

Regular Meeting  
**UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**11/10/14 (3: 36 – 4:48)**  
**MTG # 1759**

**SUMMARY MINUTES**

**1. Courtesy Announcements**

Faculty Senate Chair **Kidd** called the meeting to order at 3:36

Amber **Rouse** of the *Northern Iowan* was present.

There were no comments from Provost's Office, as Interim Provost **Licari** is out of town.

Faculty Chair **Peters** reminded faculty of the importance of attending Commencement exercises citing its importance to students and their families. He also explained that faculty input is needed at the December 1 Open Forum on Academic Master Planning. The Steering Committee works on things such as the University Mission and Vision Statements, and on the values and skills U.N.I. should have.

Senate Chair **Kidd** stated that he will be out of town for the December meeting, which will be chaired by Vice Chair **Nelson**.

**2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript**

The Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for October 27, 2014 was approved without changes. (**McNeal/Walter**)

**3. Docketed from the Calendar**

1264 Request for Emeritus Status for David **Christensen**

\*\* Motion to docket and move to head of today's order (**Nelson/Dunn**)

1265 Consultative Session on new Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Policy 13.02

\*\*Motion to docket in regular order (**O'Kane/Gould**)

#### **4. New Business – Bestowal of Honorary Degrees**

\*\*Motion to move to Executive Session to discuss three candidates for Honorary Degrees (**Smith/Walter**)

\*\* Motion to approve two of the three candidates and authorize the Dean of the Graduate College to communicate with general concerns regarding the third candidate. (**Dunn/O’Kane**)

#### **5. Consideration of Docketed Items**

**1264/1159** Request for Emeritus Status for David **Christensen**

\*\* Motion to pass (**Nelson/McNeal**)

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-status-request-david-christensen-effective-6114>

1237 1133 Curriculum Management

\*\* Motion to accept the Committee’s Report (**Strauss/O’Kane**)

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/curriculum-management>

1259 1154 Requiring V.I.D.S. Training for Faculty Members

\*\* Motion to endorse voluntary faculty training (**Heston/Strauss** )

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/requiring-vids-training-faculty-members>

#### **6. Old Business – none**

#### **7. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn (**O’Kane/Cutter**)

Time: 4:48

#### **Next Meeting:**

December 8, 2014

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 pm

**Full Transcript of 37 pages including 1 Addendum.**

**Full Transcript of the  
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
11/10/14 (3:36 - 4:58)  
MTG # 1759**

**Press Identification:** Amber Rouse, Northern Iowan

**Present:** Senators Barbara **Cutter**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Cyndi **Dunn**, Kevin **Finn**, Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Tim **Kidd**, Ramona **McNeal**, Lauren **Nelson**, Steve **O’Kane**, Gary **Shontz**, Gerald **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Jesse **Swan**, Michael **Walter**.

**Not Present:** Senators Karen **Breitbach**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Jeff **Funderburk**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Laura **Terlip**, Leigh **Zeit**.

**Also Present:** NISG President Paul **Anderson**, Interim Associate Provost April **Chatham-Carpenter**, Associate Provost Nancy **Cobb**.

**Kidd:** I’d like to call the meeting to order at 3:36. Are there any press?

**Rouse:** Amber **Rouse**, Northern Iowan

**Kidd:** Do we have any comments from the Provost’s office?

**Cobb:** The Provost is out of town.

**Kidd:** That’s a good comment. He’s in California. I see. Comments from Faculty Chair **Peters**?

**Peters:** Yes. First I think everyone I think should have received information about Commencement. I just wanted to encourage people to attend. For many years, I did not attend Commencements. We’ve got papers to grade and it’s a busy time of year. But I started going a few years ago and discovered this great tradition that we have; this faculty tradition of shaking

student's hands and saw how important it is to students to have their faculty members there to introduce them to their families and things like that. I think it does mean a lot to students and I hope that people can attend.

The other thing I'm going to encourage people to attend is the Open Forum on Monday, Dec. 1 at 3:30. This is going to be sort of the kick off for the Academic Master Planning, and as you know, the President has asked the Provost to complete a first draft of an Academic Master Plan. I think the timeline is to have it done roughly a year from now. Is that correct? And there's a Steering Committee that's being appointed. It will be in place soon. It will be in place by this December first meeting and the main purpose of this is meeting (I think) will be for us as faculty members to provide input to the Steering Committee as the Steering Committee works on such basic things as Mission Statement, Vision Statement, what skills and values we would like our graduates to hold, and things like that. I know that with all the planning, there might be some planning tedium or planning exhaustion, or what have you, but I do get the sense from President **Ruud** that this is, that he envisions planning to be a much more continuous planning and reassessment process. That this is not work for a year to come up with goals that then just get kind of ticked off every year for the Board of Regents. It's more of a constantly re-evaluating ourselves, thinking about what we need to do and doing more regular self-assessment. The faculty voice is really important to be heard in this. So I hope that you're able to attend.

**Kidd:** Thanks, Scott.

**Kidd:** Comments from me: Our next scheduled meeting is on December eighth. I will be in New York for that so Lauren (**Nelson**) will be in charge of the meeting, or having it.

**Nelson:** It will depend on our agenda. We might just cancel if our agenda is light.

**Kidd:** I don't think there is anything time-sensitive, except for what we have to do today, actually. So, that's my comments. I see we have minutes for approval from the 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. Do I have a motion to approve those minutes?

