

Regular Meeting #1794
UNI Faculty Senate
August 28, 2017 (3:31-4:32 p.m.)
Scholar Space (LIB 301), Rod Library
SUMMARY MINUTES

1. **Press Identification:** No members of the press were present.

2. Faculty Chair **Kidd** reported that further development on the Faculty Handbook with Administration will continue this year. **Kidd** has also assembled a group of faculty to assist with the student-initiated Diversity Curriculum, and asks students and faculty who would like to be involved to contact him.

3. **Minutes for Approval:** May 3, 2017 Special Meeting (**Campbell/Skaar**). Passed.

4. Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

** (**O’Kane/Strauss**) to bundle & docket Emeritus Requests for **September 11th**.

1331 Rip **Marston**, Professor of Kinesiology, Allied Health and Human Services
<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-rip-marston>;

1332 Jill **Uhlenberg**, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction Department COE
<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-jill-uhlenberg>;

1333, Mary Frisbee **Johnson**, Professor of Art; <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-mary-frisbee-johnson>;

1334 Dale **Olson**, Professor of Physics <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-dale-olson>;

1335 Richard **Vanderwall**, Assistant Professor, Languages and Literatures
<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-richard-vanderwall>;

1340 Kay **Weller**, Associate Professor of Geography <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-kay-weller>;

1341 (Posthumous) Harry **Brod**, Professor of Sociology and Humanities
<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-nomination-postumous-harry-brod>.

1336 (Burnight/O’Kane**) Presentation & feedback on the Civic Action Plan. Docketed for Sept. 26.
<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/presentation-civic-action-plan-strategic-plan>

** 1337 (**Skaar/Fenech**) Discussion and voting to approve or reject a change in Senate Bylaws Section 7.4 addressing the order of business. Docketed in regular order.

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

** 1338 (**Campbell/Stafford**) Docketed at head of today's order: Discussion of Draft University of Northern Iowa "Guidelines and Procedures for Qualifying Faculty to Teach Using Tested Experience instead of Degrees." <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/draft-university-northern-iowa-guidelines-and-procedures>

** 1339 (**Hesse/Burnight**) Review of Policy 6.10 Academic Freedom and Shared Governance for **Sept. 11** docket. <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/review-policy-610-academic-freedom-and-shared-governance>

5. New Business

* An alternate is sought for the Faculty Senate position vacated by Senator Jennifer **Cooley**. In that role, she also held a position on the Intercollegiate Academics Fund Committee.

* A faculty member is needed to serve a four-year term on the Facilities Planning Advisory Community.

6. Consideration of Docketed Items

** **1338/1228** Discussion of Draft University of Northern Iowa "Guidelines and Procedures for Qualifying Faculty to Teach Using Test Experience instead of Degrees." (**O'Kane/Schraffenberger**) Tabled for further study at head of the order, **Sept. 11**. <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/draft-university-northern-iowa-guidelines-and-procedures>

****1336 /1226** Presentation & feedback on the Civic Action Plan. (**Burnight/O'Kane**) Tabled for presentation and discussion at head of the order, **Sept. 25**. <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/presentation-civic-action-plan-strategic-plan>

7. Adjournment (**Strauss/O'Kane**) 4:32.

Full transcript of 36 pages with 0 addendum follow

**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI Faculty Senate Meeting #1794**

August 28, 2017 (3:31 – 4:32 p.m.)

Present: Senators Ann **Bradfield**, John **Burnight**, Russ **Campbell**, Seong-in **Choi**, Lou **Fenech**, David **Hakes**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, James **Mattingly**, Amanda **McCandless**, Steve **O’Kane**, Vice-Chair Amy **Petersen**, Angela **Pratesi**, Jeremy **Schraffenberger**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gloria **Stafford**, Mitchell Strauss, Chair Michael **Walter**. Also: Associate Provost John **Vallentine**, Interim Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**, Faculty Chair Tim **Kidd**, NISG Representative Tristan **Bernhard**.

Not Present: Senator Leigh **Zeitz**, Provost Jim **Wohlpert**.

Guest: Julianne **Gassman**.

Walter: Okay, I’d like to call the meeting to order of the Faculty Senate for the year 2017-2018. I’m Michael **Walter**. I was duly elected or I wouldn’t be here.

[Laughter] So we have according to rumor, a COE meeting taking place so those of you who had the choice, thank you for being here. I appreciate that quite a lot. So I’ll call for press identification. Any members of the Fourth Estate here?

Apparently not. Seeing none, we’ll proceed. We would proceed to comments from President **Nook** and Provost **Wohlpert**, except their not here, so we’ll skip that and jump to comments from Faculty Chair **Kidd**.

Kidd: That sounds exciting. I’m happy to be back because it would be terrible if I was taking a nap right now. Very sad. I don’t know that there’s too much exciting going on this year, except for the Faculty Handbook, which will be a good kind of between faculty and administration, so hopefully that will continue to go smoothly in working with administration. Also, I guess for a year and a half now, there was a petition by the students to set up a diversity-type curriculum and I’ve assembled a team of faculty for that over the summer, and so I’ll be calling them to come assist and helping with curriculum, and I’ll call I believe at least one

student representative as well to assist with that. If you really want to be involved, I'm happy to let you join the gang. Just let me know, okay? And that's all for me, thank you.

