

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
02/10/14 (3:30 p.m. – 4:58 p.m.)
Mtg. #1748

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Smith** called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

No members of the press were present today.

Provost **Gibson** offered no comments today.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** offered no comments beyond the email note he sent yesterday.

Chair **Smith** noted that President **Ruud** is putting together a group to address campus efficiency issues and to work with a consulting firm conducting such a study for the Regents. Both **Rudd** and Provost **Gibson** would like a faculty member on this committee. **Gibson** noted in particular that she would like a representative from the Faculty Senate in addition to her appointee from Academic Affairs. Vice Chair **Kidd** volunteered and was approved by the Senators for this service.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

Minutes for January 13, 2014, were approved without changes (**Nelson/Peters**).

3. Docketed from the Calendar

- 1223** Request for Emeritus Status, Duane **Bartak**
Motion to docket in regular order (Kirmani/Nelson**). Passed.
- 1224** Request for Emeritus Status, Phyllis **Carlin**
Motion to docket in regular order (Kirmani/Nelson**). Passed.
- 1225** Policy on Assignment and Changes of Grades
Motion to docket in regular order (O’Kane/Degnin**). Passed.
- 1226** Interdisciplinary and LAC Curriculum Proposals (end of the
Order of business today, 02/10/14)
Motion to docket at the end of business today (Kirmani/Peters**). Passed.

4. New Business

None

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

- 1216 1112** Request for Emeritus Status, Betty A. **DeBerg** (regular order)
(**Edginton/Strauss**)
Motion to endorse emeritus request (Strauss/Edginton**). Passed.
- 1217 1113** Request for Emeritus Status, Douglas T. **Pine** (regular order)
(**Kirmani/Heston**)
Motion to endorse emeritus request (Kirmani/Nelson**). Passed.
- 1218 1114** Extended and Separate Exam Administration (regular order)
(**Cooley/Dolgener**)
**Motion to table pending receipt of additional information
(**Degnin/Walter**). Passed.
- 1219 1115** College of Business Administration Curriculum Proposals
(regular order) (**Dolgener/O’Kane**)
Motion to approve CBA Proposal Packet (Dolgener/Walter**). Passed.

1220 1116 College of Education Curriculum Proposals (regular order)
(**Dolgener/O’Kane**)

Motion to approve COE Proposal Packet (Edginton/Gould**). Passed.

1221 1117 College of Humanities, Arts, and Sciences Curriculum
Proposals (regular order) (**Dolgener/O’Kane**)

Motion to approve CHAS Proposal Packet (Nelson/O’Kane**). Passed.

**Shout-out to the Philosophy and World Religions Department for the
spectacular/creative restructuring & marketing of their majors (**Peters**).

**Motion to divide the question by splitting out the Department of
Technology’s Proposal to change the BA Teaching major to a BS Teaching
major (**Walter/O’Kane**). Passed.

**Motion to table the Department of Technology’s Proposal to change the
BA Teaching major to a BS Teaching major (**Peters/Nelson**). Passed.

1222 1118 College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Curriculum Proposals
(regular order) (**Dolgener/O’Kane**)

Motion to approve CSBS Curriculum Proposals (Strauss/Cutter**). Passed.

1226 1122 Interdisciplinary and LAC Curriculum Proposals (end of order of
business today, 02/10/14) (**Kirmani/Peters**)

**Motion to approve Interdisciplinary and LAC Curriculum Proposals
(**Kirmani/Gould**). Passed.

5. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn (Edginton/Hakes**). No vote taken.

Time: 4:58 p.m.

Next meeting:

Date: Monday, February 17, 2014

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 50 pages, including 0 Addenda.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 10, 2014
Mtg. 1748**

PRESENT: Melissa **Beall** (alternate for Marilyn **Shaw**), Melinda **Boyd**, Karen **Breitbach**, Barbara **Cutter**, Francis **Degnin** (alternate for Jesse **Swan**), Forrest **Dolgener**, Chris **Edginton**, Todd **Evans**, Blake **Findley**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Gloria **Gibson**, Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tim **Kidd**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Nancy **Lippins**, Kim **MaLin**, Lauren **Nelson**, Steve **O’Kane**, Scott **Peters**, Gary **Shontz** , Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Michael **Walter** (25 present)

Absent: Jennifer **Cooley**, Melissa **Heston**, Laura **Terlip** (3 absent)

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Smith**: All right. I believe it’s 3:30, and that means that I can call the meeting to order, and I just did. Begin with courtesy announcements.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Smith: Call for press identification. And I see none.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Smith: Comments from Provost **Gibson**.

Gibson: I don’t have any comments today, thank you.

Smith: Thank you.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Smith: Faculty Chair **Funderburk** is not yet here.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JERRY SMITH

Smith: I do have one comment concerning a topic that came up after I sent out my meeting preview email on Friday. You may have noticed a couple of things, one of which was the PowerPoint presentation from Monday's Cabinet meeting that I sent with that email. The President is putting together a group to address campus efficiency issues, and, I believe, if I'm not mistaken, to work with the consulting firm that will be conducting an efficiency study for the Regents. I don't know if it's called the Campus Efficiency Committee. I don't know if it has a formal name. It doesn't matter. It's been suggested that the faculty have a representative on that group, something that both the President and the Provost support. So I wanted to ask if any of you would be willing to serve in this capacity. We don't need to identify somebody right now, but I would like to be able to provide Provost **Gibson** with a name at our meeting—at or before our meeting next Monday. So, if you're interested, you can step forward now or you can think about it and let me know during the week. If we have more than one nominee, I'll have the Senate decide next week, but—
Senator **Strauss**?

Strauss: My question is, who is the extant members of the Committee?

Smith: I don't know.

Strauss: Michael **Hager** is one. Is that correct?

Gibson: I think he will be either chairing or co-chairing. I'm not sure. I mean, the--it

Strauss: My point is this—is that putting just a faculty member on the Committee leads to an unequal power distribution? I think that a faculty/academic administrator like Dr. **Licari** there would better serve the faculty in terms of power distribution. That’s my recommendation.

Gibson: I do plan to have an Academic Affairs rep. I mean, I feel that there should be a representative from the Faculty Senate

Strauss: In addition to?

Gibson: in addition to Academic Affairs.

Strauss: Well, good. Then that starts to load the gun up. [laughter around] That shouldn’t go in the Minutes. [more laughter]

Smith: Vice Chair **Kidd** has expressed some interest in serving on this Committee. Would everybody be comfortable with that? [heads nod] Well, then let’s count that as you are our designee/appointee, whatever you will be called on this Committee. Thank you. Ok, then done with comments.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Smith: Let’s go with Minutes for approval. We have to approve the Minutes from our last meeting which was way back on January 13th. It’s been a while. [The January 27th meeting was moved due to weather and school cancellation that date. It will take place February 17th, next Monday.] Those Minutes have been distributed to all the relevant parties. I need a motion to approve those Minutes.

Nelson: So move.

Smith: By Senator **Nelson**. Seconded by Senator **Peters** [who indicated]. Any discussion? All in favor, say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say “No.” [none heard] Motion carries. Those Minutes are approved.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1223, Request for Emeritus Status, Duane **Bartak**

Calendar Item 1224, Request for Emeritus Status, Phyllis **Carlin**

Smith: Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing of which there are four, but I’d like the first two—both emeritus requests—I’d like to docket those through a single vote. Calendar Item #1223, which would become Docket Item #1119, is a request for emeritus status for Duane **Bartak**. Calendar Item #1224, which would become Docket Item #1120, is a request for emeritus status for Phyllis Carlin. Any discussion of the wisdom of docketing these in regular order? No such discussion. Then I would like a motion to that effect, to docket these in regular order. Moved by Senator **Kirmani**. Do we have a second? From Senator **Nelson**. Any discussion of this motion? Then we will vote on it. All in favor, say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No.” [none heard] Motion carries. These items have both been added to our Docket.

Calendar Item 1225, Policy on the Assignment and Changing of Grades

Smith: The next item to be considered for docketing is Calendar Item #1225, which would become Docket #1121, Policy on the Assignment and Changing of Grades. Now some of you may recall, and we have Francis **Degnin** here, the Chair of the EPC [Educational Policies Commission]. This issue came up last year and created a kerfuffle. We sent it back to the EPC which has proposed a revision to the policy and is forwarding that revision for our consideration. So, any discussion of the wisdom of docketing this item, again, in regular order? Then, I will need a vote to docket in regular order—a motion, rather.

O’Kane: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **O’Kane**. Second? By Senator **Degnin** [who indicated]. All in favor—any discussion of this issue? Then a vote. All in favor of docketing Calendar Item #1225 in regular order, please say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say “No.” That motion carries.