**McNeal/Walter All Aye**

**Kidd:** Great. Our minutes are approved. We have two items to schedule for docketing. We have an Emeritus Status request for David **Christensen**. I actually already have all the materials for that, so if you wanted to put it at head of the order and we crank it out today that's fine by me or we can save it for next meeting.

**Nelson:** I move we docket it at the head of the order. That way we can finish it today.

**Dunn:** Second.

**Kidd:** Sure. Moved by Senator **Nelson** and seconded by Senator **Dunn**. All in favor?

**All aye.**

**Kidd:** Okay. So we're going to do that first. And then we have a request for a Consultative Session on the new Discrimination, Harassment, Sexual Misconduct Policy. Could I have a motion to docket that in regular order?

**O'Kane/ Gould**

**Kidd:** Any discussion? Great. All Aye.

**Kidd:** We'll have that on the docket in regular order. We do have one item of New Business, and that is, we're supposed to, the University...I'll let April (Chatham-Carpenter) talk about this: Honorary Degrees.

**Chatham-Carpenter:** In the Graduate College, I am responsible for overseeing the Honorary Degree Committee and President **Ruud** has asked for that committee to provide more recommendations for Honorary Degrees in the future. So we are working on that and have three possible persons that we would like to recommend be given Honorary Degrees. I think we'll have to go into closed session when we look at that, but I've got the materials for those persons for you today to consider.

**Kidd:** Thank you. I was wondering if we could we have a motion to consider these in private; in Executive Session? It is time-sensitive in that we should have this done. If we could do that right away it would be wonderful, I think.

**Smith:** I so move.

**Kidd:** Second by Senator **Walter**. **All aye.** I guess we move to Executive Session. That means we'll close the room to everyone but Senators, then I can pass out the information.

**Motion to move to Executive Session (Smith/Walter) at 3:42.**  
**Return from Executive Session at 4:02.**

**Kidd:** A motion by Senator **Nelson** is to accept Candidate E for an Honorary Degree. Seconded by Senator **Hakes**. **All aye. Motion Passes.**

**Nelson:** I move that we accept Candidate H. Second by Senator **Heston**.  
**Motion passes.**

**Nelson:** I move that we accept Candidate R.

**Kidd:** Seconded by Senator **Hakes**. **The motion does not pass.**

**Dunn:** I would like to move that we authorize the Dean of the Graduate College to communicate the general concerns about Candidate R, to the Committee, without going into great detail.

**Kidd:** Seconded by Senator **O'Kane**. Moved by Senator **Dunn**. All in favor?  
All aye.

**Kidd:** Please relay the concerns about the Candidate to the committee.

**Nelson:** That should take us to the Emeritus Status Request

**Kidd:** That should take us to the Emeritus Status Request for David **Christensen**. Thank you for reminding me. I almost forgot that. So the motion is to approve the Emeritus Status Request for David **Christensen**.

**Nelson:** We did that at the top of the order. Do we need a motion on that? We docketed that at the Head of the Order.

**Kidd:** So do I have a motion to accept the Emeritus Status Request for David Christensen?

**Nelson:** So moved.

**Kidd:** Second by Senator **McNeal** and third by Senator **Finn**. All in favor? **All aye**. Any opposed? **Motion passes**.

**Kidd:** I keep calling you Senator, and you're Vice Chair.

**Nelson:** Well I am a Senator.

**Kidd:** The next order of business is the work done by the ad hoc Committee to form a Committee's. And I have the Committee's report I'll let you take it away, Senator **Nelson**.

**Nelson:** You all should have had the report so I will not go and read the detail of what you've already had an opportunity to read. This is in response to the concept of having some type of regular academic program review that could be done in a simple way and perhaps on an every-other-year basis. Our Committee was not charged to do the review, but simply to come up with an idea for how to form the committee. We considered an alternate model that would not have required forming an additional committee, but rather having that review conducted by the Faculty Senate, but decided that it was better to charge a committee with that task. So, we



propose a title of Curriculum Sustainability Committee, and having a voting member from each College as well as a member from the Faculty Senate, the Graduate College, and a member from the University Curriculum Committee. We would prefer persons be those with experience in curriculum review, so having members of the actual College Senates would be ideal because the College Senates do deal with curriculum review and we would also need to have persons from the Office of Institutional Research, or the Registrar's Office, to help with the data collection, so we propose ex officio members, either from the Registrar's Office or Office of Institutional Research, and one representative from the Provost's Office. And, there is some additional detail about how the committee would be constructed. So I'll open it to questions.

**O'Kane:** I'm wondering one member of the Faculty Senate or From? Is this somebody we can appoint? The same thing with the College Senate?

**Nelson:** I think we would prefer it be a member from the Senate, but again that's something open to discussion. Obviously, Senators get called on many times and often it's difficult to find a Senator who has the time to take on extra duty, but the idea being from the Senate, because the person would have expertise then to review curriculum, and would be able to report back.

**Dunn:** Under Three what we suggested is that these people be a member of the relevant Senate at the time they are appointed, but since it's a three-year term, you could finish your last year on the University Faculty Senate

and that might be your first year on this committee. Part of our idea was as well that we think that since some of the Committee members are part of these other bodies, they can serve as liaison as well, which we thought was useful.