Walter: Thank you Faculty Chair **Kidd**. Comments from me? Well, first I want to thank Angela **Pratesi** for sitting in for Gretchen **Gould** who I appointed (she actually asked) to be Secretary. It's my duty as the Chair to appoint the secretary, so Gretchen (**Gould**) is in England right now, so it's difficult to attend. Anyway, thank you very much Angela, for filling in. There was a couple of other comments I could make and will make later about filling the empty slots, but I think that the order demands that we look at the minutes for the May 3rd meeting, to approve the minutes for May 3. I'm going to have to assume that you've looked at these. So do I have a motion to approve these?

Campbell: So moved.

Walter: Moved by Senator **Campbell**. Do I have a second? Senator **Skaar**, seconds that. All in favor of approving?

O'Kane: Thank you. There is an error in that it shows me being present.

Walter: You were most definitely absent.

O'Kane: I was definitely absent.

Walter: Would it be okay if I just changed that?

O'Kane: That would be fine.

Walter: So I think I should probably go ahead with a motion for voting. I would ask all in favor of approving these minutes of the Special Meeting, UNI Faculty Senate for May 3rd, please indicate by saying, 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' So the motion passes. So we have quite a long list of items to consider and the length of this list kind of brings forward a little idea that Gretchen (**Gould**) and myself and several others have pulled up, to go to a consent agenda so this would be an extreme example of things we could take care of in a real hurry in the future. But that will have to be discussed first. Instead, what I'd like to do is march through this list quickly and simply approve these for docketing in their order, and if we want to change that docketing order, we can take care of that. So, let me propose—do we have a motion for considering Calendar Item 1331, Emeritus Request for Rip **Marston**, Professor of Kinesiology, Allied Health and Human Services? Do I hear a motion? Don't be shy.

Strauss: So moved.

Walter: Moved by Senator **Strauss**, second by Senator **Stafford**. We're going to docket that as 1221. The docketing versus Calendar Item numbers are a little Byzantine so if I show a little confusion, you'll have to bear with me on that. So that's docketed as item 1221. Do I hear a motion for Calendar Item 1332, Emeritus Request for Jill **Uhlenberg**, Professor of Curriculum and Instructional Development COE?

O'Kane: Could I make a motion that we docket all of the emeritus requests together?

Walter: Bundle them in effect?

O’Kane: I make that motion. Let me flush it out. That would be Calendar Items 1332, 1333, 1334, 1335, 1339, 1340. I’m sorry—not 1339, 1341.

Walter: What about 1342?

Petersen: There’s no (13)42 on our agenda. That was a late add.

O’Kane: And (13)42.

Strauss: Senator **Strauss** seconds that motion.

Campbell: Don’t we have to vote on these after moving and docketing?

O’Kane: Yes.

Campbell: We did not vote on the first one, so we should include 1331 in the list so we can vote on them all together.

O’Kane: I’m only suggesting that we put these on the docket, not discuss.

Campbell: Right, but don’t we have to vote to docket them, rather than just move to docket them?

O’Kane: Yes.

Campbell: We did not vote to docket 1331, we just moved and seconded it.

Walter: I suggest we include that in your suggestion, Senator **O’Kane**.

O’Kane: Any Parliamentarians here? Is that close enough? [Laughter]

Walter: Senator **Strauss**, you seconded that. Would you modify?

O’Kane: I approve the correction.

Walter: All in favor of bundling those as stated by Senator **O’Kane**, please indicate by saying, ‘aye.’ Opposed, ‘nay.’ It passes. Okay. Thank you. So the next Calendar Item...

Campbell: But my question was, don’t we have to vote on docketing them, rather than just voting on bundling them together for the docket?

O’Kane: My motion was meant to bundle them for docketing.

Walter: I’ll read off all the docket assignments, if that’s...

Campbell: But don’t we have to vote to docket it? Doesn’t there have to be a vote to docket them?

Walter: We bundled them, and we docketed them, and it passed.

Campbell: That was in the motion, then?

Walter: Yes, sir. Alright, let’s see. The next Calendar Item would be 1336. Do I have a motion to move that Calendar Item to docket? Presentation & feedback on the Civic Action Plan as indicated. Do I have a motion to docket 1336? Moved by Senator **Burnight**, seconded by Senator **O’Kane**. That would in all likelihood be Docket Number 1226. Okay, so let’s vote on that. Vote to place Calendar Item 1336 as docket item 1226. All in favor, please indicate by saying, ‘aye.’ Opposed, ‘nay.’ The motion passes. So let’s have a motion if we can for Calendar Item 1337, Discussion and Voting to Approve or Reject a Change in Senate Bylaws Section 7.4, addressing the order of business each Senate meeting should follow. This is

the consent agenda, which we just saw in miniaturized form. Thank you, Senator **O’Kane**. It’s what we’re aiming at is to get these routine items taken care of. They do this at ISU and this is where Gretchen (**Gould**) and I borrowed the idea.

O’Kane: One thing that’s fairly important to me anyway, is that when we do talk about Emeritus Status, when we’re looking at the docket, that we actually do have an opportunity to talk about each individual person.

Walter: And that would come up during the discussion of each item.

O’Kane: I would just hate to see us move to a blanket, “I vote yes on all of these,” and we don’t get to hear about our colleagues.

Walter: If I’m not mistaken, I think the consensus idea pushes these into the docket arena really quickly and basically does what we just did a minute ago.

