

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
01/23/11 (3:31 p.m. – 5:21 p.m.)
Mtg. #1706

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

No press present.

Provost **Gibson** made announcement of the meet and confer with United Faculty on Wednesday where she and President **Allen** will provide information about UNI's planned strategic and budgetary actions, which will affect academic programs. And they will seek input on the definition of "program area" as required by the contract.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** had no comments.

Vice-Chair **Breitbach** reported that the Bylaws Committee is working with the Committee on Committee, and she hopes to have some information on committees and committee structures for the Faculty Senate by the February 27, 2012, meeting.

Chair **Funderburk's** comments included noting that the next Faculty Senate meeting will be in 3 weeks, on February 13, 2012. Also, the Presidential Review Committee will soon post an instrument on MyUNiverse for faculty review process, and the Active Scholar Committee's meeting was delayed due to the recent snowstorm but will have information forthcoming via e-mail.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for January 9, 2012, were approved by acclamation when no additions or corrections were offered.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1114 1012 EPC Recommendations Regarding Academic Ethics Policy.

Motion to docket, regular order (Peters/Neuhaus**). Passed.

1115 1013 Emeritus Status Request, John Fecik, Industrial Technology, effective June 20, 2011.

Motion to docket out of order at the head of the docket (Neuhaus/Bruess**). Passed.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1109 1007 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Education (**Boody/Roberts-Dobie**)

Motion to bring item from the table (East/Terlip**). Passed.

Motion [from 01/09/12 meeting] to accept package, with the exception of HPELS name change (DeBerg/Gallagher**). Passed.

1109 1007.1 COE [HPELS] name change (**Edginton/DeBerg**).

Motion to table (Edginton/Dolgener**). Passed

1110 1008 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (**Bruess/East**).

Motion to accept full curriculum package (Bruess/Peters**). Passed.

Motion to divide the question, pulling out the 0 credit Psychology proposed new course for separate action (Smith/Wurtz**). Failed.

1111 1009 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Humanities and Fine Arts (**DeBerg/Neuhaus**).

Motion to accept curriculum package (Terlip/Swan**). Motion tabled.

**Motion to divide the question, pulling out Music Ed. 3040 for separate

action (**Smith/Gallagher**). Passed.

Motion to divide the question, pulling out Music Ed. 3050 for separate action (Gallagher/Edginton**). Passed.

Motion to divide the question, pulling out the Enrollment Management Policy in the Spanish Department's package for separate action (Bruess/Smith**). Passed.

Motion to table the CHFA curriculum package as a whole until 3 divided concerns are acted upon (Swan/**). Motion died for lack of a second.

Motion to act on the 3 divided concerns prior to acting on the CHFA curriculum package as a whole (Gallagher/Swan**). Passed.

1111 1009.1 Music Ed 3040 divided for separate action (**Smith/Gallagher**).

Motion to follow the UCC recommendation to disapprove (Swan/Gallagher**). Passed.

1111 1009.2 Music Ed 3050 divided for separate action (**Gallagher/Edginton**).

Motion to extend the discussion past regular adjournment time (Swan/Breitbach**). Passed.

Motion to disapprove (Gallagher/Edginton**). Passed.

1111 1009.3 Spanish Enrollment Management Policy proposal, tabled until next meeting (**Bruess/Smith**)

5. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 5:21 p.m. (**Neuhaus/Bruess**). Passed.

Next meeting: February 13, 2012

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
January 23, 2012
Mtg. 1706**

PRESENT: Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, James **Jurgenson**, Michael **Licari**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Chris **Edginton**, Michael **Roth**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Jerry **Smith**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Katherine **Van Wormer**, Susan **Wurtz**

Absent: Betty **DeBerg**, Syed **Kirmani**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** (3:31 p.m.): Ok, we can begin our meeting.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Funderburk: Call for press identification. Are there any press? Seeing none.....

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Funderburk: Are there comments from Provost Gibson? I think you'll want to listen to these. (waiting for Senators and the many guests to become quiet)

Provost **Gibson:** I just have an announcement to make. We have scheduled a meet and confer with United Faculty. The purpose of the meeting is to provide UF with information about UNI's planned strategic

and budgetary actions, which will affect academic programs. The meet and confer will seek input on the definition of “program area” as required by the contract. So that meeting will take place on Wednesday afternoon.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Funderburk: Ok. Comments from Chair **Jurgenson**?

Faculty Chair James **Jurgenson:** No comments.

REPORT ON COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION FROM VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH

Funderburk: Nothing. Ok. Vice Chair **Breitbach**?

Breitbach: The Bylaws Committee is working with the Committee on Committees, which is also having a difficulty—a very difficult time in finding a common time for them to meet, as are we, but we’ve done it. So we will be meeting this Thursday. We hope to have something to you, perhaps not by the next meeting [Feb. 13], but the one after that [Feb. 27], in terms of committees and committee structures.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Chair **Funderburk:** The only comments I have is we have 3 weeks until our next actual Senate meeting. Presidential Review Committee has been meeting, and the instrument is ready to be reviewed on MyUNiverse, so before our next Senate meeting, we’ll see something about the review of President **Allen** showing up on MyUNiverse of that instrument. So that’s been moving forward. And I had thought I’d be able to share with you the recommendation of the Active Scholar Committee. I’ve already shared a draft with you, but due to the snow storm Friday, that committee did not meet, so it’s delayed to later this week, so I’ll forward that as we have something to e-mail. Those are my comments today.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Funderburk: I understand from **Sherry** that there were no corrections to the transcript of the Minutes from last time forwarded. If there are none from the floor—or if there are any, now would be the time. Otherwise, we can accept those by acclamation. Ok. That is done.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1114 for Docket #1012, EPC
Recommendations Regarding Academic Ethics Policy

Funderburk: Calendar item 1114, some of you noted today that somehow the actual attached Ethics Policy had disappeared [from the website petition], and it has reappeared now. So it has been posted again up there. So, if we are ok with docketing it, it is there now. So if we can have a motion to docket 1114, EPC Recommendations Regarding Academic Ethics Policy. Senator **Peters**, motion to—regular order?