**Kidd:** Very well. Any other questions?

**Heston:** I wondered if the so-called “automatically generated indicators” has any detail to it?

**Nelson:** That was to be the Committee’s first role after being formed this year. So they would spend the spring semester investigating. We did provide some suggestions but we certainly...that was not the role of the ad hoc committee. The role of the ad hoc committee was to come up with a structure for this new committee, and then the initial charge to that committee would be to investigate possible indicators.

**Swan:** For the voting members of the committee: CHAS is a huge, huge College and I really don’t see how one member could adequately cover the entire college. Unlike the other Colleges, even though with those Colleges there’s great diversity and difference, too, but CHAS is really so large. I think CHAS is typically mindful that it continues to think about two kinds of representatives on any University-wide body. And so I certainly do think that’s a good idea. Why did the committee NOT think that was a good idea?

**Nelson:** I raised that question in the committee, and I think it probably was just in recognizing challenges in recruiting persons to serve on committees

that we hoped to keep the committee smaller. But I certainly am not opposed, personally to that. I raised that question myself. Others from the Committee can comment.

**Gould:** Did you guys discuss having anybody from the Library Faculty serve on this?

**Nelson:** We would entertain the rationale for this. I guess we were thinking of this Committee as focusing on Academic Program Sustainability, and so giving the weight to those individuals. There's certainly are probably many curriculum issues that the Library should be well represented on. But, I don't know. I would entertain...Again, if you have reasons why you think there should be membership, we certainly would entertain it.

**Cutter:** I just have a couple of questions. On the last version of this Committee, we did talk about qualitative issues as well, things like Centrality to the Mission of the University, and there's other kinds of issues, some of which are qualitative, like, you know, what else a program adds to the University: Co-curricular activities that service, that kind of thing. But also, sustainability of curriculum is, I don't think, is just about numbers. But even in terms of numbers, how can you say that one program is sustainable and another program is not, without looking at the cost of program as well?

**Nelson:** And that could be something the Committee would decide to look at. Certainly. But also, ultimately, remember that our charge was actually NOT to structure the review process, just to structure the committee, and

then the committee will come up with the indicators. It doesn't preclude qualitative indicators, but our charge really was to come up with a committee and charge them to come up with indicators that could be readily obtained without requiring programs to go through a reporting process, things like that so. I think that certainly that kind of discussion could take place within that committee.

**Cutter:** That's definitely nice to hear. I guess my concern with that is that when I read Number Four, that it "will receive reports on a small number of automatically generated indicators," and so that seems to structure the kinds of things that will be looked at. So it does seem to have made some decisions on like what kinds of things are going to be looked at, and sometimes the easiest things to look at are not necessarily going to give us a whole picture of a program.

**Dunn:** I think we may need to remind ourselves of impetus for why we thought that this Committee might be necessary or helpful in the first place, which is bluntly the events of a few years ago, and a lot of Departments that thought they were doing just fine, suddenly discovered that they were in danger of being cut. I think that this committee should not be seen as frankly, having anything at all to do with quality of our Academic Programs. I don't see that as the purview of this committee at all, because quite bluntly a few years ago when they were looking to make cuts, it didn't have anything to do with having poor teaching, or poor publication records, or students that weren't well educated. It was purely

about numbers. I think that our thought about the purpose of this committee was really sort of to serve as an early warning system. Nothing happens to you if you get on one of these lists, other than that you get told that, "Hey, some of your numbers look like they might be potentially problematic," and that ... Department Faculty have the ability to respond and on the one hand that might be to explain why this number doesn't actually mean what it looks like it might mean. But it could also be a chance for the Department to sit down themselves with their Dean and say, "You know, we've got to look at this particular number or that particular number." Our thought was also what we were really interested in having the Committee look for outliers: for the bottom 5% or the top 5%. If your student-faculty ratio is extremely high, that's not good either that's almost as bad as it being too low. But it would be basically (that) people would be reminded, "Okay, based on this particular metric, there are things you may need to think about." I guess my concern is that if we try to go into the quality of the program, I actually think the seven-year reviews are the best way to address quality issues, and so I don't actually see that as part of this Committee at all. But other people may say, "No, we're just playing the Administration's game and let's not go that way."

**Heston:** I guess from that perspective, to me, I don't understand why any, and maybe I'm being unreasonable here, thoughtful Dean and set of Department Heads would not be automatically gathering this data. It is their responsibility, and I feel a little resentful that we have to invent another committee to hold Faculty and Department Heads and Deans

accountable for monitoring their own programs more often than every seven years. This is creating extra work for a group of people. Granted, skimming some stats is not a big deal, but there is a part of me that kind of thinks that, you know, if you're not paying attention to this stuff, are you really doing your job as a Department Head? I kind of think if you're not paying attention to this stuff, maybe this report should go to every Committee that the Department Head should make it and it should go to the Faculty in that Department every year, and some cut levels should be established by a group, and if you fall below those cut levels, your Department Head says, "We got a problem." I don't understand why we're bringing a whole bunch of faculty in to look at this stuff every other year and do this extra work, at a time when Faculty are already being asked to do more stuff in new areas than we've ever been asked before.