Calendar Item 1226, Interdisciplinary and LAC Curriculum Proposals

The final item on our Docket is Calendar Item #1226, which would become Docket #1122, Interdisciplinary and LAC (Liberal Arts Core) Curriculum Proposals. And I noted this in my meeting preview e-mail. I hadn’t prepared this petition at the same time as I prepared the others because I wasn’t sure, at that time, if there would be proposals that fit under this heading. There are such proposals, and so we need to get them on board for us to address, and I am hoping, in doing that, we could docket this at the end of the order for today’s business, so they’d fall right in line with the other curriculum proposals. Any discussion of the wisdom of docketing Calendar Item 1226 at the end of the Docket for today’s business? [none heard] Then I need a motion to that effect. Moved by Senator **Kirmani** [who indicated]. Seconded by Senator **Peters** [who indicated]. Any discussion of this? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Do we have—so we have all the—we have the UCC (University Curriculum Committee) Minutes for everything else, but did we have the UCC Minutes for this stuff?

Smith: They were

Peters: I mean, I guess what I’m saying is I’m not sure that I’m prepared to even know what might need to be pulled out of it and what need to—not that I think we’ll actually get there today.

Smith: Uh huh. They were covered in UCC Minutes. There was one that was left out of the batch I sent you. I subsequently got it from Associate

Provost **Licari**. I'm not sure if it was in that or one of the other batches, but I can send it around if you want. There isn't a lot there, but

Licari: Yeah, I guess just as point of clarification, Liberal Arts Core Curriculum Proposals and Interdisciplinary Proposals were—they're intertwined throughout the Minutes, the various Minutes from the UCC. LAC courses were discussed as part of the collegiate material that was going through the UCC, rather than being pulled out and discussed as separate LAC curricular items. So, you'll find Liberal Arts Core material intertwined throughout the totality of the UCC Minutes, and I can't remember—the one set of Minutes that I followed up on with you late—I can't remember what particularly was in that day's worth of Minutes.

Smith: I can't either for sure. Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: It looks to me like the bulk of it was the November 13th Minutes.

Licari: Ok.

Cutter: The—it says Review of Interdisciplinary Proposals, LAC, and Miscellaneous.

Licari: There were a few items. The rest of the Liberal Arts Core items, though, were handled throughout the deliberation of the UCC, so you'll find them throughout all of the Minutes, actually.

Smith: And we may well not get to this today, but if we do, and you still have concerns, then we could potentially hold off on it, if those become significant. Given that discussion, are we ready to vote on docketing this at the end of the order of today's business? [nods around] Then all in favor of doing so, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "Nay or no or whatever." [none heard] Ok, thank you. This has been docketed.

NEW BUSINESS

Smith: Now, New Business. Does anyone have an item of New Business they would like the Senate to address? And as part of that I might ask Faculty Chair **Funderburk** [who had since arrived] if he has any comments that he wanted to include?

Funderburk: No. I think everybody received my note [via email] yesterday, so that's—unless somebody had a question I could answer for them....

Smith: Ok. Any other New Business to come before the Senate? [none heard] Then that is done.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET 1112, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, BETTY A. **DEBERG**
(regular order) (**EDGINTON/STRAUSS**)

Smith: And we are ready to consider the items on today's Docket, the first of which is Calendar Item #1216, Docket #1112, Request for Emeritus Status for Betty **DeBerg**. Need a motion to approve this request. Moved by Senator **Strauss** [who indicated]. Seconded by Senator **Edginton** [who indicated]. And discussion. I do have a statement to read from Professor Reinhold **Bubser**, who served as Professor **DeBerg's** Dean in the former College of Humanities and Fine Arts. But before—well, let me—I'll read my statement, and anybody else who wants to speak up thereafter will be welcome to do so. It is extensive.

Again, this is from Professor Reinhold **Bubser**:

"I am writing this statement on behalf of Professor Betty DeBerg who retired from the University of Northern Iowa at the end of December 2013 and who has been nominated for emeritus status. To be clear, this is more than a statement on Professor DeBerg's professional achievements at UNI. It should serve as a letter of commendation and special recognition for a

colleague who has served this institution with utmost distinction. I therefore consider it an honor and a privilege to write this letter in support of Professor DeBerg's nomination.

“Before coming to UNI, Professor DeBerg was a faculty member in the Department of Theology at Valparaiso University (1988-1997) and held administrative positions in development, admissions, and financial aid in the Divinity School at Vanderbilt University. She joined the University of Northern Iowa as Head and Professor in the Department of Philosophy and World Religions in August 1997. During her ten years at the helm of that Department, Professor DeBerg was instrumental in creating a program in medical ethics and in coordinating the activities that led to the establishment of the David W. Wilson Chair in Business Ethics. In instituting an impressive number of curricular and organizational changes in the department, she not only advanced its academic programs but also provided it with greater visibility on campus and in the community.

“As Associate Dean and later as Dean of the former College of Humanities and Fine Arts (CHFA), I have had the opportunity to work and interact with Professor DeBerg since her arrival on the UNI campus. Because of her outstanding administrative talent and expertise, I asked Professor DeBerg to join the College's administrative team in 2008 as Assistant to the Dean. In this capacity, she worked tirelessly and effectively in a whole host of CHFA initiatives and programs, from student recruitment and grant writing to faculty development and alumni relations. Professor DeBerg expertly mentored CHFA faculty members as Administrative Fellows, preparing them for future administrative positions. A multitude of other contributions on the College and University level serve as evidence that Professor DeBerg excelled in her academic leadership roles and that UNI as a whole greatly benefitted from her extensive organizational knowledge and versatile skills.

As a researcher, Professor DeBerg has contributed outstanding work in the areas of religion, education, and American culture. Her study of religion on American college and university campuses, of evangelical Protestant visual art, and of the work of women in U.S. Protestantism are significant contributions to her field. Her National Study of Campus Ministries was

supported with major grants from the Fund for Theological Education and the Lilly Endowment. But especially significant is her work on American fundamentalism and gender which changed the entire course of scholarship on this significant American religious and cultural movement. The first-rate quality of her scholarly work resulted in book publications by university presses, articles in major journals, invited presentations, academic consultations, and editorial activities; all of them substantiate the respect and stature Professor DeBerg has garnered by colleagues and organizations in her academic discipline.

“For her professionalism, her personal integrity, and her adherence to principled academic administration, as well as her tireless commitment to her students, who attest to her ability in the classroom and as an adviser, Professor DeBerg will be sorely missed by many at UNI. The University can be proud of being able to count among its faculty a scholar and administrator of her caliber.

“Therefore, I am very pleased to offer my colleague and friend, Professor DeBerg, my wholehearted endorsement for her nomination for emeritus status and my very best wishes for her retirement.

“Sincerely,
“Reinhold K. Bubser, Professor
“Department of Languages and Literatures”

Is there anyone else who would care to speak on behalf of Professor **DeBerg**’s or in regard to Professor **DeBerg**’s nomination? Senator **Degnin**.

Degnin: I was actually—the thing that was most exciting when I saw—when Jesse [Senator **Swan**] asked me to sit in for him today—was that Dr. **DeBerg** was coming up for emeritus status. I’m in her Department. She has been an outstanding scholar, a great administrator, outstanding colleague. I think just the level of service she’s done for this University is phenomenal, and definitely she stands probably in the top 1% of all the emeritus people, so she’s more than just—more than qualified.

Smith: Thank you. Anyone else? Yes, Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: Betty was a great champion of faculty rights and I think will be long remembered for her advocacy on behalf of faculty. She was unafraid to ask the difficult questions that needed to be asked at various times in the history of the University. Sometimes very uncomfortable for faculty, administrators, and others. But Betty was there when those questions needed to be asked, and we should be very appreciative of her willingness to do so.

Smith: Ok, thank you. Other comments? Then, we are ready to vote on this request. All in favor of endorsing Professor DeBerg's request for emeritus status, please say "Aye." Opposed, say "No." That motion carries.

DOCKET 1113, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, DOUGLAS T. **PINE**
(regular order) (**KIRMANI/HESTON**)

Smith: The next item of business on our Docket is Calendar Item #1217, Docket #1113, a Request for Emeritus Status for Douglas T. **Pine**. I need a motion to approve this request. Moved by Senator **Kirman**. Second?

Nelson: Second.

Smith: By Senator **Nelson**. Any discussion? I have a supportive statement. To preface this, Professor **Pine** was in the Department of Industrial Technology, from which he retired some years ago, in 2000. I have a statement of support from Professor Mohammed **Fahmy**, who is the Head of the Department of Technology.

And the statement goes as follows:

"Dear Professor Smith:

"I'm writing you in support of Dr. Douglas Pine's request for the status of Emeritus Professor. Dr. Pine served our department in several capacities before his retirement in an exceptional manner. His devices to students

included advising the Society of Manufacturing Engineers (SME) student club, leading them to numerous national achievements. His service to the department included being the coordinator of our Manufacturing Technology Program and several other contributions which he has completed in an exemplary way. I do strongly support his request for granting the Emeritus Professor status.

“Regards,
“Mohammed F. Fahmy,
“Professor and Department Head,
“Department of Technology.”

Any other comments with regard to this nomination? Then we are, I believe, ready to vote on it. All in favor of endorsing Professor Pine’s request for emeritus status, please say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say “No.” [none heard] That motion carries.

