight body? Is there a different body? I want the faculty to weigh in and think comprehensively about our General Education.

Grant: I haven't heard from them, so I don't know.

Kidd: Sure.

Walter: More comments, Tim (**Kidd**)?

Kidd: I'm good at this. If the Senate doesn't wish to speak, I'll speak on a personal level. I have no problem with that. I think it's important and again, this has really come in since I've been teaching more writing-related stuff, that the General Education Committee strongly consider having a tenure-track...tenured—put it that way—faculty in charge of writing curricula, at least the First Year level, and 'charge of' doesn't mean to tell what the classes need to do inside the class, but to tell what is a writing class? What is the format of it? What is acceptable? This is personal. If the Senate has no wish to make such a recommendation, that's fine. But I think it's important, and I believe that the Writing Director is probably not a position that anybody wants to have because it sounds like a heck of a lot of work.

Grant: Some people go to school for that. [Laughter]

Kidd: Right.

Wohlpart: Some people love it. Not David (**Grant**) and not me. [Laughter]

Kidd: So, I think a course release would be highly appropriate, considering what I've seen for course releases. This seems like an obvious need at the University, especially based on the student writing that I've seen. And I think other people feel the same way based on the response of the survey, that student writing is a strong issue.

Skaar: My comment is going to take us on a little bit of a tangent. Going back to something that Provost **Wohlpart** said, probably the first year he was here about—I'm an Education person—so about Teacher Ed and K-12 education is something that we do across campus here at UNI, and so I feel a little—being an education-person, and granted I'm biased, that this is a fire-putting out-kind of conversation. Whereas in addition to everything that we're talking about here at the University level in terms of helping students write, should we be also thinking systematically about how we teach our teachers to teach students to write? If a big portion of our undergraduate education is focused on preservice teachers, and that's across campus, and especially in Languages and Literatures and English Education, how are we doing that work and should that be part of this conversation as well? If we're really going to do this systemically, then we need to be talking about that education, so that our teachers go out and teach high school kids how to write, so that once they get to us, they're better writers, so that we're not still having this conversation ten years from now—again. But that we're doing a better job at teaching our teachers how to do this, so that we get better students in writing so that we don't have to have all these resources put towards this?

Walter: It seems that would make a great long-term metric for the success of...

Skaar: As we start having this conversation, we can't ignore that piece of it, we're going to be truly systematic in thinking about this.

Walter: I couldn't agree more.

Bernhard: Apologies if I'm playing catch-up here, but who would dictate what 'writing-intensive' is? I'm in a class, that's an entry level class for political science. But one of the major things we do in class is throughout the semester we write a really writing-intensive research paper. You know, tons of scholarly sources are required; to go to the Writing Center is advised...greatly. [Laughter] But there's real development of writing ability in that. I'm pretty confident in that. Likewise, I have a friend that's in a music class that he's taking through the LAC because he has to. That's not something that he's particularly interested in, but a large part of the rubric is journal entries about things. They aren't terribly scrutinized but you kind of write mostly opinion-based. You're not doing drafts for that, or anything like that and really I don't think writing is addressed all that much. But you could look at both of those classes and say a similar portion of the grade is based on writing in both of those classes. But how a student is developed in terms of writing is completely different. So do we have a body that's looking at that or...?

Grant: We currently have nothing. Right?

Bernhard: Okay.

Grant: And there is a difference between writing-intensive—and we're not asking for that because that would be an overload and a huge burden especially. I can only imagine what that would look like in mathematics. I don't know what that would be. I don't know if that would be appropriate for someone in mathematics or even someone in kinesiology to be teaching that content. Right? What you can do though, is you can use writing as a learning tool. That's what we really want. So we call it 'writing-enhanced.' You're responsible for your content because you

guys know it. As a writing expert, I don't know that content. But you know it, and we as a body might work, or we could partner with Sue **Hill** and CETL about how to develop writing-enhanced programs so that you retain the knowledge and content and you understand how writing can help you achieve your goals. That's what we're talking about.

Bernhard: It would be on faculty within a department for they, themselves to determine which courses they would consider to be 'writing-enhanced'?

Grant: Right.