**Nelson:** I think this is in response, really to protecting programs. People are looking at it as Senator **Dunn** said. The idea is to be proactive in providing people with information that they apparently did not have in the previous go-around, when programs were cut quickly and mainly based on certain metrics that Faculty apparently were not aware of. Many of us are unfamiliar with the concept that we wouldn't be made aware of information, because we work within Departments where information is routinely shared. But that is not the case across this campus. There are Faculty who don't get a lot of information shared with them, and this would just be another avenue of communication to not just Department Heads, but their entire faculty. The Committee is charged with communicating its

findings to an entire group of people, not just the Department Head, where it could just be buried or trickled down—but the entire Faculty would get it.

**Heston:** Why would a Department Head, given what we went through, be anything other than proactive at this point?

**Nelson:** We can't control what Department Heads do, but we can control the information we provide to our Faculty.

**Heston:** Why would Faculty tolerate that from a Department Head?

**Kidd:** Maybe they don't know.

**Dolgener:** If the underlying purpose is to make Department Heads and Faculties aware that they may be in trouble for whatever reason, why does the Department Head and Faculty need to respond to the Committee?

**Nelson:** In case there would be misinterpretation of information. I'll bring up an example that the Department Heads from the previous go-around of program reviews that we had. They pointed out their cross-listed courses. So some courses looked like they had low enrollment. At that time, courses could have two numbers, and students could be listed in one number or the other. In that case, that was something the Committee might have missed if they didn't have that piece of information the Department provides. So that then once you looked at the combination of students in those cross-listed courses, they were fine. They had plenty of students in them. So it's just an opportunity for a Department to explain something.

**Kidd:** Any further questions?

**Cutter:** I have a question. Maybe this is a question for Nancy (**Cobb**) and April (**Chatham-Carpenter**). Couldn't Department Heads be required by the Administration to generate a list of information for their Faculty instead of—I'm really sensitive to Melissa's (**Heston**) concern about another committee of faculty doing more jobs.

**Cobb:** Yes. (laughter) You know, I think that's not been part—I talk frequently about the DNA of an institution—I don't think it's been part of the DNA here to look at numbers a whole lot. I came from two other universities where we were looking at numbers every week. I think we could, and it would be great if the Faculty Senate would charge us with that responsibility. (laughter) And want to get those numbers.

**Kidd:** That's why somebody from the Provost's Office is on this Committee.

**Cobb:** I think numbers are important. I think other factors are very important.

**Peters:** I would add to the very good questions raised, I would add that one value in taking it beyond the Department might be that it would be useful, say, for the UCC to know—that having a representative of the UCC on this committee when curriculum proposals come up at the next curriculum cycle-- to know that well, "How are these curriculum proposals going to help you with what appears to be a problem in attracting students?" Or the College Senate—same deal. How are these curriculum proposals in any way



helping you with, or if they're not, are they an effective use of resources given the trends that have been identified in your program? That might be one argument in favor of this Committee, rather than just handing it off at the Department level.

**Heston:** I'm sympathetic to that. The flip side to that is, depending on how—having served on the UCC—depending on how that's run, we at one point were given very explicit instructions that as a committee could only consider two issues: duplication, and whether the “i's” were dotted and the “t's” were crossed, and that was very explicit from the Committee Chair, we were not to ask broader questions like that at all. That was not viewed as the Curriculum Committee's purview. I disagreed with that, but my concern is I see value in that, yeah, if we have a Curriculum Committee that can look at more than just really narrow kinds of ways of thinking about curriculum, I think it has value. But if it's not, it's sort of duplicating.

**Swan:** Thank you. I very much appreciate Faculty Chair's (**Peters**) comments, because that helps clarify something further, I think, for us. It was my understanding of what this committee was supposed to be, and it was NOT just creating numbers, but it was supposed to be—this new committee—evaluative, and so it would take a program's proposal to enhance it's curriculum and offerings because it's trying to grow, and that would be the argument, and that this committee, unlike the Curriculum Committee, would evaluate that: Is that likely to happen? Is this cogent? Et cetera. Whereas, the Curriculum Committee looks at the curriculum: “Is it rationale? Does it make curricular sense? Does it fit with the curriculum of

the University?” these sorts of things. So this Committee could judge it successful “Yes, this would increase your numbers,” and that would be an argument that maybe not so much the Curriculum Committee would take into account, but everyone else would. But it would think this committee could evaluate and that this body has said, whatever it needs to say, “Yes. This will help you increase your enrollment,” if that’s the goal. Again, the Curriculum Committee isn’t deciding whether or not it’s going to increase enrollment, it’s just is it circularly sound. This committee could evaluate and say, “Yes this will increase,” or “No, we don’t think it will help you.” That’s not anything you’ve proposed for this committee to do. You’ve reduced radically what it’s to do: Collect numbers and distribute them out.

**Nelson:** I think you’re only seeing some of it. If you look at point five, we don’t envision the committee having the expertise to do what you’re talking about initially, but first of all that “committee will develop information and tools to serve as a resource for Departments.” As they have experience with the numbers and with the Department responses to those numbers and the process, we theoretically will see expertise develop on this campus for doing that type of thing. The other thing we added was Number 6, which is that “The Committee will be a place to receive information from Faculty in other relevant constituencies on over arching issues that affect University curricular offerings. The overall strength and integrity of the curriculum, things that cut across departments, national developments.” So we don’t have a body that’s doing those things.