DOCKET 1114, EXTENDED AND SEPARATE EXAM ADMINISTRATION (regular order) (**COOLEY/DOLGENER**)

Smith: The 3rd item of business on today’s Docket is Calendar #1218, Docket #1114 entitled Extended and Separate Exam Administration. And let’s begin this again with a motion to approve. Do I have such a motion?

Nelson: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Nelson**. Second?

Kirmani: Second.

Smith: Second by Senator **Kirmani**. Now we can begin to discuss the matter. And as you may know, this petition was submitted by Professor Susan **Wurtz**, another recent retiree from the [Faculty] Senate, along with Professor **DeBerg**, but one who served for three years as the Senate Chair. And so we’ve asked Professor **Wurtz** to join us. And, Susan, you do know the drill: We’d like you to begin our discussion of this petition with a

statement from you that kind of talks us through it, after which individual Senators may well want to ask you questions and engage in a discussion. So I'm turning the floor over to you, Susan.

Wurtz: Thank you, and while that was an introduction, I think I'm supposed to say, I'm Susan **Wurtz** so that we're absolutely certain that the recording picks that up as well. And I have to say I've been sitting on my hands. Like the old fire horse, every time someone says, "Is there a motion?" "The vote.", it's like [motions of resisting raising her hands; light laughter around]. "I'm not on the Senate anymore. Keep your mouth shut. Keep your hands down." [motions of sitting on her hands]

The petition itself outlines my major concerns with this, and it came to a head last semester when I was juggling the schedule of two students, both needing extended exam time, both coming to me saying, "Here it is. I'm happy to do it." Many of you know I live with narcolepsy, a disability. I totally get the appropriateness of accommodations. On the other hand, running around the building with students in tow, looking for a room that happens to be available, that meets the need for privacy, the need for silence, at a time that both the student is available for the 2 hours and I'm available for the 2 hours, on a day when I'm giving exams in my regular classes—and, by the way, I had two students who needed extended time that day—and one of these students had just started working with Student Disabilities and was not entirely comfortable. To be fair, he was not receiving much family support. They were embarrassed that he was asking for this. It would have been so easy to lose him out of the system at that point, because he was embarrassed as we moved from room to room, looking for a place for him.

I would like to see this be part of standard operating procedure, a normal piece so that it's not accommodation. It is simply different abilities; we've got it built in. Some facility on campus of small study carrel-type exam rooms—they don't need to be large—that can be reserved by the students. The professor can send exams over. I wouldn't recommend University Mail for obvious reasons, but certainly digital forms or faculty walking them over. There would need to be lockers so that students could put their possessions in a safe place that they couldn't take into the room with them.

We've been doing this long enough. We should be able to run this as a logistics problem: how many rooms do we need and what facilities can be made available? I'd like to see the Senate say, "Yeah, let's do this."

Smith: Thank you, Susan. Any questions or—let's start with questions for Susan and engage in a discussion?

Degnin: Susan, the question I have is, I'm assuming that something like this would need to be dual-use, because otherwise the couple times we'd be using it we'd be using it a lot, but then it would be empty. And so what kind of dual-use do you have in mind?

Wurtz: Well, my question there is, let's talk to the Student Services office. How many students do we have at any point in time that have the paperwork which says "This student will need extended exam time." We should be able to predict the amount of time that such a room would be used. I don't have access to that information, but you guys [the Faculty Senate] can ask for it.

Smith: One question I had was whether this was intended only for students with disabilities, or would any students needing to take an exam at a time other than that normally scheduled, would any such student be eligible for this service?

Wurtz: Oh, my lord, I hadn't thought about that, but for make-up exam purposes, that would be way cool. So, yes, if we've got the facilities, probably an extended use beyond simply disabilities. That would also make it even more so just normal business as usual, not a stigma attached to it.

Smith: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I think this makes sense. When I taught at the University of Cincinnati almost 15 years ago, this was standard practice. So I think we're way behind the times on this. But I do want to say that we would want to oversee it somehow very closely in terms of security. I'm aware of incidents on other campuses where student workers had access to test materials and where abuses happened. As a result of that, copies of exams

getting out, things like that. So, I would want to make sure that we had some kind of protocol in place that was being overseen by professional staff members in the office, not by students.

Wurtz: And I do agree with you, but we have that—at least we attempt to have it in place with word processing units. I have an exam that got out, and, yes, I understand the angst of that situation.

Smith: Yes, Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: So, who's going to proctor it?

Wurtz: An employee with Student Services? That's a decision that would have to be made. But it certainly doesn't require the specialized knowledge of the teaching faculty member to be proctoring an exam. Our time should be spent in teaching and research, not so much in proctoring.

Dolgener: And I'm assuming that this would be something we could use if we chose and wouldn't have to use it.

Wurtz: I would let the Educational Policies Committee [*sic* Commission] make that decision. I wouldn't envision that.....unless the students really, really liked it and the students wanted it.

Smith: Senator **Degnin**.

Degnin: I'm thinking here. I mean, I like the idea, but I'm thinking here that it's—that what you're really proposing now is that we approach the idea and then we study the possible proposals, because we have to figure out where the funding is coming from, all sorts of internal matters, I presume.

Wurtz: Exactly, and the [Faculty] Senate has the ability to request the information, to look at the budgeting issues, that the Senate is the right place for doing this.

Smith: Yes, if this were approved, I guess I would accept it as my responsibility to work with the Administration and talk about trying—how it could be done to implement it, what was necessary, etc.? That should fall on me or the incoming Chair. Any more discussion of this? Senator **O’Kane.**

O’Kane: Susan, I wonder how often you have this—that kind of a problem where you’ve got two students you’re trying to juggle it and find them both a spot? Or are we talking about a situation that is so rare that we need not worry about it.

Wurtz: The two students was one time, but regularly throughout the semester it does become—because you’re giving exams, 3 or 4, mid-terms, plus the final, and as more students—as we are becoming a society more understanding, I am quite certain that we will see increased requests for this kind of service, and the proactive “Let’s figure out how to smoothly deal with it now,” I think would be good strategy.

Smith: I might ask our Academic Affairs people if they feel that this would be feasible from an implementation standpoint. Do you see this as difficult to implement? Is it—would it be extremely costly? What’s your top of the head kind of reaction to this?

Gibson: Well, that’s what I was just asking Mike—you know, what the implications would be as far as costs, and I don’t know. Mike? [Associate Provost **Licari**]

Licari: Right now the staffing of—you know, overseeing the proctoring of exams probably would be a challenge. I think space would be a huge challenge for Student Disability Services, for example, to take this on. They don’t have the space themselves. So, you know, to the extent these are roadblocks, they are there. They would be challenges that would be overcome, if, you know, the collective will was that we really wanted to have this, then we could probably make it happen. But it’s not like there’s a set of empty offices in the Student Disability Services sitting there waiting to be used with some staff members standing around waiting to proctor exams. You get my drift—that there would be resource implications.

Wurtz: There are never extra resources sitting in a corner waiting to be snapped up.

Licari: So—but the added challenge is that Student Disability Services, of course, is underneath the Division of Student Affairs, and they're not sitting around the table here, so there would need to be some coordination with that Division as well.

Smith: Any other comments or questions? Senator **Hakes**.

Hakes: Doesn't Disability Services already provide some of these services for vision impaired and things of that nature? I thought I....

Licari: You know, to be honest, I don't know.

Hakes: I think they do.

Licari: There's some testing—there is testing facilities in the Student Disability Services, but I'm not sure how that's scheduled, and I don't know what the usage levels are of that.

Smith: Senator **Nelson**.

Nelson: When I've had students who needed accommodations, I've had the option of having my test sent to Student Disability Services, and they would take care of it, or the option of scheduling the student myself. So I think perhaps a good first step would be to consult with them about what they currently are able to do, then we would know the baseline and see if we need to consider additional services.

Smith: So, would that be a suggestion that we table this and find out some of those things? And then before we decide to vote on it...?

Nelson: Uh huh.

Wurtz: Yeah, I was trying to pare this down instead of going on forever. My understanding is they will no longer do that. They had done it in the past and that that's not something they do anymore. They did send me over to—what is the Center there in the, used to be swimming pool?

Licari: The Academic Learning Center.

Wurtz: Academic Learning Center, and they did proctor one of those for me when it was that crunch time, but it wasn't normal, standard procedure where there was a smooth way to do it.

Licari: The Student Disability Services testing facility is, well, there's some shared space in the Academic Learning Center. The Academic Learning Center is—didn't used to do this, but SDS—it's space concerns needed some additional space, and then there were some staffing arrangements that needed to be juggled as well, so what's cobbled together now is probably not equipped to handle an increase in work expectations.

Smith: Senator **Degnin**.

Degnin: In the interest of time, I think that where we're really going with this is that we need to go study it more. So I think that—I don't know what's the exact proposal on the table, but my proposal would just be that we vote on whether to ask the Chair to find people or talk to more people, to study it and get back to us.

Smith: So then I would take that as a vote to table this. [nods around]

Degnin: Table that would allow us to ask more questions. Yeah, we need to know more about it.

Smith: So table this pending the receipt of further information when we pick it up again. And I'm taking that as a motion to table it?

Degnin: Yes.