Peters: Yes. Regular order.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters** to docket in regular order. Do we have a second?

Neuhaus: Second.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**. Questions or discussion on docketing of this recommendation? None? All those in favor “aye.” (ayes heard all around). All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Ok. So moved.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1115 for Docket #1013, Emeritus Status Request, John **Fecik**, Industrial Technology, effective June 20, 2011

Funderburk: Item 1115, Emeritus Status Request for John **Fecik**. Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Move to docket out of order, to be placed at the head of the docket for the next meeting of the UNI Faculty Senate.

Funderburk: Ok. So the motion is to place it out of--at the head of the next meeting. Do we have a second? Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: Second.

Funderburk: Questions? Comments from anyone? Ok, all those in favor of docketing at the head of the order at the next meeting, say "aye." (ayes heard all around) Those opposed? (none heard) And abstentions? (none heard)

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1007, CONSIDERATION OF CURRICULUM PACKAGES, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (**BOODY/ROBERTS-DOBIE**), TABLED WITH NAME CHANGE REMOVED FOR SEPARATE CONSIDERATION (**TERLIP/KIRMANI**)

Funderburk: All righty. In jumping back into our consideration of the curriculum packages, so this is College of Education, Docket #1007. Let's get **Licari** back up there [at projecting computer], so we can bring that up [on overhead screen]. Senator **East**.

East: I move we take that proposal from the table.

Terlip: Second.

Funderburk: It's been moved and seconded to remove from the table. All those—discussion? All in favor of taking it from the table? (ayes heard all around) Opposed. (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) All right, we're closing in. Ok. So, the motion is still active, as I understand it from before, which was to approve this as is. Is my memory the same as everybody else's? Do we have any discussion on this? Or questions?
Senator **East**.

East: I would like to know the status of the consultation meetings where there were either objections, further questions, further consultation with questions?

Funderburk: Do we have somebody from the UCC that can comment on that?

Dykstra (Lynn, in audience, Price Lab School Instructor): What was the consultation? Which course was it?

East: One of the—Curriculum & Instruction had a consultation that requested further consultation. I couldn't tell what course it was, because all I could see was the 2nd page of the consultation which had Department Head names, which I didn't necessarily recognize, so I don't know.

Dykstra: Well, I guess I listed the _____ (sounds a little like "deal"?) about these courses. As far as I know, all the consultations had been done on courses _____
If you can tell me exactly which one it was, I.....we thought we covered everything. Not to say that something might have gotten overlooked. Do you [to woman across the room] know of anything, Dr. **Uhlenberg**, that.....?

Uhlenberg (Jill, in audience, Interim Department Head, Curriculum & Instruction): The only thing I can think is that for course 210:142g, which was the Applications in Elementary Science Teaching. That course changes and withdrawn. So it is no longer a part of the packet. But other consultations, as far as I know, have all been completed and resolved.

Funderburk: One comment for [the many audience members].... Since we may have a lot of people talking, we've got a lot of noise from our air handling system, so you are welcome to talk, but please talk loudly, though, so we can get you on the microphone. And, if you will, identify for the Minutes, so when Sherry [**Nuss**, Administrative Assistant] is typing it in later, she knows who that was.

Dykstra: I'm Lynn **Dykstra**, the College of Ed. Rep. to the UCC.

Funderburk: Senator [sic, Associate Provost] **Licari**, are you able to find the consultation of

Licari: I need to know what course it is in particular.

East: On the summary of the consultation, there's a link that says "Communication Studies" question further consultation. Apparently there were 2 iterations or 2 different things or something. All I had to go on was the Summary of Consultations, and Communication Studies requested further consultation with Curriculum and Instruction. Later on a Biology request had objections with some Ed. Psych. course. Art had some objections with an Ed. Psych. course. Curriculum and Instruction requested further consultation with Ed. Psych. on something.

Licari: Diane [**Wallace**, in audience, Assistant Registrar], unless we can find anything in the Minutes, I don't think these were issues that were raised at the UCC meeting. It was probably dealt with prior to the UCC meeting.

Wallace: Diane **Wallace**, Registrar's Office. I can tell you that any consultations that were raised as issues in the—at the meetings were resolved. If you look online, that's one part of this curriculum process that does not show you the consultations have been completed. But a lot of them were Library consultations, and those were done. Those were completed. And you can see different areas where Library consultation was initiated and was done. That whole UCC—at the UCC level, there are no outstanding consultations that remain open.

East: For the entire College of Education?

Wallace: For the entire College.

Funderburk: Other questions or comments? Are we ready for a vote on the College of Education Curriculum Package? With the one issue that—there were a few people that were not here last time and may not have been aware that 10.07.—no wait, 1007.1, got created because we are removing the idea that there is a change-- departmental name change from this vote. It is a separate item. If you weren't here for that change, that's what that means. All those in favor of approving the curriculum package for the College of Ed. with the exception of the name change of the department, say "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Any abstentions? One abstention. Ok. The package carries

DOCKET # 1007.1 COE [HPELS] NAME CHANGE (**EDGINTON/DEBERG**)

Funderburk: Now we are ready for Docket Item 1007.1, and perhaps since, Senator **Edginton**, you were the one that raised the issue, perhaps you'd lead off our discussion on this one?

Edginton: Sure. There was a procedural issue that we brought up that as the faculty review this proposed name change, 51 individuals were allowed to vote, and there are 35 voting faculty members. So, what—what we have asked is that the vote be re-done, secret ballot, and that only the voting faculty members of the faculty actually vote. The issue was brought up by Dr. **Dolgener** in the Coordinator/Chair meeting within the School of HPELS last Friday. That was the first time he had an opportunity to have that conversation. That vote has not been taken place, and we both agree that I will go back tomorrow and instruct the Director of the School to conduct that vote so that we can—that can take place. But it has not taken place as of this time.

Funderburk: As a clarification, do we need any Senate action on this at this time?