**Swan:** That's right, we don't.

**Nelson:** We have that in this proposal.

**Swan:** That would be another concern I have, that there doesn't seem to be any cognizance of the Liberal Arts core, and how that is so integral to the identity of this University.

**Nelson:** I don't think we want to identify the Liberal Arts core as a program outside of the regular curriculum. As I say something like "overarching issues that affect the University's curricular offerings, the overall strengthen and integrity of the curriculum." To me, the Liberal Arts core is integral to that, but I don't need to specifically identify it. It don't want to feel like I'm picking on the Liberal Arts core as the one thing I want to hold out as an example.

**Heston:** I wondered why this wouldn't be part of what the University Curriculum Committee would be doing (with) it's broad charge regarding the University Curriculum?

**Nelson:** But it doesn't.

**Heston:** But it doesn't mean it couldn't. There's nothing that excludes this from being considered. Actually, when we hear of new programs, quite frankly, a lot of it is there are national developments-- this is what's happening in our field. We hear complaints about either interdisciplinary programs that are aren't interdisciplinary enough for one group or another. If they change this, it's going to screw up all of this, so I think we do hear

some of this. I don't think it's spelled out so nice and neatly as this little sentence, but we do hear about those things. How much we consider them, is maybe a different issue.

**Nelson:** Yes. I was just going to say that we actually tried to identify existing committees who could do this and they more or less refused. Not, probably because it couldn't fall under their purview, but they already had very full agendas, so the Curriculum Committee didn't see this as something they wanted to do, and the Academic Program Review Committee...

**Heston:** This Number 6?

**Nelson:** No, the whole process, not just Number 6. We didn't pick and choose components of this to offer. We just said, "This is what we were hoping to achieve," and they more or less did not feel that that was something they could take on.

**Swan:** Following up with that: Exactly, for years now we've been doing this. And all the pertinent committees pursue this question. I was a big proponent of giving it to a committee, such as the Curriculum Committee, et cetera, and none of the committees that are possible feel that this is at all something they could do, and that is why this year finally, we did have a Committee for the Committee to try and work it out, and that's where we're at again, so I don't want us to slide back. Even we just say, "No" and reject it, or and it goes back to a standing committee. That's what I'd encourage us not do.

**Hakes:** We know we do this with our research. We do a fine piece of research and if you mistitle the paper, the group is disappointed. They don't want you to change the title, they want you to change the whole thing. When they read the title of the paper, they had their minds set about what they thought they were going to read. Now, we had some difficulty coming up with a title for the committee that we're forming. When you said, "Early Warning," it may be more accurate, because that's what we perceive as our mission--Early Warning Committee, not power, but early warning based on numbers, specifically numbers, nothing qualitative. The responses from the Departments would be qualitative. "You know, those numbers don't tell the story, because..." and they would defend themselves quite easily to other faculty members and say, "that's why that number is not accurate." But I think we perceived it as...

**Nelson:** That was a part of it, and that's didn't address Senator **Swan's** points about the bigger issues and we really specifically discussed the word "warning" and decided we didn't want that for the title.

**Hakes:** It's Academic Program Review that can't handle this because it's actually shrinking. So as programs are associated with outside accreditation or other monitoring, there are some programs that are not possibly going

to be doing seven-year reviews on the same cycle, because they're being handled in other manners, which means actually we won't have access to any data from those particular ones that are being monitoring in another fashion. So that committee is really not even in play for this, unfortunately, so it's simply not useful.

**Heston:** This may be in there. These reports would be absolutely confidential? The Administration would not see these warning reports? Is that accurate? That's not what it says? I guess from my perspective is it would worry me that this gives the Administration a hammer potentially.

**Nelson:** I guess our thought was, they already have the hammer. They have the data.

**Heston:** You think that we already know the Deans and the Departments supposedly are doing this so that they can protect their own programs, so you think the Central Administration is sitting down and looking through numbers on all these to find the weak ones? Maybe so now, I don't know.

**Peters:** They're starting to, a little more, increasingly. I've heard the phrase, "Credit Hour Productivity" been thrown around a few times over the last year or two, with the emphasis on enrollment managements. Right now, it's just, "Let's get bodies to campus," right? But when we start to get numbers back up, it will start to be a little more (I suspect anyway) it's going to start to drill down a little bit more. What programs have more ability to grow at a faster rate? What programs aren't growing right now or are even losing students? How are you going to address that? My sense is

that we're headed in that direction where there will be more on-going emphasis on numbers by the Administration.

**Heston:** Wouldn't that indirectly put more pressure on Deans and Department Heads to manage this process that we're talking about putting on to faculty here?

**Peters:** Possibly. Though, I guess I don't know that all Deans and Department Heads are always as capable as we would hope on some of these issues. I mean, I think, I would say it depends on how seriously our Administration is on holding those people responsible. Right? Are you going to be held responsible for poor performance or not? How are you going to measure performance? But the other piece of this is that don't lose sight that in a given department maybe you have three or four different programs. I don't know. Is a Department Head always going to care if you lose one of those programs? Some of the Faculty might. The Department Heads might not. I honestly don't know.