Smith: Is there a second for that? Seconded by Senator **Walter** [who indicated]. Is there any discussion of the motion to table this item until we can gather further information, answer some questions, and then come back and vote on it? [none heard] Then we're ready to vote on the tabling motion. All in favor of tabling this, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] Ok. So, it is tabled then. That will take care of it for today's business, and what I'll do is I'll be in touch with Professor **Wurtz** and also to you [Senators] what questions do you have? And then we'll collectively to get some information that would help us, the Senate, decide on this in the future. Ok. Thank you, Susan.

Wurtz: Thank you.

DOCKET 1115, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION CURRICULUM PROPOSALS (regular order) (**DOLGENER/O'KANE**)

Smith: All right. Then, having addressed the first 3 items on today's Docket, we are now ready to address the remaining 5, all of which are Curriculum Proposals. And as I've said in various communications, I'm hoping that the [Faculty] Senate will be willing to treat the various College and other Curriculum Packages as something like consent agendas, where the default assumption is that we approve all proposals that have been approved and forwarded to us by the UCC (University Curriculum Committee) and GCCC (Graduate College Curriculum Committee) except in cases where we are persuaded by one or more of our senatorial colleagues that an individual item deserves special attention. In such cases, after an initial discussion of the wisdom of doing so, we will vote on whether or not to divide the issue, which in such—or divide question, which in such cases would amount to pulling the item in question from the Package for individual consideration. And I told everyone who's asked me—and there's lots of your colleagues and people across campus always are concerned about curriculum and what the [Faculty] Senate does—I've told everyone who's asked that the Senate won't reject any Curriculum Proposal today or even on other occasions without relevant parties having had an opportunity to meet with us and to speak on its behalf. And I'm hoping that you're supportive of that general approach. So what we do is table

any items we pulled from the Packages to be addressed at subsequent meetings, and then would vote on whether or not to approve the remaining parts of each of these Curriculum Packages as we address them. Any questions or discussions in how we're going to proceed with these Curriculum Proposals?

Edginton: I have a question about items that have been pulled from the Packet for whatever reason that have really not come back to the faculty, and so—and I can give you a specific example if you'd like and if you think it's appropriate now.

Smith: What I would think—what we will see is I think we're going to find that there are a couple of items that came up with these Curriculum Proposals that are ones that the [Faculty] Senate will want to discuss sometime this semester, and I would suggest that we add that particular concern to the list, and I think there are going to be some more, so we don't have to decide on it today or even discuss it today. Just, you know—and we don't want to let it hold up our addressing the Curriculum Packages in front of us. But I will remind you that when we get to these issues that we think are kind of like policy issues that you could want to bring that up and put that on the table as something that deserves further discussion from the Senate. If you're comfortable with that Senator **Edginton?**

Edginton: I am, except that in lieu of the fact that there's no explanation about why something has been pulled from a Packet, I want to be able to have the opportunity to reintroduce it at whatever level is appropriate, to have the conversation. So, that's got to be a part of the discussion at some point in the future also. You know, what are the appeal procedures?

Smith: Ok, and you're talking about dealing with particular Proposals or in the general _____ (?level?)

Edginton: Well, it's a general issue that—where we need to establish what the policy should be, #1. And then #2 there is a level of specificity that, you know, I think we need to come back to inside of the College of Education, School of HPELS Packet, Division of Leisure, Youth, and Human Services, but I think the general conversation should take place about the policy.

Smith: Ok, very good. Then we can begin by taking up Calendar Item 1219, Docket 1115, the College of Business Administration Curriculum Proposals, and, again, I need a motion to approve this package.

Dolgener: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Dolgener** . Second? Senator **Walter**. [who indicated] And discussion. Now, at this time it is appropriate to bring to the Senate's attention any Proposal in the Package that you believe warrants special attention on our part. And I'm open to suggestions of this kind. I will say I have one thing that I think we should talk about, but I'll let you folks put out your suggestions before I dump mine on you. [none heard] Then I guess I'm going to dump mine on you. [indications of others wanting to speak] Oh? Sorry, Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Well, the one thing I noticed, and I suspect it's the same thing you're about the point out here, is the 1000, 2000, 3000, and 4000 no-credit courses. And it's not that I necessarily have an objection to those courses per se, but it's just that this is only the second time I've been through this, and I know some of you have been through it more than that, and this question of "What is a zero-credit course?" versus "What is a one-hour credit course?" for these kinds of professionalization seminars seems to be something that we come back to every single curriculum cycle, and whether it's in a context of approving these particular courses or whether it's just an attempt to make a broader policy about what you need to do to get academic credit, I think it's worth the Senate's attention to it in some way.

Smith: Any other discussion? That is the issue that I had planned to bring up, and I'm happy that the Senator brought it up. Any other discussion of this? Yes, Senator **O'Kane**.

O'Kane: Some years ago when I was not on the [Faculty] Senate, Biology also had a course that was zero credits, and I don't recall if that was discussed by the Senate, but that course went away because there was

some kind of objection to it. So I don't know if anybody recalls that, but the students in particular perceived that as a problem.

Smith: Yeah. I can speak from the College of Business Administration. I know some students who have troubles with this. On the other hand, they should be happy, because they are not being charged for something. And the motivation in the case at hand is these courses teach professional skills, and so they're less academic than what typically goes on in courses. But they are important skills that we want our students to have, and so you use the course requirement as a way of forcing students to take them, but they get it for free, and so that's the argument for it being zero. But I agree with Scott's [Senator **Peters**] point that this is something that we should discuss. It shouldn't hold us—it shouldn't hold up approval of the College's Curriculum Package, but we should put it on the list with the point raised earlier by Professor **Edginton**, Senator **Edginton**, that here's something that this semester we collectively talk about and decide how to dispose of this and where to go with it. So if you're comfortable with—Senator **Peters**?

Peters: Well, I do have a question that might be directed at Associate Provost **Licari**, could I—my recollection in the UCC Minutes is that these were approved sometime in the past, and then since these have been approved, no other zero-credit courses have been approved? Is that correct?

Licari: That is correct.

Peters: And so zero-credit courses have come up for approval and explicitly been rejected?

Licari: By the UCC, correct.

Peters: By the UCC since the creation of these.

Licari: The Biology class was indeed one of the items that came before the UCC a few years ago in the last curricular cycle, and that zero-credit class was rejected by the UCC. But since these courses were already on the books, the UCC used the logic of, well, these were just—I think they were

description changes or something like that to something that was already in the catalog. The UCC did not feel that it could remove those from the catalog. But, what I did then subsequent to this—to all of the UCC meetings and in my memo that I wrote to Dr. **Smith** [Faculty Senate Chair], in my capacity as Chair of that Committee, that I requested that the Senate provide guidance to the UCC on this issue because it is coming up every curricular cycle. The Committee is unsure what to do with Proposals like this, and so we're seeking guidance from the [Faculty] Senate on it.

Smith: So, if you're supportive, I'm suggesting that we put this on the list of things—topics—that we're going to talk about hopefully sometime this semester, and either ourselves resolve it or kind of foist it off on somebody else that we hope can resolve it [light laughter around]. But we're not going to sweep it under the rug. We're going to address this down the road. But we're not going to, at this point, let this hold up approval of the Curriculum Package. Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: But we are going to table that part of the Business Package?

Smith: Well, no, we're not going to, because that doesn't—we're going ahead and approving their Proposal because their Proposal—the UCC recommended approving it. We're not going to not approve what they've recommended. We're going to talk to the policy issue.

Cutter: Oh. My understanding was that Scott [Senator **Peters**] had just asked that we table it so we could discuss this particular Proposal in the context of that because the UCC asked for some guidance.

Smith: I personally wouldn't see the value in tabling the Proposal because it has been approved by the UCC. I think that the point is for us to give the UCC some guidance on policy, which is what they've asked for.

Peters: It doesn't really matter to me whether we—I mean, one way to do it would be to pull out that Proposal and use that as a vehicle to have that discussion, and have that discussion, and then at that point decide, ok, let's—you know, let's approve these or not approve these. And then do whatever we need to do in terms of policy. The other option would be, as

Jerry [Chair **Smith**] is laying out which is to assume that these are ok since they were approved by the UCC and only address the policy.

Smith: Yeah, I don't see why we need to have Curriculum Proposals as a vehicle for our addressing the policy. I think we can address the policy. Because we're the Senate, we can do that. Senator **Degnin**.

Peters: I mean, it's really up to the Senators whether they—but I personally don't have a preference of which way we do it.

Degnin: I'm a little confused by your logic, maybe because I don't understand the procedure, but by what you've said, Jerry [Chair **Smith**], the Senate actually doesn't have the authority to disapprove anything.

Smith: Oh, we have the authority to disapprove. I'm saying, as I said, we're not going to disapprove anything today. The worse thing we do is table things, and that

Degnin: Right, and that

Smith: We could decide to do that.

Degnin: So that would be acceptable then if Scott [Senator **Peters**] or Barbara [Senator **Cutter**] wanted to say, "Let's table this part of the Proposal."