Kidd: We’ve been bundling the emeritus requests for a couple of years now as one calendar item. I’m sorry I didn’t let you know. I didn’t see the agenda this time, and I didn’t try really hard to get one I guess. Just so you know that you can bundle them all together. We made that change a couple of years ago. So that makes things smooth anyway.

Walter: So that leaves us...Did we just vote for 1337?

Kidd: That was discussion.

Walter: That was. Okay, moving to a consent agenda. I wasn’t aware that we already did a consent agenda in here.

Kidd: Kind of.

Walter: We're going to make this official by moving it into the docket, discussing it and voting on it. Not necessarily at the top of the order, because there are other items on here that need to go above that. In any case, shall we—do I have a motion to move Calendar Item 1337 up for docketing? Moved by Senator **Skaar**, second by Senator **Fenech**.

O'Kane: Could I ask who put forward this proposal?

Walter: Gretchen (**Gould**) drafted it, bounced it to me. I returned very few changes on that. Most of these items that come onto the Senate website I petition. That's just the way the mechanism works. Other people can petition as well. I did that because it was easier. Okay? So all in favor please of moving Calendar Item 1337 onto the docket, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' The motion passes. That goes on as 1227. Possibly docketed at the top of the order, do I hear a motion to bring Calendar Item 1338, Discussion of Draft University of Northern Iowa Guidelines and Procedures for Qualifying Faculty to Teach Using Tested Experience instead of Degrees? Do I have a motion to move that to the docket? Senator **Campbell**, second Senator **Stafford**. All in favor of moving Calendar Item 1338 as docket...

O'Kane: Same question of that one. Where does that come from?

Kidd: John **Vallentine**.

Walter: Yeah, Dr. **Vallentine** can probably address that.

Vallentine: That was a request from the Provost for the Higher Learning Commission.

Walter: Okay. I think...I'm going to assume that all of us haven't read a lot of these all that thoroughly for today, so if we end up getting into a discussion of that, what we can do is try to move this up a bit.

Vallentine: Sure.

Walter: So all of those in favor of moving that to docket, please indicate by saying 'aye. Opposed? Motion passes, and let's put that one at the top since Dr.

Vallentine is here. Now this next item, I admit I'm a little uncertain what to do with this. I would appreciate any comments anybody has on this. This is Calendar Item 1339, Review of Policy 6.10 Academic Freedom and Shared Governance. The Provost has been moving this along. We've all participated at various committee levels with this. So, let me open this up just for comments or suggestions as to whether or not we vote this on to docket or not in Provost **Wohlpart's** absence. Does anybody have a take on this?

Campbell: Is it ready for docketing is the question? Is it ready for voting?

Hesse: We've already voted on it. This is just something that Provost **Wohlpart** is bringing back, as he promised he'd show it to the Senate one more time. We've already voted on it last semester.

O'Kane: We voted to accept it? Approve it? I don't remember.

Hesse: I know it's been working its way up through the chain of command.

Kidd: I remember there was some discussion of issues related to non-tenure track faculty, and I don't remember exactly what the wording was at the moment, but there was some wording there that seemed to imply a voting rights and something like that, and I thought that language, if I remember from Scott **Peters** some of that language was removed this document here. So I'd recommend that it be docketed, but I think people should read it before it's passed of course.

Burnight: I think one of the concerns was about the shared governance.

Kidd: Yeah.

Burnight: And I think the language consistent with the terms of their contract used was very important. Which was how much non-tenure track faculty could participate. I think that was one of the additions that was in response to our conversation, if I'm remembering correctly.

Walter: Okay, so what I suggest is that we vote it on to the docket with the understanding that it will come up for discussion in the next Senate meeting, which is September 11th of all auspicious days. Does that sound okay? Let's make this official. So, I need a motion to vote Calendar Item 1339, Review of Policy 6.10 Academic Freedom to the docket. Do I have a motion? Senator **Hesse**, second. Senator **Burnight**, thank you. All in favor of moving 1339 in as Calendar Item 1229, probably for the next Senate meeting, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay. The motion passes. Okay.

Kidd: I hate to interrupt. 1342 wasn't on the screen yet, but we as faculty don't deal with administrative emeritus requests as far as I know.

Walter: I had the same question. Someone else, and I don't know who it was, said, "Oh yeah, we do that." But no, I think you're probably right.

Campbell: Did she have a faculty appointment?

Kidd: It's administrative emeritus.

Walter: It's administrative emeritus.

Kidd: It's not up to us.

Walter: Okay.

O'Kane: When I was Chair, I used to get the occasional one of those and I just sent them back.

Walter: Okay so I put that on in error because I didn't know that.

Kidd: That's fine. Yeah.

Walter: and so I think I'll just strike it, unless anybody has an objection to that. Once it's a Calendar Item, we can either bring it up for docket or not, but since I'm the one that put that petition up, I think I'll just volunteer to remove it. Any objection to that?

O'Kane: We need to change my motion then because we had already docketed that.

Walter: We did, didn't we? Okay, Do I hear a motion to remove the particular Calendar Item, 1342 from the bundled motions that went up a few minutes ago?

Campbell: I think it would be easier to just, when it comes up for a vote, refer it back to the administration.

Walter: Okay. So all those requests are bundled in.

Fenech: Now I'd like to ask the question I had earlier. In regard to 1341, was that bundled together with the other emeritus requests?

Walter: Yes, it was.

Fenech: I'd like to see that uncoupled. I don't think it belongs there because it is of a different nature and that's what I have to say.

Walter: What would you recommend that it be? That we don't discuss it at all?