Edginton: No.

Funderburk: Do you want to divide these questions? We can pull it out.

Licari: Right, these—yeah. These issues are handled separately from curriculum matters. There's no need that they go through simultaneously.

Funderburk: So maybe it would be appropriate to table it until— indefinitely? Is there a motion? Is that a “yes, I'll consider that.” Excellent. Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: We should be able to do it before the next meeting.

Funderburk: So, we'll just table it until a future date.

Edginton: Yeah.

Funderburk: Ok, let's list that as a motion to table from Senator **Edginton** and seconded by **Dolgener**. Any further discussion? All in favor of tabling this until brought to our attention again, say “aye.” (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion carries.

DOCKET #1008, CONSIDERATION OF CURRICULUM PACKAGES, COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES (**BRUESS/EAST**)

Funderburk: Back to item 1008, Consideration of Curriculum Package from College of Social and Behavioral Science. Do we have a motion with regards to this? Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: I move that we accept it.

Funderburk: Move to accept. Do we have a second?

Peters: Second.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**. Discussion? Questions? Comments?
Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I have a question about a proposal in the Psych. Department, specifically having to do with a proposed new course, 1002 Careers in Psychology. It's offered as a 1 credit course as I see it—or 1 hour course, credit/no credit, and it struck me as essentially kind of something that in many programs it would be kind of like counseling and advising. I was just concerned about granting academic credit for what to me looks like counseling/advising kinds of stuff. I don't know how other people feel about this, but if enough other people had the same concern I do, then I would move to pull this out and talk about it separately.

Funderburk: Does anyone want to respond to that? The UCC or Department or

Hildebrandt: Ok, I'm Carolyn **Hildebrandt**, the Head of the Psych. Department, and if I could come up here [to the central table].... This kind of course is offered in a lot of Psychology Departments across the country, and what we've found in our SOA Reports and also just from talking with students is that it's not clear what they can do with a BA in Psychology. There's a lot of things, but there is not a job called "psychologist" for a BA graduate. So what we decided to do is pilot this course, and Kim **MacLin** has taught it on an experimental basis, and it turns out it's very, very successful. They—the—the students get a chance to explore careers in psychology and write a cover letter to—it was 10 different places that they could apply. They do cover letters for at least 10 different grad. programs they could apply to. They--they take the GRE. They put together a resume. They explore internships. I don't think that Career Services—I mean, although Career Services has helped us a lot and is working with us on this, I don't think that they can carry this kind of load for our students. It—it's been very, very well received. She asked that the seniors, if they should—if we should have students wait until their senior year, and they said, resoundingly, "NO! Take it right away." So we—we—we piloted it before proposing it, just to see what—what would happen. And I—I am convinced that it's something our students really need in our program.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, I—I don't in the least dispute the value of what's being done here and the need for it. What I am concerned about is granting academic credit for what strikes me as kind of advising/career preparation. I know in my College, for instance, we have a set of 0 credit courses that students are required to take that do this and then a bunch of other things. And I personally think that's a better way to go, because I don't like giving academic credit for things that—that are borderline academic. I mean, non-academic. And that—that's what bothers me about this. If you were to offer this on a 0 credit basis, if you had a required course, no credits, I would support it entirely, but giving academic credit for it is—is bothersome to me.

Funderburk: Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: I just had a question. I remember—I don't know if **Jesse** remembers, but we handled this in the last curricular cycle with English for portfolio construction. Does anybody recall what we did?

Smith: We rejected that course. That's right.

Male voice: That was a 0 credit.

Smith: No, that was a 1 credit course, and we turned it down.

Funderburk: Senator **Van Wormer**.

Van Wormer: Well, it sounds to me like it's something very important for the students to be, you know, considering what they're going to do with a degree. And it's similar to other courses that are offered in other Departments that ties into the professional side. But, of course, one quick question would be, "Are some of the students weeded out, if it seems like their career plans don't fit in with the Psychology Major?" I would think, though, that they would realize from that course that maybe they are in the wrong area.

Hildebrandt: That's right. It teaches them things that they need to know. What they need to do in order to become a psychiatrist, for example, as opposed to a psychologist as opposed to, you know, someone who is using psychology in some other career. And it's good for them to know that right—right away.

Van Wormer: Yeah, and I'm thinking isn't there a course on campus that has to do with career? It's a course I've had students come in to me. I know—I know they get academic credit for it, and it's where they change a career and a major.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I think there's precedence for this in a number of places on campus. In our Department, we have an Intro. to Communication course where they do that along with exploring the Department and other kinds of things to kind of get them started so that they can take a Comm. Major to the direction they want to take it as well. Prior to being an Intro. course, it was a portfolio course, so we've had, for as long—I've been here almost 20 years, we've had that course in our Department.

Funderburk: Associate Provost **Licari**.

Licari: Yeah, I will say, just to add some context here, that the UCC actually liked the way this proposed course was set up. There is precedence on campus as just has been mentioned by Senators **Van Wormer** and **Terlip**. We do give academic credit for these kinds of classes. The UCC, I will also mention, rejected a 0 credit course that came from the Biology Department last Fall on the grounds that if it was going to be a required course in the—in the Major, basically, providing precisely this kind of activity and professional development for students that they ought to get credit for it. So, the UCC actually rejected the Biology proposal that had no credit attached to it. This is just for context.

Funderburk: Senator **Shaw**.

Shaw: I teach the Intro. class that Dr. **Terlip** is talking about, and we do not only some career exploration, but we do looking at the history of communication itself and what the Department has to offer and what the University has to offer and how it connects to their overall, long-term desire for their major, so I feel it's a very beneficial course.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: This course is a—for—as lots of you have said, are nationally—nationally done at other places, and so when we don't do it, our students are in a distinct disadvantage, and so—and we have direct experience knowing that. And that's another reason it's not good for this Body to dig into fine, little pieces like this, because we can't know when we, you know, take something out that that—the people who are knowledgeable on the University Curriculum Committee have considered thoroughly and in do—and passed, and so I think, of course, we need to pass this because our colleagues who are in charge of knowing these things deeply pass it, and we can't know except that it would put the Psychology students at a distinct disadvantage nationally, and the UCC, of course, took that into consideration.