**Kidd:** Okay. Any other discussion, as we end the discussion? I guess the motion would be to accept the recommendation of the Committee to make the Committee? Do we have a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation?

**Nelson:** I think with the Committee thing, we can have a motion without a second because it's a Committee Report.

**Kidd:** Sure.

**Nelson:** So I move.

**O’Kane:** Are we voting to accept this report, or are we voting to now implement it?

**Nelson:** Implement it.

**Swan:** So if we vote no, we’re not going to have this?

**Nelson:** Right and we just drop it. We don’t go back to doing it.

**Swan:** Unless we make another motion.

**Dunn:** So I would say we either vote to go forward with it as written or we vote against it, which case it dies. If someone wants to make a motion to amend the proposal, that could be another possibility: It would be perfect if you only changed number....what ever.

**Kidd:** So do we have a motion?

**Swan:** So he’s calling the question. He has the floor. He called the question. Is there a second for that?

**O’Kane:** Second.

**Kidd:** Moved by Senator **Strauss**, seconded by **O’Kane**, so will we accept the Committee’s recommendation?

**Swan:** So do we want to close the debate?

**All aye to close debate.**

**Kidd:** So now I can say the question?



**Strauss:** Could we have a show of hands?

**Swan:** So it's closed now. Now we're voting for a show of hands on this vote. Sorry.

**Kidd:** Can we have a show of hands? It's okay by me. So, with a show of hands, all in favor of accepting the Committee's recommendation to create a Sustainability Committee?

**Counted by Kidd: Six In Favor  
Six Opposed**

**Kidd:** I am for it, and if this was in my Department, I wish I had this so much a couple years back. There's no question in my mind. Speaking as someone with experience in Administrators finding numbers. Motion passes by six-and-a-half to six. I got to vote on this. We are on to the V.I.D.S. Training. This is something from the Student Government. So I'll pull it up and Paul (**Anderson**) can talk about it.

**Anderson:** This is a resolution that came out of Student Senate awhile ago, actually last year, last spring. I don't know if it didn't get sent last spring or it's taken this long to come up. The Student Senate would like to propose that Faculty and Staff across campus look at the potential of going through the V.I.D.S training that's offered here on campus, and their biggest reasoning for that is the fact that in a situation where there may be an active shooter, or something like that on campus, a lot of times students and people are going to be looking up to faculty members in those situations. This is a training that's offered, I think it's a three-hour training

already free, on campus. This is something they wanted Faculty to at least look into and consider. It even says in the resolution that it wouldn't be required. They want to look in to if new faculty were to come in, maybe that would be part of their training when they come in to the University-- something like that.

**Kidd:** Any discussion?

**Nelson:** I think part of the issue here is we called it requiring faculty, and that really isn't what the Student Petition is about, because I don't believe the Senate could require anything of that nature. So what could we do as a Senate? It seems like we might endorse our Faculty taking the training, but I don't think we could require it.

**Dunn:** I guess I have a few comments. Thanks to students for thinking about this and bringing it to our attention. I think the timing is somewhat unfortunate because we've just gone through our required Anti-Discrimination Training and our required Sexual Harassment Training and our Required Theory Training, so adding one more piece certainly this year would certainly not be well received. I appreciate you sort of leaving it open to us to require/encourage. I'm afraid if we just require, nobody does anything, frankly. I think that one possibility we could consider would be request that it be part of the new faculty orientation. They already have a day or two of orientation at the start of the semester. It wouldn't cover everybody, but over time it would gradually. We could also set some kind of goal, if we chose, like "Everybody should do this by 2020," and that it

should be renewed every five years, but leave it up to the individual when or if they want to do it. But the other thing I thought reading this is that I think that we often over react to new threats, and are remarkably sanguine about threats that are more familiar to us and that we should, perhaps, be more aware of. Because what I thought about reading this was, I've never had fire safety training at this university. I've never had tornado training, I don't actually know where in the buildings I teach, where I would send people in a case of tornado. If a(n) epileptic student had a seizure in my class, I have no idea what to do. So I guess I'm thinking whether it's required or encouraged, it might make sense to broaden out the training, and think about, "What are the most likely emergencies where faculty could actually act to save someone's life?" Statistically, I don't know if I'm more likely to be killed by a tornado or gun from someone I don't know. On the one hand, you said it's three hours, that makes it five hours and that makes it more burdensome. I think we should be thinking more broadly about the most likely threats, and not just reacting to the current one that we're all stirred up about.

**O'Kane:** Is this training currently available to anybody?

**Kidd:** I believe so. Yes.

**Peters:** I did the training, maybe a couple of school years ago. Out of sheer luck, or lack of luck maybe, I did it on the same day that I went to see a briefing about mental health problems on campus. I went from the mental health briefing to the violence training. It is worthwhile. It is a highly unlikely incident, obviously, but I would say it was a worthwhile way to

spend some time. Particularly if you've never given any thought as to what would happen if any kind of violence really broke out in your class.

**Nelson:** I also went to the training voluntarily and it is definitely worthwhile. You do learn strategies, many of which are you could probably see yourself implementing. One thing about the training, that I felt, and maybe you had the same feeling, is for many of the strategies to work, you would have to have a large number of people in your class who'd also experienced the training, because some of it involves working together, and doing things collectively to protect each other, and so that part of it would suggest that many students would also need to have the training in order for a faculty member to effectively implement the strategy in the classroom.