Fenech: No. I think we should certainly discuss it, and I'd like to discuss it individually though, rather than as a bundle. I'm sorry. My attention had swayed when we came to the numbers.

O'Kane: I'm not sure that in this case we can docket that as a single item. I think they each have a docket number.

Walter: Yeah. I just wrote them all in here.

O'Kane: We'll be doing them separately. In the future though, that number...I lost track of where that was...1337 in the future they may just have one number, but I sure hope we individually talk about people.

Walter: The posthumous emeritus nomination for Harry **Brod**, correct?

Fenech: Yes.

Walter: That would be Docket Number 1231. It will be discussed individually, as they all will be. Is that satisfactory?

Fenech: That is.

Walter. Great. Okay. Alright. Quickly through a few New Business points. Senator **Cooley** stepped down from Faculty Senate for the 2017-18 year, having been appointed Department Head of the Department of Languages and Literatures. Suggestions for progress on an alternate replacement? This also bears on her appointment upon the Intercollegiate Athletics Fund. So, does anyone have any updates for me on the process of replacing Senator **Cooley**? Does anybody have any information that might be helpful on that?

O’Kane: Is she in fact our representative on IAF?

Walter: Yes. The Faculty Senate appointee. Now she’s department head so that no longer pertains. So that sounds to me like we can name anybody, or we can ask politely for a volunteer.

O’Kane: I’m not volunteering. I want to let you all know I served quite a few years on that Intercollegiate Academic Fund Committee and it is a blast.

Walter: But yet, you’re not volunteering?

O’Kane: I’m not volunteering. I’ve got enough going on. It really is fun. What could be more fun than short proposals in which you give money to people? It’s really pretty fun and they have refreshments.

Walter: Okay. Thank you, Senator **O’Kane**. I want to volunteer myself for that but I won’t. Do we have a volunteer for the Faculty Senate Appointee to the Intercollegiate Athletics Fund? I don’t know when they meet, but I’m sure this can be determined. You’re volunteering?

Campbell: No. Does it have to...generally, Faculty Senate representatives don’t have to be a member of the Faculty Senate.

Walter: Yes, that’s a good point. So you’re suggesting that we draft somebody when they’re not here?

Campbell: Or, we could have the Senators ask anyone, and bring back a name next time, if no one here wants to serve. We have that option.

Walter: An excellent idea. So...

O’Kane: Actually, sorry. Some committees that’s true and other committees that’s not true, and I don’t know what’s the case. I’m thinking back, and I think we always—I’m getting confused. I’ve been here awhile. I think it’s always been a Senator, but I don’t know for sure if it has to be.

Walter: Well, Senator **Cooley** was obviously a Senator, so...Anyone have any ideas of the time frame? How often do they meet?

O’Kane: I think they meet—I’m going to say six times a year.

Walter: So this is not exactly an emergency. Alright, so let me...

O’Kane: Probably not. It’s one of those committees though, where the early ones really matter. That’s when most of the money gets given away. The last one or two get cancelled because there isn’t any more money.

Walter: Okay. I suggest please for the next Senate meeting that we come back with some suggestions to fill this spot. This is the Faculty Senate appointee for the Intercollegiate Athletics Fund.

Schraffenberger: Do we get a sense of actually how many meetings there are and...

Walter: Six I think.

O’Kane: In fact, the dates I know are already out there. I just saw them and I don’t remember where I saw them.

Walter: If you go back to your departments and colleges, if you have someone that you think would be good at this particular job, please let me know as soon as possible and I’ll just post that.

Campbell: Someone suggested--I don’t know if it will fall to Dr. **Vallentine** now to verify who’s in charge of that committee, and whether or not it requires a Senator appointment or not. Whoever came up with Intercollegiate Academics Committee, right?

O’Kane: Yes.

Campbell: Whoever...which I think is out of the Provost’s Office. Should be able to find out whether or not the Senate Representative has to be a Senator.

Vallentine: I will be checking. I don’t think it says it has to be; that it’s recommended that the Faculty Senate appoint someone.

Campbell: You can verify that.

Schraffenberger: It simply says ‘appointee.’

Campbell: Okay.

Vallentine: There is a late September meeting.

Walter: We should be able to do this at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate, which is September 11.

Petersen: Is this the Athletics Advisory Council?

Campbell: No.

Walter: A different name I think.

Campbell: No. Athletics Advisory Council is also a one-year appointment. I was their one-year appointment last year. This is Academics Council. They decided some years ago with all the money we’re giving to Athletics for away meets, we should give some money to Academics for away conferences and the like.

Walter: Thank you for looking that up.

Campbell: We will need an appointment for the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council. We will need an appointment for that also.

Walter: That's not on the agenda today, but thank you.

Campbell: Just a head's up.

Walter: If you would shoot me a note on that I will double check and we'll figure out when they meet and what they really need, okay? So, please, draft somebody. Give them a little extra experience. The other item of new business, quickly, the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee (FPAC) which is an advisory to the Executive Management Team that deals with facilities and land use and needs a Faculty Senator to serve the 2017-2020. That's a long appointment. Members of the Committee are appointed for four-year terms and may be reappointed for one additional four-year term. So we need an appointment for that, a Faculty Senator, it says.

Walter: Senator **Mattingly**?

Mattingly: Senator **Bernhard** needs to mention something related to the last item.

Walter: I'm sorry. Did I miss your hand?