Funderburk: Other comments? Questions? Senator **East**.

East: Just for the record, the UCC has less representative—is less representative of campus as a whole than the faculty, and it seems—I don't think that—I do think that the—that the Faculty Senate should not substitute a less representative's body opinion for its own. I think it is perfectly reasonable for us to discuss this and that we have as good—we probably have a better chance of—of being fully consid—of considering it fully than the UCC does.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**.

Wurtz: One thing I think we need to keep in mind is that we're not discussing the merits of the content covered here. I think there's been a very clear statement that this content is content that should be made available to our students. The question is: "Under what format?" And one

of the ways to look at it is a 0 credit course, for this opens up more content in the courses for credit, and perhaps we're going one better than, rather than putting them at a disadvantage.

Hildebrandt: I—I'm not sure I understand what you said.

Wurtz: Well, again using what we do in the College of Business perhaps as a pattern, that we understand this career development is very, very important, and so we set up 0 credit that is required, but it's required because it's important. But by not using up their credit hours within the content area for this, we can then include more of the business, the finance, the human resource management. The content of business is deeper because we are doing the career stuff as a separate area, so that we wouldn't be denying it to them. I agree with Senator **Swan**; to tell our students "You can't have this," would be to make our program less good. But the fact is we can do both.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Well, I—I think we kind of entered a damned-if-you-do/damned-if-you-don't moment here because the—the UCCC [sic] has said that they don't want to have these 0 credit courses, and a number of us here are saying that we think that they should be, and that leaves folks sort of in a gray area.

Hildebrandt: Well, one thing I might add, I believe that we are offering this as a pass/no pass course, so it's not going to affect grade point averages. But it is a—a--a credit hour represents time, and if you put 0 credit hours, it—it—it makes it look like there's no time involved in doing it, and actually there's quite a bit of time involved in doing this 1 credit course.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I—I appreciate the College of Business's model, but I don't think there was universal agreement that that 0 course—those 0 courses were a good option. In fact, many of us thought it put an undue burden on the students, and it was a way to meet your accreditation without

increasing the length of your major. I may have misunderstood, but I—I just want it on record that there is not universal agreement that these things should be offered as 0 credit.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: In general—the issue on 0 credit is partly “Do we want to maintain some standards on academic substance for college credits?” And it’s not just time. It’s learning. It’s learning academic material, that’s real, substantive kinds of stuff. When you are doing career advising, those can be really important things, but it’s not really academic. And that’s the concern I have. I have it with this course, and I have it with some other ones. And it came up 2 years ago as well. That was why the English Department then got voted down, because there was a feeling that it didn’t have academic substance to simply put together a portfolio, stuff you’d done in other courses. So I think we—and this issue—I mean, the issue of should there be 0 credit or not—it’s something that I’m not convinced the UCC has really looked carefully at the issue of what do we do, what—what are the standards we have for enforcing—for providing academic credit? And if they don’t want to do it, I think we need to do it. Not here today, but we need to do it sometime. So, you know, I—I think we—we should think about this carefully and think about what are our standards, if we have any, for the granting of academic credit. And so I want to move that we split the issue on this and pull this out from the curriculum package.

Funderburk: Motion is to divide the question to separate this Psychology course from the—and the number on it?

Peters: Are we just--just this one course?

Smith: Yeah.

Funderburk: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

Wurtz: I’ll second it, so we can consider it.

Funderburk: Second, Senator **Wurtz**. Discussion on the idea of dividing the question? Questions? Comments? All those in favor of dividing the question, say “aye.” (a couple ayes heard) All those opposed? (many no’s heard). Abstentions? Chair ruling the motion does not pass. So we are still curr—considering the full curriculum package. Other comments?

Neuhaus: Maybe a question.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: As you envision this course, and maybe this is—is still too soon, but if I was taking this course, what—what sort of things would I be tested on, or would there be some testing, or would there be some moments where, because it’s pass/fail, would there be some moment that—that—that would give me some feedback as to whether I’ve learned the difference between various sub-disciplines in

Hildebrandt: I think—I think that’d be a good idea. I—I didn’t bring enough material to say whether she’s testing them or not, but certainly she does have very high standards, and they need to get out of there knowing what is available to them and what they would have to do in order to pursue that. So, you know, whether she’s giving them a quiz, or whether she’s reviewing materials that they are presenting to her, is—is—is another question, but I—I can vouch for her standards, and the students I’m sure will get what they need out of that course.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: There have been student outcomes assessments ascribed to the course?

Hildebrandt: Well, we do have student outcome assessments that ask students what they know about careers in psychology, and we’ve been disappointed with those outcomes that we’ve seen (?) in the—in the 4 years.

East: You have existing assessment devices that you could use on this course?

Hildebrandt: Right, and then we could see, you know, as a pre/post. We do a pre and a post and pull out those that took the careers class and—and see whether it makes a difference.

Goldsmith: May I?

Funderburk: Yes, please. Vice-President **Goldsmith** (NISG).

Goldsmith: I'd like to provide some insight on the major. I'm a Psychology major, but I never took the course. One of my best friends is in the course right now, and I would say it's a lot more than a 1 credit—in terms of the rigor, way beyond any 1 credit course that you would see, because I know he's currently writing a 1000-2000 word reflection, and that's on a weekly basis, and the students are required to, you know, take a GRE or a version of it, are required to format a resume. They are required to do all this kind of stuff that is going to really be beneficial to them in the long run, and—but I would say it's more work now than what a 1 credit hour usually would be in another course, so I just wanted to add that.

Hildebrandt: Thanks, **Ian**.

Funderburk: Do we have any additional comments? Questions? Senator **East**.

East: Again on the consultation, I see no objections. There apparently were 2 requests for further consultation. Those were all resolved ok?