Walter: Let's make Provost **Wohlpert's** comment the last because we do have two other items to get to, and I want to make sure that one's covered.

Wohlpert: I want to say one thing real quickly. Tristan (**Bernhard**) at many college campuses, what you do is you bring a large group of people together to define those things; to give guidelines for what counts as 'writing-intensive', 'writing-enhanced,' so that there is agreement about that. What a great conversation that would be. A lot of that work has already been done by this committee. The second thing I'll say real quickly to Senator **Skaar** is that I've never said anything so eloquent or so beautiful as what you said about during my first year here. [Laughter] So thank you for giving me credit.

Skaar: It was close to that, because I remember in our Ed prep meeting the first one you were at, you said something like that. Maybe I enhanced it a little. But you did and I thought it was such a great thing to talk about from an education-

person's perspective is that we do a lot of that here and so let's all come together and think about that. I think that was a good thing to say.

Walter: Thank you for pointing that out. One last comment?

O'Kane: A question. Are we looking for the Senate to accept these recommendations or perhaps accept and endorse the spirit of?

Schraffenberger: I got a sense that we were saying direct this to the Gen Ed Committee where direct action can be taken.

Walter: Basically a discussion of this. But I don't know that we need to act on it particularly at this point.

Grant: This has been informative to me. I see a little bit more parallel action going on. The sails aren't maybe as luffed as they were before. Talking to the Gen Ed Committee: Obviously this is where the administration wants us to head. I think that's a great recommendation. I think Senator **Campbell's** recommendations are also good in talking with and asking departments "What do you need? Can you do it?" I can work with our own Teacher Ed program and Iowa Writing Project. That's another need that we're going to have real soon. Where's the Iowa Writing Project going to go? So we need to figure these things out, and we need to do it without delay. But I have some concrete steps now that I can take. So I thank you.

Walter: I don't see a need to vote on anything. Does anyone disagree with that? Okay. I thank you. Great conversation in here today. I'd like to move on to Docket

Number 1348, Strategic Plan Metrics and we have Becky (**Hawbaker**) here as a guest. Who wants to speak first?

Hawbaker: Amy **Petersen** and I were the two faculty representatives on the Strategic Plan Action Committee. (SPAC) I'm sure I could invite Senator **Skaar** along to review the importance of good assessment measures, and how important it is to align those with our goals and what we're trying to achieve.

Petersen: People would fall asleep. [Laughter]

Hawbaker: No, they would not. But I think in one way it's like minutiae, but in another way it's really important because if we say that the Strategic Plan is what is meaningful to us, and what we're all going to rally behind and move forward to make us great in 2025, or whatever the date is—we need to make sure that we measure what we treasure. And that we're measuring the right things that are going to show us that we are actually making progress towards that goal. And as Amy (**Petersen**) and I looked at the Strategic Plan and some of the initial metrics that were being built in, a lot of the metrics that we started with were things that we were already collecting. It's easy to get. We have it on hand, and that's not necessarily the best way to measure your goals. So, we took another look at this through the lens of 'How do faculty contribute to this plan?' and 'What matters to faculty in terms of these goals?' and also to say, I have heard some faculty say, "I'm looking at the Strategic Plan. I see Student Success at the top. That's great. I love all the pillars, but where is the faculty in there?" Because you have to go into the weeds a little bit to find where recruitment, development and evaluation-

rewards of faculty are actually there. And most of them are right there in Student Success, because that's where we belong. That's what we do. We teach students how to think and learn and write and be successful. So, we are here to bring some of these metrics to you for your consideration. Some of these metrics are more official than others. Some of them have been vetted by the full committee multiple times, and those are mostly the ones where we've got a good base year and a good five-year target. But we also added in some others that we believe are important, and we would like your input on, or to ask you if there are other areas that have been overlooked that are really important, and that do contribute to us meeting the Strategic Plan goals. That's what we want to know. So there's the vision, the mission, the values that you've seen before from the Strategic Plan. So here's our first goal of Student Success: You can see Item Number 4 there: that's our big thing with faculty, and Item Number 5, about our advancing knowledge through all forms of scholarship and creative endeavors. Those are some big things to try to measure, and a lot of the things that I think of as meaningful are more qualitative than quantitative. But we took a stab at a couple of things.