**Kidd:** Sure. Any other discussion or is there any amendment to the proposal to be considered?

**Nelson:** If we wanted to address Senator **Dunn's** question...

**Cobb:** You want me to respond to that? Actually there is a lot of concern about that kind of thing. And to that effect, one of the issues is that every building is different. There is actually information, and what I did at the beginning of the semester was forward to Department Heads and said, "Please send to your faculty." If a Department Head has most of their classes in one building, this works, but it is sort of up to... you can go to the Public Safety website, and I forwarded that information so that faculty members could put information in the syllabi or they could, you know.

Whether it all gets out there, I don't know. There's all sorts of things about tornadoes, about fire, about evacuation chairs, but every building is different. So if you're in the College of Business, it works very well. They have Building Managers, but the other buildings don't have so much the manager, and that's another topic of discussion which has to do with Department Heads and their responsibilities. I came from a place where as a Department Head, I was the Building Manager for my building. So we had an Emergency Plan. That's also part of the DNA here, is that kind of thing. The information's there. We could spend several days training the entire faculty on a lot of things. (laughter)

**Kidd:** Any other discussion? Is there a motion to put this up for a vote?

**O'Kane:** We can't vote on it as it stands.

**Kidd:** That's what I would assume, yes. I think we would probably need to remove "requiring" because we don't have that power, I guess. But I want that power.

**Heston:** Didn't that language come directly from...I mean and all they did is ask us to consider the possibility. We've done that. I think we need a separate motion. This is not a motion to act upon. This is the petition itself asking us to think about it, look at the idea, so I think somebody needs to make a motion if they want to say something about this.

**Kidd:** That's true. I guess we have considered it. So if anyone would like to make a motion to do more than consider it, please do. If not, we can consider it considered.

**Nelson:** What would the students like to have out of this?

**Anderson:** I mean, best-case scenario, I think that they would love the opportunity for faculty to be required to be trained in this, so that they did know what to do. You know, an active shooter, or violence in the classroom, I think because they are viewed not only as leaders in classroom but the leaders on campus. We understand that you are not committed to get every faculty member, to buy into this. It just wouldn't go over well, so I think if the Faculty Senate endorsed this training, and said that "We think this is a good training for faculty members to go through." Maybe a motion to have this be a part of the New Faculty Orientation. I think that would be a good step. But again, I can't make that motion.

**Cobb:** Right now, there's no time. I mean, there are so many things that people have to do. We've actually extended and have an all-year New Faculty Orientation, so that everybody can get their reports done in. We're down to the point of what do we leave out of the New Faculty Orientation. So. I'm sorry. We'd love to.

**Nelson:** Are you approaching other individuals, like are you approaching administrators with the idea because that would really be the individuals who could begin a process of requiring something.

**Anderson:** I think the thought process was that if this was going to be something we wanted faculty to do, we would want it to have an endorsement or a belief that the Faculty Senate was in favor of something like this for pursuing or requiring faculty to do that. Actively talking to administrators? No, that is not the intent.

**Strauss:** Out of curiosity, is this an interactive video training? Or is this a class?

**Nelson:** This is a class, a hands on...

**Anderson:** They do escape routes, countering techniques, additional planning for survival and other situations.

**Strauss:** Who is 'they'?

**Nelson/Anderson:** Public Safety.

**Strauss:** And how often do they hold these courses?

**Heston:** There are a couple in December.

**Strauss:** So they're scheduled.

**Heston:** You can sign up if you know about them. Our department secretary has recommended that they all get the training. She says ...that we may think we may know what to do, but some of the recommendations are counter-intuitive to what our initial response is. I don't know if that is accurate or not. Just as human beings, they're counterintuitive. I'm signed up for the training, so do what you guys want to do. I'm going to do it.

**Nelson:** Well is there any sense that we would want to do more that just receive the report? Maybe we could just encourage the students to go forward their pursuit of their issue.

**McNeal:** We could endorse and therefore encourage them.

**Dunn:** I think there's a difference between saying, "We as the Faculty Senate encourage all faculty to take this" versus saying "We would like the Administration to require it." Do you see the difference? Do we want this to be a voluntary program, or would we like those who have the power to enforce it, enforce it? I personally would not support requiring it of everyone.

**Anderson:** I think that's the discussion we were hoping to have and figure out what kind of a recommendation you would like out of this.

**Kidd:** Does everyone agree with that? Can we actually do anything about Staff? It doesn't seem like our purvey.

**Heston:** Staff are much more likely to be required.

**Nelson:** It's not our purview. The training I went to at least was really oriented towards the classroom and something happening in classroom. Was that similar?

**Gould:** We did get Public Safety to come to the library and give the library two sessions in the library, since it's is a big building.

**Nelson:** An open building, too.



**Gould:** If there were other buildings, Public Safety would be willing to come.

**Cobb/Nelson:** I'm sure they'd be willing.

**Heston:** I move that the University Faculty Senate encourage faculty to take Video Incident Defense Strategies course.