Wallace: There were no outstanding consultations. That is correct.

Dykstra: Lynn **Dykstra**. I just wanted to say we [the UCC] have had discussions—lively discussion about giving 0 credits for certain classes, and I think the Registrar's Office would probably agree, too, that we tend to not want to do that. We thought that it set a bad precedent to start offering a lot of 0 credit hours, that it might be better—if it is not worthy of be—I

mean, if it is worthy of the students taking the class, and it has the academic rigor and what not that you need for a class, then they deserve credit for it. And if you want to offer these 0 kind of credit courses that maybe you attach it to another course, you know, that already is giving credit and have them do some lab kind of something like that. So we've not come to any permanent decisions on that or anything, because each situation has been somewhat different, but we've had some discussion about it.

Smith: What kinds of standards are you discussing?

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: What kinds of discussions have you had regarding general standards for academic rigor and academic content for the granting of credit?

Licari: Actually the discussions revolved around coming back to the Faculty Senate with that question: "What standards would you like to have the UCC enforce for 0 or 1 credit classes?" We didn't feel that we wanted to open the floodgates with 0 credit courses. They do lengthen the time to degree without necessarily making it obvious that it's more time to degree, so we want to be very, very careful about that. On the other hand, there might be instances where it's not appropriate to offer credit for a particular class. The UCC felt that this class did justify awarding a credit, and so our discussions revolved around actually coming back to the Senate with a question for some guidance on the issue.

Funderburk: Comments? Questions? Anything other than this one class you wish to talk about from a very large Social and Behavioral Science area? Hearing none, all those in favor of accepting—or passing on the recommendation or approving the recommendation of the UCC, say "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Any abstentions? Two abstentions on that. Motion passage—passes.

DOCKET #1009, CONSIDERATION OF CURRICULUM PACKAGES, COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND FINE ARTS (**DEBERG/NEUHAUS**)

Funderburk: 1009, Consideration of Curriculum Packages from the former College of Humanities and Fine Arts. Do we have a motion? Or anything else?

Terlip: I'll move to accept the Humanities and Fine Arts package.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip** to approve.

Swan: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Swan**. Comments? Discussion?
Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Perhaps we can wait for a second until...[those in audience who are finished exit]

Funderburk: We'll pause for the rowdies to get under control. (light laughter) Ok.

Peters: Ok, so this—this curriculum packet does include several—several new programs which are specified and under policy is something that the Senate should scrutinize. And I see there's the new program, the Interactive Digital Studies program, the sort of separating out the Master's program in Teaching English in Secondary Schools, a new program in Graphic Design. I'm wondering if Mike [**Licari**] or someone else on the UCC can maybe talk a little bit about consideration—the considerations you gave to new programs. How many resources they would require? What prospective enrollment was going to be? If you could kind of give us a sense of how you scrutinize new programs in the process.

Licari: Yeah, I mean, that's a couple of things that—that go on with—with new programs. Obviously, the—the reporting's a little bit more intense in the—in the curriculum process which asks the Department to provide a lot more information about what's going on. And that then prompts, you

know, a bit more investigation on the part of the Bodies involved, and I won't limit it to just the UCC, because whenever you're asking for a new program, you start to—or catch the attention of the College Senate, the Dean's office, things like that, because especially the Dean is going to be hit perhaps for a request for additional resources, you know, and so I'll say that it's not just the UCC that begins scrutinizing those a little bit more in an involved way, but it's all the way up through the chain. In the case of—I can let Shoshanna [Coon] speak to any of the grad. programs, but in the case of the undergraduate program in Digital Media, you know, that had been a discussion actually in terms of curricular development for a number of years that had been going on as the Department ensured that the other participating Departments, and I think there are up to 8 other participating Departments, would be onboard—would be able to commit time and other instructional resources to the program, and so this takes a lot of legwork on the part of the proposing Department. The job of the UCC is to make sure that that legwork has been done, that everybody's onboard, and it was particularly intensive with the proposal coming out of Comm. Studies, because it's such an interdisciplinary project. And so actually, if you look at the Minutes of the UCC meeting, much of the discussion revolved around the interdisciplinarity of the program and some of the actual difficulties in getting everybody onboard. And I think the Minutes will reflect that there was some resulting concern, I think, from the Art Department as a result of that proposal. So, you know, those are the kinds of things that we go and dig into, basically to make sure that up until it gets to the UCC, all of those are, you know—all of that legwork has been done. I will say that then after the UCC, and frankly after the Senate, reviews these, the process for a new program isn't done. The—the--what I'll call the “off-campus consultations” begin. The ICCPHSE reviews the proposal. The Iowa Coordinating Committee for Post High School and Secondary Ed. There you go. You gotta know your acronyms. (light laughter around) And the Council of Provosts will also review the—the—the program. A lot of that has to do with reviews of demand, duplicity, and all of those kinds of things. It's also the chance that the Provost has to prevent a program from being started that the Institution does not have resources for. And at the end of the day, you know, up until now the Dean has been onboard. The Department Head has been onboard with commitments to resources. But up until then—up until now—this--this point is where the Provost can say, “I don't think the

University actually has the resources to commit to this—to this new program.” And if that commitment isn’t there, then the proposal can die as well. So, there are a fair number of safeguards. The UCC also operates with the knowledge that a new program will be scrutinized by the Faculty Senate as well, and so there are a number of checkpoints or gates or fail safes or however you want to describe it.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So perhaps if we could call up the curriculum package process, because I do have a question. I may just misunderstand this and misremember it, and Associate Provost **Licari** should be able to answer it, but it’s certainly in the curriculum process. For new programs, it seems to me, perhaps again erroneously, that I’m remembering that for any new program the people proposing it must go through a pre-process, right? And that that’s led by the Provost, and that that goes to the other Provosts.