Bernhard: Yeah. I was just a little late for it. I got this through NISG, and I believe I have some details. The first meeting is Sept. 21st, 3:30-5:00. It looks like all the meetings I've been invited to follow that same time schedule: from 3:30-5:00 at Seerley. And also email correspondence I think is a pretty big part of that to get a lot of business out of the way through email.

Walter: Good. That makes it a lot easier. Thanks. Thank you Senator **Bernard**. That fortifies the FIAF suggestion, so again, please find us someone to draft for that. So the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee needs a Senator. Same situation with that, so we'll need to come up with somebody to fill that particular spot. I think I had corresponded with Dr. **Vallentine** a few weeks ago about the potential incursion of a road that had to do with the hospital that was being speculatively perhaps built on one end of campus. This really has a lot to do with who puts what where, and for us, that has to do with academic programs—land use et cetera, so this is not an appointment to be taken lightly, but it's something we should hurry up to fill.

Kidd: Yeah. I've been talking with someone about that also. One thing that's come up is it's a long appointment. It's unclear whether people want to spend that long on---four years is a long time commitment. The second thing is that if it's a Senator—if it's to be someone from the Senate, the Senate terms are three years. So this is not...

Walter: ...Not really compatible, is it?

Kidd: No. So would it be for at least the Senate appointment? Would it be okay if it's less than a four-year commitment?

Vallentine: I would think so, and then someone would have to fill it for the final year, or they change their by-laws.

Walter: I would be curious to know why it's so long in the first place.

Kidd: Yeah. That's making it tough to get people to be willing to commit for that long.

Vallentine: I can bring it up to the committee.

Walter: Thank you. I appreciate that.

O'Kane: I want to reiterate how important this committee is. In fact, I would volunteer if I weren't teaching at the time they meet. The University of late, I think has doing a lot of things that are not so green. We've apparently sold the property that is west of the Dome—all that lovely walking trails and prairies over there. They're gone. Greenhill Road is going through the Tallgrass Prairie Preserve area where they grow their seeds. We've just taken a great big piece of green space and apparently sold it to Sartori, and we're just putting all those new tennis courts in where the Lab School used to be—that lovely greenspace that was constantly being used by people on campus and neighbors. If you have some conviction about keeping this place as green as possible, I would highly recommend that you volunteer for this.

Walter: Very good point, especially with regards to areas that are actually being used for academic programs—the forest and some of the tallgrass prairie areas are absolutely essential to some of our programs, at least most importantly in biology. Okay, we will probably see this as another item of new business. I just wanted to put you on notice for this: the UCC matters now have a tighter schedule of—since we have shortened the curriculum process considerably, so we're looking at deadline of October, or potentially the last meeting in September of Faculty Senate to approve various changes in curriculum for the UCC so we can expect to see those. We're not seeing them today, I just wanted to let you know

that as soon as I have the documents that relate to those changes I'll put them up. Associate Provost **Pease**, did you want to make a comment on that?

Pease: I can. The programs in particular that come up, and the packages for UCC and GCCC will all be coming a little bit later this week, once the minutes from the last meeting are approved. As I recall, all the rest of the paperwork is done. These early ones are the program changes that have to go all the way through the Board approval. And so while a lot of curriculum that doesn't need to go that far can be handled as we go through the semester, this one we have to actually meet some deadlines for: ASAC (Academic Student Affairs Committee), COP (Council of Provosts), and some other groups in the Board, so that's their rationale for trying to move them up quickly, so they can get approved in this cycle and hopefully be active. Whether it's terminations or new programs, those changes will be made for the next catalog year.

Walter: So I assume I'm going to be receiving some documents and I'll post them—as petitions on the Faculty Senate website.

Pease: Yes. You'll receive the documents on the programs. There's some closures and some new programs. You'll receive the documents for those along with the Board forms that accompany those and the approval minutes from the curriculum committee groups to demonstrate that they've made it all the way through and are ready for Senate review.

Walter: So, unless I've skipped something important, on to Docketed Items. Now, what I suggest because Dr. **Vallentine** is here, and I believe he would like to

discuss previously Calendar Item 1338, Docket Item 1228, Discussion of Draft University of Northern Iowa “Guidelines and Procedures for Qualifying Faculty to Teach Using Tested Experience.” Are you ready to make a presentation on that or just discuss it?

Vallentine: I can discuss it, sure.

Walter: Can you give us the bare bones on that?

Valentine: Sure. We’ve had a trial round of this the last several weeks with department heads writing rationales for various faculty that they want to be qualified to teach in classrooms. And for those that don’t know a lot about this, it’s basically you have to have a degree above the level that you’re teaching at, and if you do not, you have to follow the guidelines in this document. And the department head has to write a rationale, really, of tested experience. And what I’m finding in the letters that are coming to me, these are folks that have really been out there working professionally in the field before they started teaching at UNI. So they bring a wealth of experience that you typically would not find in someone that would want to teach at the university level. They’ve been out there as professional experts in their field. They can have qualified letters written in support of their cases, and various documentation to add to that letter. This has basically come into play with HLC, beginning September 1st. Soon—so if we’re going to be an accredited member of the Higher Learning Commission, we will have to follow through with doing this process.

O’Kane: If I heard you right, you’re saying that HLC is making this mandatory for accreditation, of all schools?

Vallentine: All schools across the country.

O’Kane: You shall hire people without the degree, if they have the experience?

Vallentine: I’ll have to check the ‘shall’ word, but that’s my understanding.