Wohlpart: This is the wrong copy, so you have to go back.

Hawbaker: So this is just the Strategic Plan. We need the one with the metrics. Thanks for your help, Gretchen (**Gould**). I appreciate it. I don't know the best way to do this. Item I refers to the work of the Faculty Evaluation Committee to develop a comprehensive system to evaluate, recognize, reward temporary, term, tenure-track, and tenured faculty based on an expanding understanding of scholarship, service, and teaching. That's a really big one. There's a lot of qualitative things that are going to go into that, but that work is critical. If we talk

about developing our faculty and rewarding excellence, that endeavor is the main driver of that Strategic Plan goal. But we also believe that some things that we can measure very easily are about maintaining or increasing the percentage of faculty who are tenured or tenure-track. The direction nationwide is in the opposite direction. And if we really believe in outstanding faculty and the preservation of academic freedom and excellence, I believe—we believe that that's the metric we should be reaching for, and that for our colleagues who are temporary or term, we would also like to see them be allowed to graduate into greater security in their work to maintain or increase the percentage of renewable term instructors in the total of non-tenured faculty, so that we have fewer people who are semester to semester, and they don't know from one semester to the next if they're going to be back. Or more who at least know, "I'm going to be here for a year. I'm going to be here for a two-year term. I've earned my way to a five-year term." And that that's a way to reward excellence, but also to invest in good teaching for our students. We also looked at things like maintaining or increasing the number of applications and awards for PDAs or summer fellowships. I think those are the big ones we added.

Skaar: One thing you said just a little bit ago, "What is still missing?" One thing that I saw throughout this—I'm not going to get nit-picky, but the one thing that I saw about this that was missing was that there was a lot of focus on undergrad, which is what we do mostly, but I didn't see anywhere where we talk about grad programs. Being the coordinator of a grad program, that's important to me that we are holding up our grad programs to those high expectations that we hold our undergrad programs up to. So I saw somewhere in here about increasing—

something about when students leave they have jobs and things like that. That's a big part of looking at grad programs as well. I'm not sure that that was mixed up in here. There's a lot of focus on four-year graduation, six-year graduation, and those kind of things. But where are those metrics for grad programs as well? If we're going to talk about high quality graduate education, we'll want to put that into our Strategic Metrics as well I think.

Hawbaker: That's a great point.

Pease: I've actually submitted a few for consideration. They just didn't make this document. But they've been moved on to Randy **Pilkington** and the President for consideration.

Hawbaker: This is being shopped around. Not shopped around, but shared out to multiple stakeholders so we get more feedback and they get added in.

Wohlpart: Becky (**Hawbaker**) is your sense that we can add to the Strategic Initiatives? Because there's nothing in the Strategic Initiatives that speaks to graduate programs. One of my concerns is that there's not a very clear, close alignment between the metrics we've come up with and the Strategic Initiatives. I think partly because many of those Strategic Initiatives would beg for qualitative metrics, and that's not where we have been. I think we desperately need more of that. Is your sense also that the Initiatives can be edited and added to, or are they done? Have you guys asked that question?

Hawbaker: I'm not the right person to ask. I think that the Strategic Plan itself has been formally adopted, but I don't know that that means a revised, especially if they are especially critical as graduate education.

Skaar: I'm looking at strategic initiatives. The first one under Student Success is "Enhance and increase engaged student learning and high impact experiences on and off campuses; inside and outside of classroom." We can do that in graduate education. I just don't think that there's a metric there that specifically focuses on graduate education. I mean we do that in School Psychology all the time, but that doesn't mean that it's in there anywhere. So, the focus is undergrad programs which I get, but at the same time, let's bring in graduate education too.

Hawbaker: There might be a specific initiative that is related.

Skaar: Graduate only.

Kidd: Becky (**Hawbaker**) Could you back up a little bit?

Hawbaker: I'll let Gretchen (**Gould**) take the helm.

Gould: Where do you want me to go?

Kidd: Where is the metrics for Number 1?

Wohlpart: There aren't any, and this is my point. A lot of these beg for qualitative metrics, and we have not developed those.