Licari: That’s what I was describing [showing a projected diagram of the process]. The timing is

Swan: Yes, yes, yes, yes. But this happens well in advance, and that that’s being ok’d. The Administration, and the B—and to a degree the Board of Regents knows about this, and endorses it to see—to go through the process. Of course, once again after--and this is the case with anything we propose, anything. The Provost may have to not take it to the Board for financial reasons or any number of reasons. So that is sort of another issue. But it—and so I’m sure that these new programs have gone through the whole process, or the UCC would right away say, “Well, it didn’t go through that first process for new programs,” and then not consider it, because that’s part—we want to not consider things that don’t go through the proper process. There’s an additional process, again, after us, back to the Provost, etc. that’s of course for everything. So that’s what I wanted to—to say that for these new programs they’re not just, you know, not that that’s not good, the faculty saying it. The Administration and the representatives, the way the Board of Regents has had it sort of set up for the different Universities, have considered these and said at least “Go ahead through the process. We all see that they are a good—or possibly, you know

appropriate, and that we will do our best faith effort to finance them.” Of course, things change, but there’s been that approval ahead of time.

Funderburk: Dr. **Licari** do you have a response?

Licari: Yeah. [indicating the projected graph] What I was describing was the—the end there, and the President’s, the Executive Vice President and Provost’s Office presence. You can see the ICCPHSE, Council of Provosts.

Swan: Yeah, and that’s for all programs. I mean, everything—all—the whole curricular changes.

Licari: Any new--any new major or program would—would—would go through the ICCPHSE. Everything does clear through the Council of Provosts and then on to the Board of Regents.

Funderburk: Senator, did I miss you a minute ago? [some confusion and sorting out of who was next] Ok, Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I—I think the other thing this particular new major illustrates is maybe a difficulty we have with proposing interdisciplinary things, because it really is truly interdisciplinary, and it just had to have a sponsoring Department, but that makes it almost twice as difficult to get in place, and so I’m hoping maybe we can get that on record to try to streamline it, because it does the very kind of thing our Strategic Plan articulates we should be doing.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Is there anyone from the Art Department here? I mean, was that—was that settled, or was that—was that complaint about new program outstanding from the....

Licari: To the best of my knowledge—and—and I reviewed the Minutes before I came in, and I think the Minutes reflect that it wasn’t completely settled.

Peters: That's what I thought, too, but no one from the Art Department is here objecting to it, I take it?

Funderburk: No, but I can, because I was working on the proposal as well. The bulk of what was going to be included that would have involved Art has been pulled. So..... Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: **Chris**, did--do you know of any status reports?

Chris Martin [in audience, Interim Department Head of Communication Studies]: We just had a result that—that Art decided not to participate in it and go towards their own major, which is in the curriculum package as well. They aren't in agreement as we left it.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: I do believe there is the outstanding issue with regard to Music and Special Education that needs to be brought up.

Funderburk: I'll give that to **Licari**.

Licari: Yes. Senator **Gallagher** is correct. The Music Ed. 3040 course and its replacement in the related Music Education restatements was not approved by the UCC at our October 26th meeting.

Swan: So I don't understand now. May I ask a question?

Funderburk: Please, Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So, what does that mean that the UCC is proposing? So, if it wasn't pro—if it wasn't approved, that sounds to me like that wouldn't be part of the proposal, and so is that accurate?

Licari: We left it—we left it in so that the Senate would—could review it. If—if we pulled it out of this packet, I wouldn't be able to pull it up on the screen for your review. It's your decision. If you wish to add it back in, that's fine.

Swan: Oh, so you did take it out?

Woman (**Gallagher? Breitbach?**): Is it out?

Licari: We—we did not approve this course.

Swan: Ok, so

Funderburk: Yes, please. [calling on Melissa **Heston**, of the UCC]

Heston: The way process is—typically works, is that we don't take things out. We tell the Department we don't approve, and the Department has the choice to leave it in and take it before the Senate for review, or they can pull it out, anticipating that you may or may not agree with us on the UCC, and in this case the Department has chosen to bring it forward as still part of their package.

Licari: Essentially what the Music Dept.—School of Music is doing is appealing the UCC's decision.

Swan: Well, this is pertinent. Then—then the—a Senator is supposed to say that—that you want this out.

Female voice: Right. Right.

Funderburk: We're all ears. Senator **Smith**.

Smith: So I move to divide the issue and pull that particular proposal out of the package so it can be acted on separately.

Funderburk: And this is the specific class 3040?

Smith: Music Ed. 3040, yes.

Funderburk: Music Ed. 3040, motion to divide the question for it. Do we have a second for this motion?

Gallagher: Go ahead. I'll second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Gallagher**.

Heston: Could I have a clarification? Which course are we discussing here? Are we discussing Schools in American Society? Or are we discussing Diverse Learners? Because there were 2 courses, there were different outcomes on those courses at the UCC, and I don't know when you say Music Ed. blah blah blah. I can't see it from here.

Smith: Teaching Music in American Society.

Heston: Ok, so this is the Schools in American Society. It is the only one that was disapproved by the UCC.

Smith: That's right.

Gallagher: Ok, I'm making reference to the Diverse Learners class, which is still highly unresolved.

Funderburk: So, does your second hold for the 3040 class? Or would you like to start amending things? (light laughter around)

Gallagher: Yeah, sure.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So, my understanding is that the UCC is recommending this curriculum without those 2 proposals. I really would think that to put them back in we would—we would put them back in.

Licari: Just fine. Uh huh.

Swan: But you're not. The UCC is recommending the Department's proposal but saying it doesn't think these two classes is good. So, which is it?

Licari (?): No.

Swan: Ok, so it's a third thing.

Heston: That's not actually what

Swan: You see this is very confusing. What is the UCC recommending?

Funderburk: The Chair of the UCC **Licari**.

Licari: The UCC passed the School of Music's packet without Music Ed 3040 in it. That is our recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

Swan: And that is what we have. So to get that back in, we need a motion to get it back in.

Smith: No. We want to get it out, so we can act on it separately.

Swan: Is that not what you did? I miss—I misheard, **Mike**? And so you recommended it with the course in it? (several voices attempting to explain) No? Excluding the class, so we need to get—if we want to put the class in, we have to have a motion to put the class in?