Campbell: I think as I read that, it would be better phrased, “You must make strong justification for hiring people without the academic degree, and industrial experience may be one means which you can use to justify.”

Walter: There is a three-page draft of this which I have up here, and I don’t think I can assume that everyone’s read this really carefully. So I’m actually not terribly certain as to how I proceed with this, but it seems likely that we have a deadline for this coming up, correct Dr. **Vallentine**?

Vallentine: Yes. The other part of this is if Russ (**Campbell**) would want to teach in Geography, he would have to have at least 18 graduate hours in that field, so if you cross disciplines, you are eligible to teach, and some faculty members have wide interests, and may be very interested in teaching in other areas.

Bernhard: You said there was a rationale had to be provided prior to this. Is there any like empirical standards that would have to be met before you could be considered for this, or as long as there is a rationale, you would be subject to xxx? [inaudible]

Vallentine: State that again?

Bernhard: You said that rationale is kind of like a precursor to being considered for this. So, is there any standards that have to be met in order to be, or just as long as you had it submitted, you could be considered?

Vallentine: I think the definition of 'tested experience' is earlier in that document. And that's as close as we can get to the question that I think you're asking.

Bernhard: There's no year figures or...?

Vallentine: No. It's pretty open because it would depend on the discipline.

(Many Voices) It does say five years.

Vallentine: As a practitioner. Oh. Sorry.

Kidd: Reading through the HLC document, it says...basically it lists a group of people this applies to: part time adjuncts, dual-credit... non-tenure track. It doesn't say tenure track inside the HLC document. Is this supposed to apply to tenure-track positions as well at the University of Northern Iowa? Because right now I thought—and I could have read it wrong, but it seemed to read very broadly that this would include tenure-track positions, and I don't think the HLC document includes that. At least that's the list on page one of the HLC document that was attached to the petition. It does say, "faculty's primary role is teaching." And again this is including everything but tenure-track faculty. So my question is, is this supposed to be hiring practices for tenure-track positions?

Vallentine: I think that's an excellent question. I inherited this, so I'm...I wasn't on the committee last year so I don't know if any Senators were.

Kidd: I just think that would be something important to clarify before voting on it.

Walter: Thank you, Chair **Kidd**.

Campbell: I was just going to remark that this is for teaching undergraduate courses, and for teaching graduate courses later on, I think you will still need the doctorate to teach graduate-level courses. [Some voices of disagreement]

Walter: There's no language like that in there.

Petersen: There's criteria for making...

Campbell: "Must hold a master's degree for teaching in a master's program."

Vallentine: And then you would have the tested experience above that.

Campbell: Okay. There's your doctoral program.

O'Kane: Dr. **Vallentine**, when does the 18 hours of additional classroom stuff kick in? I don't see that in what we're reading right here.

Vallentine: It's on the very first page.

O'Kane: I did see that, but I noticed that it said, "should," not "will."

Kidd: It says should in the HLC document.

Walter: Dr. **Vallentine**, one clarifying question. I know you've inherited this.

Vallentine: Sure.

Walter: But what—let me back up a little bit. What problem did this proposal seek to solve? Was there something that needed to be done, according to HLC that wasn't being done, or is this just an adjustment to...for some other reason?

Vallentine: This is an assumption on my part that they just wanted to keep standards high.

Walter: So the problem was that perhaps standards were slipping?

Vallentine: That was my assumption, that perhaps around the country, some places were not hiring appropriate professors to teach in various disciplines. Or, they were telling faculty, “Well, we need someone to teach over here. You have to teach this class in this department.” But that’s an assumption on my part.

Campbell: I can just mention that because of this, our Department and the Computer Science Department each lost a faculty, an adjunct faculty member who we liked very much, because they did not have master’s degrees. So, this force of the HLC has impacted many other departments than those two, but those two which I know were impacted where they were adhering fairly strictly to the master’s degrees, and couldn’t justify waiving that requirement.

Walter: So, I suppose we are in a position to either vote on this, or someone could make a motion that we table it for further study. Do I have a useful motion?

O’Kane: I move that we have time to consider this. That we in fact bring it up next time.

Walter: So, Senator **O’Kane** moves that we study this a bit. It is the first Faculty Senate meeting of the semester, so that doesn’t surprise me terribly. Thank you very much for your experience on that by the way, Steve.

Schraffenberger: So my question would be to have those questions answered for us next time; those that have been asked, as well as and I think I might have discovered this, but I was curious about who's approving those—what 'tested experience' means. Do you need to make a list of "I did all this stuff and it kind of fits," but then who's the person who's finally checking?

Walter: Who checks those boxes off?

Schraffenberger: And then the department head has to write a letter and I guess it's the Provost who's eventually saying, "Yes that qualifies." Or does the department head's approval that gives it the rubber stamp?

Vallentine: It's absolutely the Provost, and he's already been rejecting some of them and sent back for further clarification.

Schraffenberger: That's good to know.

Walter: Some of the applications, the hires based on this? I see. We're being cautious about this.

O'Kane: So we haven't seconded that. If I might add to that, it seems that we need to have some time to provide comments. This isn't part of the motion, but I'm wondering which body would accept those comments and make any changes if at all? I don't know who wrote this.

Schraffenberger: I don't either, but I do know that the Writing Committee for instance, was interested in this because they want to make a distinction between

somebody who's a practitioner and a teacher. Those are two different activities. So I know that there are others on campus who would like to have their say.