Kidd: Even still, it's easier to get the quantitative that we already collect, but there are lots of things--We actually measure some for these in our department.

So, for example, placement of internships. I'm sure you could have the same idea for placement and outreach activities and other things, right? These are quantitative measures, right?

Wohlpart: Yes, Tim (**Kidd**). I'm not suggesting you couldn't but if you look at for instance the first metric. Which initiative does that relate directly to? "An 85% retention rate of freshmen."

Kidd: I don't know why that particular one is in this category.

Wohlpart: Because it's generally about Student Success.

Hawbaker: Because it's something we already collect.

Wohlpart: Yes.

Kidd: I understand. There are overall metrics, and I understand why that would be in Student Success. That's fine but yet it seems like.

Wohlpart: My point is only that it seems like the metric haven't flowed out of the initiatives.

Kidd: Yes.

Hawbaker: And part of that is the process that we used. Because when we sat down to start doing this, the Initiatives were not part of it. It was the larger goals.

So this kind of alignment, I mean the first document we sent two weeks ago, you would have had to have gone back and toggled between the Strategic Plan and this other completely different, separate spread sheet about the overall goals. I think the holes are easier to see now, and so process-wise we probably should have started here, but...

Skaar: One way to help make that better is to say, “Strategic Initiative One: Here’s how we’re going to measure it. Strategic Initiative Two: Here’s how we’re going to measure it.”

Hawbaker: Like a level 2 lesson plan.

Skaar: Exactly Becky, (**Hawbaker**) you should know that. And just be really clear here about the alignment of those things. “I’m going to measure this goal and here’s how I’m going to do it. “I’m going to measure this goal, and here’s how I’m going to do it,” So that some of those issues that Tim (**Kidd**) just brought up about the graduation freshman retention and those kind of things—they get put somewhere, or they’re in the “Other” category: We measure these and they’re important to us because we have this information and we look at it because the State likes to look at it mostly, probably. And HLC likes to look at it, or some accrediting body likes to look at it. But they aren’t necessarily measures of our Strategic Initiatives. So that they go in that “Other” category where we just list them and say, “and we also look at these things.” But they’re less important to us and whatever metric we’re using to measure the initiatives.

Hesse: I've got an initiative and a metric to go with it. Earlier we talked about how every year we have more and more students come to UNI with transfer credits and AP credits. And often these credits are from Community Colleges that are not up to par. They're just not adequate. And so one possible metric for Initiative Number 3 would be something like, "Increase the number of LAC courses that UNI students take at UNI." Because those are the ones that typically transfer in, and the students are not up to par.

Wohlpart: The politics in the State.

Walter: Good suggestion.

Hesse: I see this in my field because I teach the Humanities I, II, III sequence and those are very commonly taken online through Hawkeye or some other place, and you know—the students just don't get the education somewhere else.

Wohlpart: So because of articulations at the State, I'm not sure that we will be able to force or control high school students to stop taking those and having those transfer in. One of the things that I've been talking about since I got here is this idea of thinking intentionally and developmentally about our curriculum and the engagement learning experiences; the co-curricular, the way in which we do in education Level I, II, III, IV. If we thought about that in every one of our programs, we would be able to say very clearly that we are known for a residential four-year college experience, and that coming here later will put you behind for these reasons. Here's the experiences that our students are having

when they're freshmen. Not just that they've taken these courses, but they've had these other experiences. And that is something that would make us very distinctive. I think prominent, and I think would reclaim that four-year residential degree, which I think is actually a hallmark of what UNI is—should be known for. But I think we have work to do then if we're going to do that.

Hesse: One major reason that students transfer credits in is because the grades also transfer, and so they're taking a class somewhere else to get an easy 'A' and so we could maybe discuss scenarios where we do accept credits from Community Colleges because they are State schools, but not the grades. That's kind of a half.

Walter: A compromise. Yes. Well, we're inching up on 5:00 here people. Now, refresh my memory. Do we finish at 5:00 or at 4:50?

[Group]: 5:00

Walter: Okay. Good. That's the wrong answer. Shall we consider that we had a good, healthy discussion here or do we need to vote on something about this? What's your sense, Becky (**Hawbaker**)?