Smith: But if we do that, then what we're setting up is, ok, next meeting we're going to have to have the College of Business Administration come in and defend their thing. And we're not really challenging what they're doing in the context of their Proposals. What we're really concerned with is this policy regarding zero-credit courses. And so, for me, if we were to table it, we're kind of saying, "Gee, we got troubles with their Proposal." What we really have is uncertainty about how to handle zero-credit courses, whether we should have them at all. And so I don't see why we should stop the College of Business Administration's Proposals because of our

Degnin: Well, the logic of it would be—and I'm not saying this is my position, but the logic of it would be that if we have—if people have sufficient concerns about the whole zero-credit option period, the logic would be that they want to delay approving it until they resolve those concerns.

Smith: See these courses, though, have already been approved. They are already there. They're just shuffling them around. It's as Associate Provost **Licari** said, more of an administrative shift. It isn't like we're talking about approving new zero-credit courses.

Peters: There are no new courses at all.

Smith: We're not doing that.

Peters: They are renumbering them.

Degnin: Ok, ok.

Smith: Yeah. Senator **Kidd**. We'll get to you next [to Senator **MacLin**]. [some joking about those on left side being left out]

Kidd: So I guess my question is different now. So these courses already exist?

Smith: The courses exist.

Kidd: Oh, ok. So I was just afraid that if you had a new course, then we'd have to back-track on it.

Smith: No, there are no—this is not a Proposal for new zero-credit courses.

Kidd: Ok.

Smith: Senator **MacLin**.

MacLin: I was just going to quickly add that what we're really doing is supporting the UCC's decision that they have made, that they aren't going to mess with this one because they're already on the books. We're not approving any new zero-credit courses, but they'd like our feedback. I would be interested in having this conversation on a policy level sometime this semester because there's also different ways that it's used throughout the different Colleges. Some of these courses are 1 credit, some are 3 credits. Some people who have 1-credit courses have been told they can't have it 3 credits, but there are 3-credit courses that exist that are very similar to these zero-credit courses. So I think that we do need to discuss this, but it seems that we're just supporting the UCC's rationale that this isn't a new course, let them do what they need to do with it because it's already on the books. Is that correct?

Smith: Yes. Senator **Cutter.**

Cutter: You know, I feel it doesn't really matter to me which way we do it as long as we discuss it, but I think it's important for everybody to know that when the UCC did approve this—this is from the October 28th, 2009, Minutes—they had to have 2 long meetings about this, bring people in, and the people vote was actually 3 yes, 1 no, and 2 abstentions. So this created—it wasn't like the UCC was unanimous in any way here. They had some concerns that, you know, that keep coming up. So we really are going to need to deal with this, I think.

Smith: So, if you're comfortable, what we will do then is put this on our list of things that we're going to talk about and address, but we're not going to hold up or delete or table anything from the College of Business Administration's Curriculum Package, and then we are now prepared, if I am not mistaken, to vote on that Package. Is there any further discussion? [none heard] All in favor of approving the College of Business Administration's Curriculum Package, say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No?" [none heard] It is approved.

DOCKET 1116, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION CURRICULUM PROPOSALS (regular order) (**DOLGENER/O’KANE**)

Smith: Next item on our Calendar is Calendar Item—on our Agenda is Calendar Item #1220, Docket #1116, the College of Education Curriculum Proposals. And, again, I need a motion to approve this package. Senator **Edginton** [who indicated] moves. Second? Senator **Gould** [who indicated]. Discussion. And, again, are there any Proposals within the College of Education Package that any of you believe the Senate should discuss? That warrants our attention and that we basically want to divide the question, pull out of the Package, get into it at a subsequent meeting at which time we will have relevant parties from the College and/or Departments here to talk with us about their Proposals? Any items that deserve that special level of attention? I can tell you, personally I didn’t have any, for what that’s worth. [none heard] Is there any more discussion of this package? [none heard] Then we are ready to vote on it. All in favor of approving the College of Education Curriculum Proposals, please say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” It is approved.

DOCKET 1117, COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SCIENCES CURRICULUM PROPOSALS (regular order) (**DOLGENER/O’KANE**)

Smith: Now, we’re getting down to serious business here. Our third and largest set of Curriculum Proposals comes to us as Calendar Item #1221, Docket #1117, the College of Humanities, Arts, and Sciences Curriculum Proposals. And, again, we begin with a motion to approve this Package.

Nelson: So move.

Smith: Senator **Nelson**. Seconded by Senator **O’Kane** [who indicated]. Any Proposals within the CHAS Package that any of you believe the Senate should discuss? I do have some on my list, most of which were identified by Associate Provost **Licari** in his 1/7/14 memo, which I did share with you. Any suggestions here? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I have one that's a little bit different, and I'll—I have one that I wonder if it might be worth our attention bringing up for positive attention, not because—not because we may kill it. I think that what Philosophy and World Religions did with their majors is spectacular and may be a model for what Programs on campus that are faced with a sort of headwinds in terms of, you know, bad publicity about Humanities majors and things like that, what they can do to reshape a major and make it marketable and relevant. And I just—I think it deserves a special kudos. I think I would just like the [Faculty] Senate to find a way to highlight the work that that Department has done on its major, and so whether we think it's worth our time to actually separate it out, I don't know. Francis [alternate **Degnin**] is here. Maybe he can say whether the Department would want to come and talk about it, but we are going to be very busy, obviously, talking about all these things, so if we decide not to do it, at least it's in the Minutes now, and everyone, if you haven't looked at Philosophy and World Religions majors, you should do it, because they did a fantastic job restructuring those majors.

Smith: Could you—could you just say conceptual—at a conceptual level what did they do?

Peters: The Philosophy Major—well, Francis can probably speak to it better than I can, but the Philosophy Major was restructured around 4 concrete learning—or 5 maybe—concrete learning outcomes, and the Major is stated as various specific statements about what philosophy majors will be able to do when they graduate. “Philosophy majors will be able to analyze”—you know, I'm making this up now—but “analyze complicated situations. Will be able to deal with ethical conundrums.” And then the 5th one is “They will be able to make these all relevant in professional settings,” and it involves an experiential learning requirement. And so all their courses were restructured based on being able to demonstrate exactly what philosophy majors will be able to do when they graduate from UNI with a Philosophy Degree. And it's—I've seen a mock-up of the brochure they're going to put out, and it's just a very, very creative and I think smart, strategic way to restructure a major, like I say, when you're faced with the kinds of headwinds that so many Humanities majors have been faced with in the last few years.

Smith: Very good. Senator **Degnin**, did you want to add anything to that?

Degnin: Sure, I think that I also want to give—because you mainly have been bringing up the Philosophy restructuring—I want to say that, you know, we did it under an extreme time crunch, and we could not have been successful if the Religion side of our Department hadn't already given us the guidance and done the same thing with theirs. And so it was a lot of work very fast, and I want to acknowledge Ed **Boedeker**, who was Chair of that Committee, as well as my colleagues on that. But the Religion side really set the model that the Philosophy Department was able then to use and modify.

Smith: I will take that as a shout-out for the Philosophy and World Religions Department [light laughter all around]. And it is in the Minutes, and so they should feel applauded by the [Faculty] Senate for what they've done. If no one else has suggestions, let me go through some of the things on my list as ones that we might want to consider, the first of which is something like the zero-credit course issue we just talked about, an issue that I think merits discussion at some near future time but is not a reason to hold up any particular Curriculum Proposal, and that's the matter of defining a distinction between BA and BS programs. This was the--the UCC did kind of talk about this and expressed some concerns and felt they would like to have some guidance on this. They got into it because of a proposal by the Department of Technology which would change their BA Teaching major to a BS Teaching major. And, again, I don't think we should hold up that Proposal because of what's, you know, this kind of uncertainty about what differentiates the two. Again, the UCC was supportive of that proposal, and if the Senate is supportive, I'd like to add this to our list of "Curricular Topics for Future Discussion." So, are we on board with the—Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: Yeah, I want to follow up on that because I think you're right about—I mean, I agree about the BS versus BA, but I think there are reasons to table this particular proposal and talk about it, because we don't have a BS in Teaching, and we don't have hours defined for that, so I think before we have a Program like this go through, we need to define what a

BS in Teaching, in particular, is going to entail in terms of hours and what's a Standard Program versus what's an Extended Program, because this Program really seems to be pushing the boundary of the difference between "standard" and "extended."

Smith: Ok, let's talk to that point then, because what's going to happen now is, if Senator **Cutter** follows through on what she's proposing, we'll have a motion to divide the question. Do we want to talk about that before to give Senator **Cutter** a sense of "Is there a lot of support for doing that" or "Is this something that, gee, we may not want to address in this particular case; we'd rather address it in the general case that I've talked about?" Any discussion here? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I would say that unlike the situation in Business where the—we were just dealing with changings in course numbering, they weren't new courses, this is a new—I mean, it is a change from a BA to BS. I would consider that a major change, and you know, almost equivalent to a new degree program. That is, if we don't act—if we don't approve it, you know, the BS doesn't happen. So, I think it would be an appropriate vehicle to talk about the standards a little bit, and we can hear specifically from Technology and Engineering about why they want to do it, why they think it's appropriate. And then perhaps decide to—even if we decide to approve it, we may still decide there are larger policy issues that need to be dealt with.