Smith: No, it's—it's in the proposal. It's in there. It just doesn't come with the UCC's recommendation.

Swan: The UCC's recommendation that we're

Smith: If we were to pass this proposal, then we would be passing this against the UCC's recommendation.

Licari: Right.

Smith: And that's why I made the motion to divide the question so we can act on it separately.

Funderburk: Now, for clarity on the motion, is it going to be to divide out for this one course, which is the Schools in American Society alternate, or is it going to be the addition of two courses for consideration?

Gallagher: May I amend to have both courses pulled out?

Smith: I'm not comfortable with that.

Gallagher: You're not.

Smith: No, I want to stick with this one.

Terlip: So, a separate motion?

Funderburk: Is your second still there then to 3040?

Gallagher: Yes, it will be.

Funderburk: Ok, so currently on the floor, just so everybody's clear, to divide the question to consider the Teaching Music in American Society course as a separate issue from the curriculum package.

Terlip: Call the question.

Funderburk: The question has been called. Second. Was that a Senator East seconding the call for the question?

East: No. (light laughter around)

Funderburk: The question has been called. Is there a second?

Swan: To do what?

Funderburk: Call the question. (many voices trying to explain) On the amendment to divide the question, yes. (more still trying to explain)

Dolgener: I second it.

Funderburk: There's a second from Senator **Dolgener**. All those in favor of calling the question on the divide the question motion, say "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Confusion? (light laughter) Ok. So, we will be taking up course 3040 separately from the rest of this curriculum package. Senator **East**.

East: We need to vote on that. (other voices agreeing)

Funderburk: We didn't vote on that. Sorry. That was the question was called. So, all those in favor of dividing the question, "aye." (ayes heard around) All those opposed? (one no heard) And abstentions? None. Right. So that passes. So 3040 is now considered separately from the other. Senator **East**. And then you're pointing someplace.

Breitbach: She's been wanting the floor.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: I've been wanting the floor. I still want to deal with the Diverse Learner class.

East: And that was my question, if there was—was there—were there other outstanding problems, and apparently there is.

Funderburk: That is the question. Do you have a motion you'd like to make? Say, to perhaps divide the question once again.

Gallagher: Well, we can either discuss it now—we can either discuss—and give me—give me clarification on procedure, because we can discuss it here now or we can separate it out and discuss it separately and pass the rest of the curriculum package.

Funderburk: That would be an option if--if you would like to see that course defeated individually, you can. Or you can ask to divide the question. If you just want to discuss it now, it's

Gallagher: Ok, I move that we divide the question on that course.

Edginton: Second.

Funderburk: We had a second already from Senator **Edginton**. (voice asking which course, attempting to clarify motion) Can you give me the course number exactly for what this other one is? (voices attempting to clarify) So that would be the Music in Special Education course?

Gallagher: Yes.

Funderburk: Ok, so this is—the motion is then to divide the question this time for Music Ed. 3050, Music in Special Education, to be considered as separate from the rest of the curriculum package. That is the discussion topic at the moment. Do we have any comments about dividing the question on this one? All those in favor of dividing the question and pulling out this course for special consideration, please say “aye.” (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? Senator **Van Wormer** opposed. And abstentions? None. Ok. So, we have now 3 things before us. We have the curricular package minus course 3040 and a separate minus 3050; so we’ve got 3 things. What shall we take up first? What is the will of the Senate?

Male voice: The entire pack....

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, let’s work—continue work on the package and then have people who want to talk to the 3040 and 3050 be advised to be here on the next meeting to talk about it.

Funderburk: I would suggest that they’re sitting across the room.

Terlip: I think they’re here, aren’t they?

Funderburk: They are.

Smith: But if we're—if we're continuing with the regular package, I do have a concern about a proposal in the Modern Languages Department. (voices sorting things out....) No, it's not Language and Literature. It's Modern Languages. It's the last proposal in their package. (voices still sorting through things) It was retro credits for Spanish to be here. This is the last one. It's at the bottom of the package.

Funderburk: As we find this course, we've got a line up before Senator **Smith**. I knew you'd wanted to say something, Senator **Swan**. Please go ahead.

Swan: For a point of parliamentary clarification. I don't know what you're doing. I don't know where—where—where--the floor is supposed to have something on it.

Funderburk: The floor was called for Senator **Smith** who was trying

Swan: Well, no, no. For what business?

Funderburk: The current version is the package,

Swan: The whole package.

Funderburk: the full curriculum package, which Senator **Smith** is attempting to raise a question about.

Swan: Ohhh, so these

Funderburk: Something Dr. **Licari** is finding [to project]

Swan: So these—these separations from the package are understood to be handled at some separate date, not as amendments. Ok, I think I'm understanding.

Funderburk: That was the sense of the Senate at the moment.

Swan: So we keep—we're—we're always on the package. I understand now.

Funderburk: My current understanding is I suspect there are some other items that some may feel need to be pulled out separately as well. (voices in room still sorting things out) So, Senator **Smith**, are you ready? Have you found it?

Smith: Yeah.

Funderburk: Ok, the floor is yours.

Smith: Again, it's stated as Enrollment Management Policy, and as it says, what it would do is grant credit to heritage speakers of Spanish for taking Spanish 2001 with—and passing with a grade of B or higher, they would get 21, I think 21 credits. And it says at the bottom [reading sporadically from the policy proposal found at:

<https://access.uni.edu/cgi-bin/ccd/curriculum/viewAbstracts.cgi?dept=92>]

that this policy of retrocredits is very widely used at Northern Arizona, Pittsburgh State University, etc. We are not aware of any institution that applies this system to heritage speakers only. Now, the concern I had was some of the institutions that are cited there, University of Wisconsin-Madison, St. Cloud State University, and others that I found pointedly do not provide retrocredit to heritage speakers. They provide it to non-native speakers of a language who have in high school or other ways have acquired some language skill and want to get credit for it. So it seems to me—it just struck me as a concern that we are kind of giving 21 credits to somebody because they grew up in a Spanish culture. That's fine, but I don't know that—you know, again, I have a constant concern about cheapening of college credits, and this looks to me like it's doing that, particularly when you start off saying it's a powerful recruiting tool, that we can attract a lot of people here because we're going to give you 21 free credits. That bothers me, and I thought it was important enough that I thought we should be talking about that. I did go on the—to the Minutes of the UCC, and I didn't see any discussion of it. Now, I understand that they're the experts, and they really go into everything, but I didn't see any discussion of this, and it struck me as something that—important enough

that needs some discussion. That's why I'm bringing up the issue. Should we be granting 21 credits for that, particularly when schools like Wisconsin, Michigan, Wichita State, St. Cloud State pointedly do not.