Hawbaker: I don't think we need a vote. We need feedback. We have not been able to walk through the other goals, although I would say that the Student Success one is the one with the biggest additions that we had. I'd also though, like you to take a good look and the Diversity and Inclusion one. We were feeling like

we wanted a wider definition of diversity with some of the metrics that are collected and also wanting to look at some of the data from the climate survey that faculty, students and staff and administrators complete every two years. In any other places if you're seeing those gaps where the metric doesn't match the initiative; doesn't match the intent of the goal. The metrics are important, right? That's how we know if we're meeting our goals. So if we choose stupid metrics, it's going to be garbage in-garbage out. So, help us do good metrics.

Walter: Should we continue the discussion at our next Senate meeting? Would that be something you want to do?

Hawbaker: I just want to make sure that when people leave they don't just forget about it, because this is really important.

Walter: It's hugely important.

Wohlpart: Would the faculty be interested in an open forum to review the metrics and give feedback? It's time on your part. We could set something like that up.

Walter: What time table are we looking at? Next month or so?

Wohlpart: I can't imagine it would happen until mid-November to set up some open forums to put these out. Put people at tables and give feedback on them.

Walter: I think that's a generally good idea.

Kidd: That's a great idea.

Wohlpart: Well you all are on the team. What do you think?

Hawbaker: Look, the way they have this laid out to consult, this is our major consultations with faculty and to be honest, it's feeling insufficient to me and it's not about you. It's about time and having time to discuss it with others, and so I'm hoping you will agree to some kind of additional faculty input would be in order. Is that? Would you agree with that? [murmurs of agreement]

Walter: That's a good consult.

Hawbaker: If there are no objections, I think that's what we should do.

Vallentine: I'd just like to thank Becky (**Hawbaker**) and Amy (**Petersen**). They spent time over the summer doing this, and this fall. We don't often take time to thank faculty, but they put in a lot of hours on this.

Walter: Thank you both very much. So we have about 4.5 minutes. Is this going to be sufficient time to address Item 1349, Draft Policy for Posthumous Degree and in Memoriam Certificates? Or, would somebody maybe provide us with a motion to kick this to the next meeting?

Campbell: Is the Registrar always going to be here? Or is she here just for this?

Morrow: Your next meeting is on what date?

Walter: October 23rd.

Morrow: I may or may not be here that particular day.

Wohlpert: Did you all already review this and give feedback?

Campbell: We gave feedback. I sent an email.

Wohlpert: And changes have been made based on the feedback that was received?

Morrow: Yes. Yes. Yes, there were changes. Can I say something briefly?

Walter: Yes. I didn't mean to rush you?

Morrow: I'm new in this role. I've been in it about six months. When I first started, the second day I was in it, the first question that came to me two days into it: "What's your posthumous degree policy?" and so I looked at it and it needed a lot of work. Thanks to the Provost and the President and legal, we came up with something that was very flexible, but yet directive, so that it helped you be able to help those that you feel are reaching the end of their degree and very deserving and very difficult time for them and their families, and you have that

opportunity. Or you could choose not to have that opportunity. So, if you've read through it you'll see that it is very flexible and based on Russ's (**Campbell**) comments we were able to make it even more flexible. It's short and sweet.

Walter: Okay. I'm loathe to rush this still, and I suggest that we kick it to the next meeting. Do I have a motion as such?

Campbell: Can we reserve the right to kick it to a later meeting if we feel appropriate?

Walter: I'm open to suggestions.

Campbell: Just if the Registrar is not here, you might want to postpone it to a meeting when the Registrar can be here.

Walter: Can you send someone in your place who might know the document pretty well?

Morrow: [hesitates] Dr. **Wohlpert**?

Walter: I would suggest Dr. **Wohlpert** would be the perfect person for this.

[Laughter] Okay. Did I hear a motion to...Senator **Fenech**, second by Senator **Strauss**. All in favor of moving Item 1349 to our next meeting or perhaps even after that, depending on the availability of personnel. Please indicate by saying,

'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain, 'abstain.' Do I have a motion to adjourn?

[Laughter] A three-way tie! Done. Nice discussion. Good work today.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Sundstedt

Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist

UNI Faculty Senate