Smith: Ok. So, if we want to pursue this, I will need a motion to divide the question—I think it's divide the question—and specifically to split out the Proposal to change the Department of Technology's BA Teaching major to a BS Teaching major, to pull that out in essence of the Package for purposes of our consideration. We will subsequently vote on the remainder of the Package but not—by dividing the question, we are splitting that out, and then we will table that. So, I need a motion to that effect. Moved by Senator **Walter** [who indicated]. Second? Senator **O'Kane** [who indicated]. Discussion of the motion to divide the question here. [none heard] Ok, we're ready to vote on this. All in favor of dividing the question by splitting the Department of Technology's Proposal to change their BA Teaching major to a BS Teaching major, all in favor of splitting that out, please say

“Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] That passes. And so now this is separate from the remainder of the CHAS Curriculum Package which we’ll be talking about and ultimately voting on.

Peters: Now, do we need a motion to table that?

Smith: Yes, it’s good—I guess we do.

Peters: To table the discussion of the BS Technology Teaching Proposal.

Smith: Sounds good. [light laughter around] Moved by Senator **Peters**. Second?

Nelson: Second.

Smith: Second by Senator **Nelson**. Any discussion of the motion to table? [none heard] All in favor of tabling that

Dolgener: Aye.

Smith: particular Proposal, please say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around; then lots of laughter and joking] Sorry to be slowing you down here. Opposed, say “Nay.” [none heard] It is tabled. And now we’re back on the CHAS Package. I’ve got a number of items that—and again, I should say, we did agree that we’re going to have the general discussion of BA versus BS, but in addition to that general discussion, we’re going to be talking—I’ll talk to the or contact the Department of Technology and ask them to come in and, you know, talk with us about their particular Proposal, but the general issue of BA to BS that’s on our set of things that we’re going to be talking about down the road.

Some other items: And a number of things, all of which involve Departments adding courses. Now, again, these are ones—there’s a lot of judgment here. I just wanted to kind of put them out in front of you because I know the Regents are always concerned with this. I know that our Provost often has to explain at Council of Provosts and other meetings: “Hey, why are we adding all these courses and not dropping many?” And

so it seems to me as part of being responsible in managing the curriculum, we ought to be kind of at least thinking about Departmental Proposals where there's lots of course adds and few, if any, course drops. In the case at hand, there are a number of Departments in CHAS that are adding more courses than they are dropping, although none of these cases is as extreme as one that we will encounter in a different College. In saying this, I don't mean to suggest that any of these are not justified. I only want to suggest that this is something that we might want to give attention to.

The Department of Mathematics is adding five new courses, without any drops. The Department of Technology is adding three new courses, with no drops. The Department of Languages and Literature is adding five new courses, with two drops—at least these are my counting. The Department of Theatre is adding four new courses, no drops. The School of Music is adding eight new courses, with two drops. And in each case, there might be excellent justification for the net addition of new courses, and again, in my view, none of these cases are so egregious, in my judgment, that I feel really strongly that we have to get explanations from the Departments. But I wanted to put this in front of the [Faculty] Senate and get your sense of, you know, how do you feel about this? Do you feel we should talk with one or more of these Departments? Again, maybe we've got Professor **Coon** here from the GCCC who could talk about Graduate Proposals. We've got Associate Provost **Licari** who could talk about Undergraduate Proposals. Do you want to talk about this some more? Are there some that you certainly feel we should pull out? What's your sense on this? Senator **O'Kane**.

O'Kane: I have to assume that each of those Proposals has a justification that indicates probably no additional costs, no additional time? Am I right?

Smith: They would have been—using standard boilerplate [laughs]—yeah, they would have been approved by the UCC or GCCC, and they—those bodies, at least, they didn't express significant concerns. Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: Yeah, I want to follow-up on Senator **O'Kane's** point, which is that since they—the GCCC and the UCC did not express any concerns, these did not show up on our list or anything like that, it seems that, you know, the [Faculty] Senate's job is to deal with the concerns. I forget the exact

language, but we talked about this in an earlier meeting where our job to look at curriculum is not to go back and scrutinize everything but to deal with objections and concerns from the lower levels. So, I think we can, you know, rely on their expertise to.....

Smith: I would suggest that we can use our judgment in that regard, and these—some of these did come up and were, you would see in the comments that, in the Minutes at least of the groups, that sometimes if it wasn't Associate Provost **Licari** it was somebody else saying, "Hold it. We're getting a lot here." But you're right. It isn't something that was highlighted as a serious source of concern. Yes, Shoshanna [**Coon**, Associate Dean of the Graduate College]

Coon: Shoshanna **Coon**, Chair of the GCCC. I just wanted to point out in one instance I can easily explain. In the School of Music, they took a course that had had individual sections, this was the Instrumental Jazz Improvisation, and the individual sections were actually separate courses. And this was causing problems in the Advisement Report for tracking whether students had taken the required number of individual courses because section numbers aren't in the Advisement Report. And so we actually requested them to break those out as individual courses. They look like new courses, but there are no resource addition because they were already being taught. So that's the kind of thing that happened a lot in—particularly at the graduate level—and I did send Chair **Smith** that today but quite late, and so I don't know if you had a chance to send it on. So, I apologize for my lateness.

Smith: Thank you. The sense I'm getting is that there isn't a strong feeling that we should pull any of these out and kind of roast the relevant Departments, so that's comfortable with me. [laughter and joking around] Yes, Senator **Degnin**.

Degnin: _____ (too quiet to hear) have done the curriculum cycle stuff. When I went through it before, though, there was also a general rule or guideline that if the course hadn't been taught in a certain number of years, then it normally got dropped. Do we still have that guideline?

Licari: We do. And truth be told that was some of the conversation that came up in the UCC meetings when I would ask the question about resource _____. There was one Department that was a little bit close on the resource concerns, but a lot of the times Departments with new courses had already been teaching them, in some cases several times as experimental courses, and so those new courses were already well established in faculty teaching rotations. The old courses that they were perhaps going to replace weren't formally dropped, but the Department was just going to wait until all of the students were perhaps finished with those old courses, and then they would just be discarded through the natural process of not teaching it for a number of semesters, and it would just vanish out of the catalog.

Smith: Ok. Oh, sorry, Senator **MacLin**.

MacLin: And I would say that both of these explanations are illustrative of the fact that I think the lower bodies have adequately dealt with these issues, and we don't need to be concerned about them.

Smith: Everybody's on board with that then? There is one item that I do feel we need to discuss, based on our recent past practice, and that's a proposal to reinstate the joint Communication-Theatre Teaching major and minor, which had been suspended in 2012 due to low student enrollments. And if you recall, some of you were on the Senate last Spring, and we did this kind of review for other Programs that had been suspended—Women's and Gender Studies, some Geography Programs. And it seemed to me that consistent with that, when you've got a suspended Program, before you reinstate it the Senate ought to be talking about it with the relevant administrators. So I think we should do the same in this case, but, again, I'm open to your suggestions. Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: I'm—I'm actually—sorry, I'm a little confused by that, because when I brought up Women's and Gender Studies, it just came up on its own because it was being fast-tracked. There wasn't any special—there wasn't supposed to be any special treatment by the Senate.

Smith: Well, the Senate did discuss it. We met with you.

Cutter: But—but it's just because it was a stand-alone pack—piece of curriculum.

Smith: Right, but

Cutter: It's not because it was out of the regular chronological cycle. It wasn't because it had been suspended.

Smith: But in principle we could have handled it without having anybody from that Department here to talk with us and answer questions, which in fact we did do both in that case and the case of Geography. And I'm suggesting that if we're talking about a suspended Program, that's significant enough that we ought to talk about it. I'm not suggesting that there's something wrong here. Maybe you don't want to use time in this particular case. It has been approved by the UCC. How do you feel about it? Should we hold this one out and ask people from Communication and Theatre to talk with us about it? Or are you prepared to approve it as is? Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: I would be satisfied to approve it as it is.

Smith: Ok.

Beall: I am representing Marilyn **Shaw**, a non-voting member, but I am from Communication Studies, and Communication Education is my area. We have—we had because that major was suspended, we didn't have new majors, but I did academic advising this summer, and we have 10 new people coming—who just came in the year who are interested. The numbers are increasing because there are more people wanting to teach communication and theatre arts in the high schools, and there are more job openings in Iowa and elsewhere. And, frankly, Iowa is the place that a lot of people internationally and nationally come to get their teachers because of the good work ethic. So I think there's a place for it, and we have worked on setting that up so that we meet the Common Core Standards, the Iowa Standards. We've worked really hard to get that in place.

Smith: So I take that as an argument that this newly-designed program is in good shape, and we can expect it to do well. Are there any other points of discussion here? I'm not hearing a lot of sentiment saying we should pull this out and talk to it, in which case, hey, makes my life easier. That will be fine with me. So, we'll let that one go.