O'Kane: And anytime that's the case, we really need to have this out there for people to be able to look at for a minimum of two weeks.

Bernhard: And to your prior point, Senator **O'Kane**, I think 'should' and 'will' is something that could definitely be looked at, particularly if the purpose of the document is to be a little more selective when hiring. I think leaving those places vague allows for a less strict or selective process.

Walter: It sounds to me like the suggestion links towards stringency, which is caution, which is good. So, Senator **O'Kane's** motion involves delaying any decision on this for now, further study, if there's any other documentation that may help, we'll try to get a hold of that. Do I have a second on that motion? Senator **Schraffenberger** seconds the motion. All in favor, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed? The motion passes, so that will be put on the back burner for now.

O'Kane: Dr. **Vallentine**, what is the time deadline on us needing to act?

Vallentine: I think just as soon as possible, just because of HLC getting this started. Nationally, I think we're ahead of the curve.

O'Kane: We're fine on two weeks or three weeks?

Vallentine: I think we're fine. These are guidelines, and it will be helpful.

Walter: Okay. Good. Thank you. So this is the Strategic Plan, the Civic Action Plan item which is now Docket Number 1226, and short of a presentation, Julianne **Gassman** is here to make a couple of statements about this so we can put ourselves in context of this plan. I'll bring up what I have. This is the Civic Action Plan.

Gassman: So I'll just make a few comments about this. The Civic Action Plan was drafted last year by a committee and really the Civic Action Plan really came out of two different places. Probably the first, original reason we were asked to develop this is UNI is a member of Campus Compact, which is a network of colleges and universities across the country working to strengthen community engagement efforts in higher education. Iowa Campus Compact is headquartered in Des Moines and there are about 22 institutions in the Iowa network of Campus Compact. The national organization put out a call to higher education institutions to develop a Civic Action Plan for institutions to think about their public purposes. And so actually, the State of Iowa was the first state where all institutions in that network agreed to develop a Civic Action Plan. That agreement actually was back when President **Ruud** was here, and so he signed on along with the other institutions in the Iowa Campus Compact network. So we agreed to do this probably two years ago now. Then, quickly following that, UNI went writing a new Strategic Plan, and as a part of the Strategic Plan, Community Engagement then was elevated as one of the main areas to strengthen student success in our Strategic Plan. So, as a result, the Civic Action Plan is really I think designed to serve two purposes: One, to respond to the call for writing a Civic Action Plan with Campus Compact. Institutions across the country this year are revealing their Civic

Action Plans, most in the State of Iowa have not done so yet, but a few of them have. As well as, as we're developing this Civic Action Plan, its purpose very closely aligns with what we said we wanted to do in our Strategic Action Plan. It really would serve as the implementation of the Community Engagement component of UNI's strategic plan. Is that sort of falling into place? There was a committee that was pulled together. It had a number of community members on that committee as well as faculty and staff represented. There is a website where you can see all the committee members that were a part of developing this. So, this is the Civic Action Plan now, and what we would like to do is put this plan out for feedback to the faculty, but before doing so, wanted to make a presentation to the Faculty Senate.

Walter: So, you would like this docketed for our next meeting? It seemed to me like you didn't want to make a presentation today.

Gassman: Well, I didn't know where it would fall in being docketed. If you want this to serve as the presentation, I can be more formal and stand up and take questions. Here's what I would say: I don't know if you're prepared to vote on it, because I don't know if you've all had a chance to read it. Or, if feedback would come in the form of... We would just like to put it out there for faculty feedback. This isn't a final draft of the form. So I don't know if feedback can come at the time when we put it out there for faculty, or if you would like to read it, and approve for moving forward for feedback from the faculty. So I'm prepared to make this the full presentation today, so we can move forward for feedback, or docket it. Or, keep it until September 11th--whichever.

Walter: Probably the latter.

Hakes: Isn't this one of these cases where we don't actually vote on it.

Walter: I'm not sure what's required.

Hakes: Accept it if you want to post it as a docketed item to be discussed so the rest of the campus can see it. We don't have the power here to...

Walter: We don't 'up' or 'down' it.

Hakes: We don't have to vote on it as a 'yea' or 'nay,' we just vote to accept the report or proposal, or accept like we've seen it. But there isn't any more than that. We may comment on it, but even those comments don't have any authority. We can't...

Walter: I don't think it requires our approval necessarily.

O'Kane: I don't either.

Hakes: Am I saying this right?

O'Kane: I'm wondering if the Committee is wanting comments from us, and that's why the document is here.

Gassman: I wouldn't say the Committee. I would say Provost **Wohlpart** has said before we put it out the faculty, make sure you make the presentation to the Faculty Senate. So, I don't know that the Committee is...well the Committee is looking for feedback before we say this is our final draft from Faculty Senate and/or from faculty across campus.

O’Kane: So comments would be going to Provost **Wohlpart** or...?

Gassman: The comments would likely come to me. I was Chair of the Committee, so I would think they would come to me, and I would share them with the Committee as we edit and refine the draft before we would put it out as our public document. And this document is a little different than maybe the Strategic Plan and the supporting documents, as the National Campus Compact will share Civic Action Plans. So it serves us two purposes, right? So it’s really a response to a call to think about our public purpose in higher education, as well as it’s nice that it also fit nicely fit with our Strategic Action Plan and could become the implementation part of the Community Engagement. The five statements we agreed to in developing the Civic Action Plan parallel very well with what came out of our strategic planning process. So it really does—both of those things complement each other very well.