**Nelson:** I think its Violence Incident....

**Heston:** The Violence Incident Defense Strategies class.

**Strauss:** I second that motion.

**Kidd:** Do I have this worded correctly up here? (refers to overhead screen)

**Nelson:** Yes.

**Kidd:** Moved and seconded by Senator **Strauss**. All in favor?

**All aye**

**Kidd:** Students win.

**Dunn:** One recommendation I'd give for you is to talk with Public Safety. I'd be curious what percentage of faculty have taken it? That might be useful information for you as well.

**Strauss:** Maybe we should start with the Senate all taking it?

**Kidd:** You're first.

**Strauss:** We should lead by example.

**Kidd:** So we have a little bit of time. I don't know if we can get through this or not. It's on a policy change regarding Honorary Degrees. We're going to try. Should we try?

**Chatham-Carpenter:** I can at least tell what the difference is between the current and the proposed, and then maybe talk about it at a different time.

**Kidd:** Thank you.

**Chatham-Carpenter:** The current policy...can we pull up the current policy?

**Kidd:** Isn't this the current one?

**Chatham-Carpenter:** That's the changed one.

**Kidd:** 2.05, right? Here you go.

**Chatham-Carpenter:** Yes. That's the old one. Let me just tell you the things that are potentially to be cut out of this, if the policy is approved. It is available for comments, too. The changes were precipitated out of the desire again, so that the President would have more honorary degrees nominations. So "Purpose and Nature of the Honorary Degree Program, Numbers one, two and three," no changes. Under "Criteria to be Considered in Selecting, Number 2," we deleted that one because although we don't want to be picking someone because of financial or political considerations, they may have given money to the University, that's not a reason why we're choosing them, but we don't want to be also kept from having them in the pool because they have done some things politically or financially for us. So Two is considered to be deleted.

Number Six is also because what does “too far in the past” mean, and whose determining that? And if they have done something that’s important in the past, even if they haven’t done something in the last 15 years, does that mean that they’re not someone who could be nominated? So we took that out.

For the Committee on Honorary Degrees, Number One is the same, but Three has been deleted and I’ll explain that when I talk about the changes to Number Two. I think (Number) Four is the same-- in terms of three years. I think we’ve changed four to three years. I’m not sure why. For Number Two, the proposal is for the committee to be expanded to be more than seven members to be nine members; nine voting members plus the Provost, and the Provost would serve as the ex officio Chair of the committee, a faculty representative from each of the four Academic Colleges with two from C.H.A.S.; one would be appointed by the Provost. It says here, “serving on this committee will be the special assistant of the President, Dean of the Graduate College or designee and two additional people would be the Athletic Director and his or her designee, thinking that there might be some folks that that person might know about that Faculty would not necessarily know about, and then the Vice President for Advancement and his or her designee--again, to try to extend the swath of who might be nominated or to be thinking about. So, that’s probably the most controversial part, I think, of the changed proposal. “Procedures for Selection” are the same. “Nomination Material” is the same. “Awarding of Degrees,” the change on that one is on Number Three and Number Four.

Number Three, “An Honorary Degree shall be conferred only if the recipient is present in person.” We talked about doing these posthumously, and if we did that, they can’t be here in person. So we put “Shall normally be conferred” take out the word ‘only.’ Or, I think we left “only” and put “normally” in and then Number Four: It is expected that Honorary Degrees will be awarded every year is what we said for Number Four. So, because its 4:57 now, I expect that we’ll need to discuss this at a future time, but I wanted you to know at least that if you compare them, what the differences were.

**Kidd:** Sorry we couldn’t finish this. Do we have any other motions for the day?

**Nelson:** Would the motion be to table it to be taken up at the...

**Swan:** Just leave it at the head of the docket, where it is right now. We really haven’t done anything. That’s the best way to do this.

**O’Kane:** I move to adjourn.

**Cutter:** Second.

**Adjourn      All Aye      4:58**

**Submitted by:**

Kathy Sundstedt

Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant and Transcriptionist

**Follows is 1 Addendum**

## Addendum 1: Letter of Support for Emeritus Status, David Christensen

David Christensen was employed at UNI for 39 years as a faculty member until his retirement in June 2014. He attained the rank of Associate Professor of both Elementary Education and Science Education. At UNI, he first taught at Price Laboratory School as a 4th-5th grade Instructor from 1993-1999. In 1999, he transferred to Curriculum and Instruction, where he taught *Methods of Teaching Elementary Science* and *Activities to Integrate Math and Science*. He was named a national awardee of the 1992-93 Presidential Award for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Teaching. He was also recognized in 2008 with a Governor of Iowa Excellence in Science Teaching Award.

David was active in establishing a strong relationship with Chilean teachers through grant funding by the Chilean Ministry of Education. This program brought Chilean teachers to UNI where they received professional development in teaching elementary children. Other scholarly activities include presentations on this Chilean MECIBA Project, and multiple national presentations on science teaching topics. He also reviewed multiple manuscripts for a variety of publishers.

David served as a Faculty Senator from 1998-2004 and again from 2005-2008. He served as a Faculty Marshal for all Commencement exercises from 1992-2009. In addition, he served as the Undergraduate Coordinator of all programs in C&I. He was a long-term member of the Academic Appeals Student Grievance Committee and the Committee on Admission and Retention, as well as multiple search committees and serve as a College of Education Faculty Senator.

I am pleased to recommend David Christensen for emeritus status.

Jill Uhlenburg  
Head, Curriculum & Instruction