There are several somewhat similar items, although these involve Programs that were asked in 2012 to restructure but they weren't suspended, and actually we've talked to some of those Programs, that being Philosophy, the BA with a major in Philosophy, BA with a major and minor in the Study of Religions. And we've already given them our stamp of approval, so we certainly, I believe—we don't need to do, you know, do anything else with that. Ok, one other thing here.

Peters: Jerry?

Smith: Yes.

Peters: I know there was some email discussion before the—originally—before the meeting that was cancelled a couple weeks ago, there was an email discussion about, I think it was in Theatre with new courses that were going to be dependent upon adjuncts to be taught. I thought I remembered some Senators being interested in discussing that as a separate item, but—so I just thought I would throw that out there. I don't really remember who that was, but there were a couple of people in an email who mentioned them.

Smith: I don't even remember it at all, so I'm a total blank here. Vice-Chair **Kidd.**

Kidd: I had, I guess, a question. Does the—is that something the [Faculty] Senate should even look at? Like, is it our job to look at staffing for courses, or is that something for the UCC or the Provost? That would be my thought here. That's what the discussion I had, that this was not ours.

Smith: Any other thoughts on that issue? Any other specific Curriculum Proposals in the CHAS Curriculum Package that we—that you feel we should talk about?

Peters: I had one conflict that I was wondering if it had been settled.

Smith: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: In the UCC Minutes of November 21st it still mentions a potential dispute between Ed. Psych and Languages and Literature regarding Lang 4750 as a substitute. Did that get worked out?

Licari: It got worked out to the satisfaction of the UCC in terms of whether or not the course itself was approvable. And then, you know, whether or not it would be useful to the Languages and Literature Department, we determined to—the Committee determined that it would be. The Committee then also determined that whether or not it would be something that would be appropriate to exist inside the Teaching Education sequence would be more of a matter for the Teacher Education Senate, and we essentially referred that particular matter to them. The course itself can exist in the Catalog. If the College of Education wishes to use it in an additional capacity, that's not for the UCC's determination basically.

Smith: Then, if there aren't any other specific Curriculum Proposals from this Package that we want to talk about as potential topics for splitting the issue, I believe we're prepared to vote on the CHAS Curriculum Package. And, again, we'll be voting on the entire Package with the exception of the Department of Technology's Proposal to change their BA Teaching Major to a BS Teaching Major. We pulled that out and tabled it. We're prepared to vote on that? All in favor of approving the CHAS curriculum package, as adjusted, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say "No." [none hears] It passes.

DOCKET 1118, COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
CURRICULUM PROPOSALS (regular order) (**DOLGENER/O’KANE**)

Smith: Now, we’re ready to address Calendar Item 1222—we might actually get this done [light laughter all around]—1118, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Curriculum Proposals. I need a motion to approve this set of Proposals.

Strauss: Strauss.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Strauss**. Second? By Senator **Cutter**. And discussion. And I want to begin our discussion by noting there is one Proposal in this Package to which we do have to give special attention, by virtue of our own policies/practices, a request we made several years ago to the Provost: To wit, that the Provost would consult with the Senate in any case where academic units—Programs, Departments, and Colleges—were being restructured or reorganized. We do have a case of that kind, that being the Proposal to suspend the Masters of Public Policy Program as part of moving it under the auspices of the Department of Political Science. And I’ve been in conversation with the Provost, the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. They would like to consult with us in this regard because, in fact, it is our practice now to do that. So, I am asking that we split this Proposal from the rest of the CSBS Package, and to do that we are going to need a motion to divide the question.

Peters: Actually, first, there was a—those are really two separate things. The question of suspending the Program is a completely separate thing from the consult regarding restructuring. Those are two completely separate things. Regarding—as part of the Curriculum Packet, all we’re dealing with is suspending the Program. The motion to restructure—the motion to consult with the Provost about restructuring would have to be filed as a separate petition, and it’s completely unrelated to curriculum.

Smith: Well? [laughter all around and joking]

Peters: The moving it into a different Department, that doesn't have anything to do with the curriculum. You could keep the curriculum exactly the same and move it into a different Department.

Smith: So, then we don't—and we don't need—well, ok, so then do we want to have a consult about suspending the Program? Do you feel that? We don't now—that's not something where we've got past practice or our own commitments that say we should do that. Do you want to separate that or not?

Edginton: Was there a controversy on that issue?

Smith: No, not really, to my knowledge. I don't think there is at all. [voices saying faculty endorsed it] Yeah, the faculty, in fact, have endorsed and proposed it, ok, so we don't need to do that. Would the issue then of restructuring—that will come up in a different way, and we'll have to just address that with a—we can work up a petition to take care of that.

There was one other matter in the CSBS Package, and again this is all—you all are welcome to throw other things here, but the one that I thought might deserve some attention from the Senate, this involves the Graduate Curriculum Proposals—and Professor **Coon** can talk to this—from the Department of Social Work. A lot of discussion of these Proposals in the GCCC, including Chair **Coon's** observation that the Department was adding 16 new courses. I counted four drops. There may be a good reason for all the net additions, and in Shoshanna's [**Coon**] email that I got today it sounded like there were good reasons for this.

Peters: What email? I'm not sure we ever received anything from GCCC. [other voices saying, "No, we didn't."]

Smith: No, I just got her thing

Coon: It came very late, I'm sorry.

Smith: Yeah.

Peters: Well, if we haven't seen it, we can't talk about it. [voices agreeing] I mean, you haven't distributed it to us. We can't talk about it. We haven't seen it.

Smith: So, do you want to then—you don't want to approve this? Do you want to hold this?

Peters: Well, we can't act. I mean, nothing—no Graduate Curriculum is even properly before the [Faculty] Senate. [voice agreeing] There's been no motion about any Graduate Curriculum before the Senate, except in so far as the UCC endorsed the suspension of the MPP [Masters of Public Policy] Program because some undergraduates take it, that those Minutes reflected the fact that it's had yet at that point to be approved by the GCCC. So, I mean, that—even the suspension of the MPP Program isn't before the Senate right now. We have not received a motion from the GCCC as far as I know.

Smith: I was assuming that the College Curriculum Packages included both Undergraduate and Graduate Proposals.

Peters: Those came from the UCC.

Smith: What's that?

Peters: Those came from the UCC, right? The College Curriculum Packages came from the UCC, didn't they?

Smith: Well, we don't get Packages per se. What we get is stuff put up on the website, and that's it. And so the Graduate stuff is on the website, and my assumption is it's—that's what's out in front of you. What we didn't get from the GCCC was a copy of their Minutes which we did get from the UCC, and I did get their Minutes by getting them myself. But, to me, for my money, I had assumed that when we put College Packages put forward, it includes both Undergraduate and Graduate Proposals.

Peters: Ok, well the problem here is that we have had no way to know what the Graduate Proposals were. Every vote I've passed so far today was

assuming I was only voting on Undergraduate Proposals, because as far as I was concerned, I had not received any Graduate Proposals. You know, I mean, I sent an email to the [Faculty] Senate asking, “How are we supposed to even make any sense of this new curriculum software since you can’t even sort by like, what?, is this a Program change? Is it a minor change? Is it a major change? How am I supposed to even know what’s there to look at, right?” And so the suggestion I got was to get the UCC memos, which I did, which were very useful. And thank you to Diane **Wallace** for the excellent Minutes, and thank you to the UCC for all their work. But that’s the only stuff I have any information on. I never got any information of use about anything that came out of the Graduate School.

Smith: Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: Yeah, I just want to follow-up on what Scott [Senator **Peters**] said because, yes, we are technically voting on a whole College packet which includes Graduate stuff, but it’s true, we haven’t been able to look at the Graduate stuff because we don’t have the GCCC Minutes. And with the system it’s very difficult to actually look at these things, and we had, you know, nothing pointed out in particular that we could focus on. So, I think we really need to have those Minutes and have Shoshanna [**Coon**] flag stuff for us to make it easy.

Smith: Yes [recognizing **Coon**]

Coon: Shoshanna **Coon**, again. The GCCC Minutes have been on the Graduate College website appropriately (?) available since they were approved or shortly after the entire pack—the entire bunch was approved. And the Curriculum Packages themselves were thoroughly gone over by the GCCC and approved by Graduate Council, and the approval of those is in the Graduate Council Minutes. And so I do apologize that I did not send to Chair **Smith** a summary. I was asked to provide only things that needed special attention and highlighting, and I did not feel that there was a lot there. And so it took me some time to get that together. But all the information was publically available prior to this.

Smith: And I would say this, I've been—this is at least my third or fourth curriculum cycle on the [Faculty] Senate, and it's never been the case that the Senators have been provided either with the Minutes or anything else. And once we've gone online electronically, if you don't find it yourself, you don't get to look at it. Historically, I suspect, most Senators didn't much look at it. That's why I got the things from the two chairs of those Committees to kind of draw our attention to stuff. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Well, I mean, with due respect to everyone who is involved in the curriculum process, and to anyone who is very familiar with it, it's very impossible—it's nearly impossible for anyone who hasn't followed and tracked a proposal all the way through to figure out what the heck is there. And when stuff comes up to us at the end of the cycle and all I can do is sort by Senate—where is it in the workflow—and that's really the only way I can sort through it, and I've got how many different Proposals to go through? How am I supposed to know what's there? I can't tell what's—I can't tell what's a simple course change versus what's a major restatement of the course. I can't tell when a minor is simply being changed because one course number was changed in it to when a brand new Program is being proposed. I can't tell, and so the only way to do that is through that memo that we got from the UCC. And having not been even made aware that the Graduate stuff was ready, I didn't think we were—I didn't think it was part of what we were considering today.