Walter: Well, this document is up on the Senate website, so if someone is interested in it, they can download it and read it. Let’s see. I suppose the thing to do would be to entertain a motion to have you come present for us. Say move this docket date back to Sept. 11 initially, so your team could come in and make a presentation and we could have a little bit more thorough discussion of it.

Campbell: How much time is the curriculum package going to take on September 11th?

Pease: I think that’s up to you. [Laughter]

Campbell: I just want to make sure that we’re not docketing too much?

Pease: I believe you're going to see two new programs, and two programs that are ending. I'm guessing the ones that are ending are not going to take very much time. The two newer ones might take some more discussion, but I really don't have a sense of how long those discussions have historically taken the Senate.

Walter: The urgency of this matter is slightly less than the UCC items.

Campbell: And Senator **O'Kane** wanted us to talk about John **Vallentine's** industrial experience—that's not the phrase

Campbell: That issue is also on for September 11th, so I've spent many a Senate meeting just waiting for my item to come up many years ago, and I don't want to inflict that on people when it's not necessary.

Walter: Point well taken. So the next Senate meeting is—somebody correct me if I'm wrong, which is likely, is September 26th? September 25th? Thank you. So we'll go ahead and leave the documents up. It's a docketed item. Do I have a motion to schedule this for two Senate meetings from now? Head of the order. Thank you. Senator **Skaar** so moved, second by Senator **Burnight**. Okay. All in favor of moving this item out to two meetings from now head of the order, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' The motion passes. I almost always forget to ask for a vote. It's not a natural thing. [Laughter] Okay, so where are we? Well, what I suggest now is that we start from the top of the various emeritus requests and work our way down, more or less in the order they were...

O'Kane: That's for next time, isn't it?

Walter: All of these emeritus requests? They were moved on to docket.

O’Kane: Nobody’s had time to read the supporting documents.

Hakes: For next time.

Walter: That wasn’t clear to me. I don’t think I made that specific suggestion.

Campbell: technically, it’s at the top of the docket, but many people will want to prepare remarks, which they haven’t prepared yet.

Walter: That leaves us with the frightening possibility of ending early. [Laughter] I don’t know if we can stand this. Alright, I wasn’t actually aware that it was structured like that. So, docketed at the top of the order, emeritus requests for our next meeting, which is September 11th.

Campbell: Again, I think the other matters are far more pressing that were discussing and if the remarks are just prepared by Senators who are here anyway, they can read their remarks at a later meeting far more easily than the other two matters on the docket. So, I don’t think it should be the top of the docket. I think it should be after the other two things.

Walter: Following the Testing Experience Items and...the Civic Action Plan is out two weeks...

Campbell: Curriculum has to be the top of the docket for next meeting.

Walter: It would, but we haven’t really even...That’s not even a calendar item yet. So, I would have to move that up. In all likelihood, it will be. Does everybody kind of understand how that works? Someone will have to petition that or it will be

me, to put the documents up and we'll move that to the top of the order. We are trampling all over Robert's Rules of Order here. Did you have a comment, Chair **Kidd**?

Kidd: Yeah, I did. For the emeritus, one of the things we've been doing historically—the last four years, is asking department heads to supply testimonies, and anyone can supply testimonial and then we don't have to read documents in the meeting per se. Although comments are of course welcome. But, five years ago, it was like reading of many pages, which seemed to be excessive, and you just copy the testimonies into the minutes. It shouldn't take that long.

Campbell: If that is true, and you want those write-ups by the department heads or whoever, be appended to minutes without being read here, should Chair **Walter** contact the department heads prior to the next meeting and say, "Can you submit comments for the record which won't be read in full?" Because often we've gone by, and there never have been those comments appended to the minutes.

Walter: If there aren't any.

Kidd: Also, they should be included in the petition itself.

O'Kane: Yes

Kidd: And then that way they're automatically appended to the minutes. Not automatically, but it's easy to transfer the petition to the minutes and they're of course open for public reading.

Campbell: It might be appropriate for the Chair to request those be submitted.

Kidd: Or they won't happen, yes.

Walter: I'm going to read the list of emeritus requests. You could obviously read this yourself. It won't take very long, so if there are department heads that you know, I would encourage them to submit the comments in that order: So Rip **Marston**, Jill **Uhlenberg**, Mary Frisbee **Johnson**, Dale **Olson**, Richard **Vanderwall**, Kay **Weller** and posthumously for Harry **Brod** and Donna **Vinton** which we supposedly don't deal with, because it's an administrative request. So that one's actually struck. So if you know department heads from whom we can obtain comments on these emeritus requests, please take action on that. So the Provost is not here, so I'm not sure how appropriate it would be to look at Policy 6.10 Academic Freedom and Shared Governance at this point. I think we'll have to delay that until the Provost shows up on that one, unless there's an objection to that.

Hakes: Is that docketed for next time?

Walter: Yes, we've already docketed that for next time.

Hakes: We couldn't discuss today, because it's docketed for next time. We have to have a two-week period. That's why it's on the Calendar.

Walter: It is docketed for next time. Okay, so do we have any suggestions for the good of the order? I think we've run through our list of 'to-do's' here.

Strauss: Motion to adjourn.

Walter: Second on the motion to adjourn? Senator O'Kane seconds. Done.

Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Sundstedt
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist

UNI Faculty Senate