Licari: I can—just to—just to respond to some of the concerns about sorting, and it is a new program. It's taken me a long time to learn it as well, but in the Course Inventory Management and the Program Management, particularly the Course Inventory Management, for example, you can sort by edited, added, dropped courses, and you can also sort by undergraduate and graduate only. So you could begin to parse out just as—just for an aid for as you'd navigate this. You know, once you've narrowed your search down, you can actually—you can actually boil it down to maybe just a handful of classes that you might be particularly interested in at the time. So, if you're interested only in added graduated courses, you can filter that out so that you're only left with that list of courses. So it's there if you just go into the—it's the Quick Searches bar that's on the upper right.

Smith: Senator **Edginton**

Edginton: Yeah, I'm persuaded by Senator **Peters**'s comments. We ought to take a little bit more time to review the Graduate Programs. As I expressed to you on the way in, you know, today, I had difficulty tracking through the system, had to get a printed copy [holds up binder of papers] of the stuff that comes out of the School of HPELS and couldn't understand it even in printed version from what's there. So, I don't think it's going to hurt given how efficient we've been today to go back and re-docket those Graduate Programs for each College and give the consideration with the assumption that that memo then would be distributed to the [Faculty] Senate so that we could have time to review the concerns. I think we could go through it very quickly, very efficiently, but do our due diligence by making sure that it was back on the Agenda for a future meeting.

Smith: That's how people feel? [agreement through voices and nods] So what are we going to do with the motions that we've already approved and were supposed—should we understand those as having approved only Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals? [more agreement shown in room] Senator **Kirmani**?

Kirmani: Can we do that? _____ they're all the courses?

Degnin: I think we have to make a motion?

Smith: And what that motion will be?

Coon: I'd like to point out that there are a number of courses that are listed under the 3000 or 4000 level which also have a Graduate component. Am I to understand that you did not approve the Graduate component of those courses? Or is it just Degree Programs that you're more interested in? [voices saying "We don't know yet."]

Smith: One thing I'm going to suggest we do, and this goes on our list of curricular matters to talk about down the road, is to decide what we want

to get from UCC, GCCC, whatever, on an ongoing basis that prepares us to address curriculum, because as you know, now when it's online, that system doesn't make it easy for us to kind of sort out the important stuff. Now, I tried to do that by having both the Chairs of those Committees give us the memos, and we ultimately got those. I did look through the Minutes of the meetings of both of those, and that's where I put together my stuff. But you folks didn't, apparently, go through the—I did distribute the Minutes of the UCC to you with one exception. GCCC Minutes did not get distributed to you, so one thing we could do going forward is pin down what we want from these groups in the future. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Two things. First, I think maybe a possible parliamentary solution here. Leave the votes as is but distribute the GCCC Minutes, and then allow Senators to look through those Minutes, and then, if there are any problems in the College Packets that we have approved, to notify you of the intent that we would file a motion to reconsider.

Smith: That sounds good. [other voices agreeing, nodding]

Peters: So, in absence of any motion to reconsider introduced, say, at the next meeting—I don't know—then we would, we'll assume that that—that, you know, everything lies as it is. That would be my suggestion for how to handle that.

Smith: Ok.

Peters: The second thing would be that I just—I—the way we've traditionally done this as Curriculum Packets where we've literally had a "packet," you know, I mean, it just doesn't quite reflect, like you said, like you were, I think, suggesting there at the end, it doesn't really reflect the way the workflow works now, and so as you indicated, I think, the Senate might need to—the Senate and the GC—and the Grad Council and UCC might need to figure out some mechanisms to adjust the way we do this in the future, because this obviously has some holes here.

Smith: Ok. Now, we're back—taking that, we're back with the CBSB Package. The one issue I raised had to do with Graduate Proposals, and so

we're going to let that go pending, you know, distribution of information to you all regarding those Proposals. Are there any other matters in the CSBS Curriculum Package, and I'm talking about Undergraduate Proposals now, that anybody feels deserves extra Senatorial attention? [none heard] Then what I would propose is that we vote, but the vote being the understanding we're only approving the Undergraduate Proposals that when I talk about a Curriculum Package now, henceforward, we're talking about Undergraduate Proposals. Are we prepared to vote on that?

Strauss: Actually, I thought we were approving the whole shooting match and then leaving open the chance to reconsider.

Degnin: Yeah, that was Scott's [Senator **Peters**] proposal.

Peters: Well, that was my proposal for what we had already done. We hadn't voted on SBS yet. [other voices declaring understanding now]

Smith: Right, if you want to go that route with this one, we can.

Strauss: I think we should.

Smith: You think that's going to make it easier? [many voices agreeing to having them "all the same"] Ok. So, we'll vote then on the entire CSBS Package with the option to reconsider. All in favor of approving the CSBS Package, and now that has—nothing has been pulled out of that—the package in its entirety, all in favor, say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No?" [none heard] Ok.

DOCKET 1122, INTERDISCIPLINARY AND LAC CURRICULUM PROPOSALS (end of business today) (**KIRMANI/PETERS**)

Smith: Final Curriculum Package just added today to our Agenda is Calendar Item 1226, Docket #1122, Interdisciplinary and LAC Curriculum Proposals. I need a motion to approve this Package.

Kirmani: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Kirmani**. Second? Senator **Gould**. Discussion of this Package? Small set of Proposals, includes one that might warrant extra [Faculty] Senate attention, that being the Proposal to reorganize Category 5, the Social Sciences Category of the LAC. Do you want to talk about that with the Director of the LAC, or are you comfortable with that Proposal to Reorganize the Category without—that it doesn't serve further attention from the Senate? [pause] I'm not hearing a lot of excitement here.

Degnin: I have a little different question, but I'm still thinking about what Scott [Senator **Peters**] said earlier, too. Now, Jesse [Senator **Swan**] just asked me to step in yesterday as of today, so I haven't looked at it. How many other people have had a chance to look at this, as this is the one we just

Smith: Well, you would have had a chance if you'd got the Minutes from the UCC, which you did, or at least other folks did, and that would have talked to this.

Degnin: Right, I know, and so that's why I'm asking the question is—is how many people feel like they're really ready to—I'm just asking that as of today. [pause, no responses]

Smith: Ok, so I'm not hearing a lot of excitement about pulling this out, which means we won't pull it out, which means unless there's further discussion, we're ready to vote on the—on Calendar Item 1226, Interdisciplinary and LAC Curriculum Proposals. All in favor of approving these Proposals, say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No?" [none heard] It is approved.

Smith: And that completes our business for today in a manner of speaking. I will be in touch with Deans and Department Heads for the Programs and Proposals we've set aside. Sorry. Yes?

Zeitz: [Audience member Leigh **Zeitz**, Associate Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction] Could you please clarify? So, for the College of

Education, you approved only the Undergraduate, or you approved both Graduate and Undergraduate? [many voices beginning to explain]

Smith: We approved everything but with the option that Graduate ones could be reconsidered if brought back for reconsideration.

Zeitz: Like next week?

Smith: Yeah. [voices saying “yes”] So, that’s where it stands.

Audience Member: Thank you very much.

Evans: I think the question is whether or not he needs to come back next week. How will they know if they need to come back and defend/discuss?

Smith: Well, if we reconsidered and we decided, “Ok, we really want to talk about this,” I would then commit. I’d hope the Senate would commit, “We’re not going to vote it down unless relevant people are here to talk about it.” [voices agreeing]

Zeitz: And you’ll contact the relevant people?

Smith: I would contact the relevant people. Yes, Shoshanna [**Coon**].

Coon: I will send out to Jerry [Chair **Smith**] tomorrow morning a list of the Graduate Degree Restatements. There are no new Graduate Programs, even though it looks like there are a couple, but there are no new ones. And so I will send out a list of the Graduate Degree Restatements so that you can go and look at those, and in my comments with Jerry, I did address the issue of the large number of new courses that “look like” they are new courses, but they aren’t.

Smith: And I will forward the email that Shoshanna sent to me earlier today. I will send that to all of you. That has copies of the GCCC Minutes, which I think will be the substance of the information you want. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I just wanted to thank the Chair for getting us through the entire Curriculum Packets today. [voices agreeing and hands clapping; some joking]

Smith: Well, thank you, Scott.

ADJOURNMENT (4:58 p.m.)

Smith: That does complete our business for today. We're going to be meeting next week, same time, same station. So I need a motion to adjourn.

Edginton: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Edginton**. Seconded by Senator **Hakes** [who indicated]. Thank you. Hope to see you next week.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting: Monday, February 17, 2014
Oak Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.

Follows are 0 addenda to these Minutes.