Funderburk: Do we have additional discussion on that? Or a motion regarding that course?

Funderburk: Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: I would like to divide this one out and wait for somebody from the Spanish section to come, because there's nobody—nope, no one here from the Spanish section of the new Department.

Funderburk: Ok. So this is—or I don't see a course number on that one. (many voices trying to determine just what this is)

Breitbach: It's just an Enrollment Management Policy.

Funderburk: Enrollment Management Policy, ok. Then the motion is currently and not yet seconded is to divide the question, pulling this Enrollment Management Policy out regarding the Spanish Majors, even though what I see is Major, not Majors. That's the motion. Do we have a second?

Smith: I'll second.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith** seconds. I'll recognize Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: This discussion—did the UCC approve this?

Male voice: Yeah.

Funderburk: Dr. **Licari**? (who nodded) That's a yes.

Gallagher: They did? Ok.

Funderburk: Discussion on the topic of dividing the question, once again, to remove the Enrollment Management Policy as a separate issue? Any other comments? All those in favor of dividing this out as a separate issue, say “aye.” (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (one heard) Abstentions. (none heard) Ok. Motion carries. So we are back to the full curriculum package minus our selected dissections. (light laughter around) Senator **Swan**.

Swan: Ok, so now if we—we pass the curriculum package now, we would be passing the package as recommended by the UCC except for one part, this last part that we’ve divided out. Is that correct?

Funderburk: It would be

Gallagher (?): And those two courses.

Swan: No, no, no. The UCC doesn’t recommend those two courses.

East: They’ll recommend one of them.

Smith: They recommended one.

Swan: Oh? It did recommend—oh, good, good, good. This is it. So—so if we pass the curriculum package now, we’re pass—package now, with the UCC package except for those 2 parts....(many voice trying to clarify)

Funderburk: Three items except that, if I understand your logic, we

Swan: Well, I’m trying to figure out what the UCC recommends. This package minus what?

Heston: This package minus the Schools in American Society equivalent.

Swan: Ok.

Heston: Because there is an outstanding issue of disagreement still related to the Diverse Learners course, that one was pulled, and now the third

piece to be pulled is this Enrollment Management Policy. So there would be 3 pieces that have been separated entirely from the package to stand as independent items of action. Everything else at this point remains in the—in the curriculum package.

Swan: Ok. My question, though, is: “How does that relate to the UCC’s recommendation?”

Heston: On what?

Swan: Those 3 things.

Heston: Those 3 things. No, on one. Yes, on the second two.

Swan: Ok. So UCC only recommended not having which class?

Gallagher: Schools in American Society.

Swan: Schools in American—it recommended the other two things that we’ve pulled out. That’s all I want to know. Ok.

Funderburk: I had Senator **Peters** and then Senator **Gallagher**. Senator **Peters** passes. Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: I was just going to clarify this.

Funderburk: We are back on the curriculum package. Do we have any additional—Senator **Swan**.

Swan: I’d like to hold off on the approval of the curricular package until we resolve the items that have been taken out, because curriculum—curricula operates as a whole, and the curr—and so there are parts now missing from the package that the UCC, in the fullness of its recommendation, did recommend. One item is recommended that we take out. If that were the only item we were taking out, I would feel very comfortable then—than approving that. But because we’re taking out other items that the UCC does not recommend taking out, I think we should resolve all of those items

before we pass the curriculum as a whole, because the curriculum as a whole is now very different from what the UCC and the faculty at large had envisioned passing.

Funderburk: So is yours a motion to table until the other three items have been dealt with? I'm trying to turn this into an action statement.

Swan: Ok. So—or to—yes, I mean, that's the language we've been using for like the other two things we have.

Funderburk: Ok, so we have a motion then to table the vote on the curriculum package until we deal with the 3 items that we have pulled out. Do we have a second for that tabling? Hearing none. Motion dies for lack of second. I see Senator **Gallagher**. (passes) Additional comments or questions from anyone? My understanding then, we are ready to vote on the curriculum package minus the 3 items we have pulled out. Senator **East**.

East: Senator **Swan** does present an issue that presumably Music Education changed their program with the—that they are revising their major in Music Education, and it depends on these two courses, and so we would—we would certainly need to separate the Music Education Major revision out of—if we are taking these two courses--

Funderburk: Do we have folks from music here?

East: --if we're considering those two courses separately, then we can't pass the major that includes those two courses, so by necessity we need to divide the question further.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**. But one moment, did we—does anybody from Music want to speak to that at the moment, the impact on that?

Droe [in audience, Head of Music Education]: No. That would be correct on the—the revisions to the major do include those two courses.

Funderburk: This is Dr. **Droe**, Head of Music Education. Ok, Senator **Terlip**. And then Senator **Gallagher**.

Terlip: Yeah, I was just going to ask if we could consider the Music. Since we have folks from Music here, if we could consider those before we voted on the whole package. I realize nobody's here from Spanish, but these folks are here today, so.....

Funderburk: Ok. Floor's to Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: I am simply trying to make a point that it--however it happens, these things need to be discussed. Now, if—if it—if it—if they will be discussed by taking them out, fine. If not, I'm happy to have the conversation here now. We just need to have that conversation, so I can go either way.

Wallace: Diane **Wallace**, Registrar's Office. I do want to mention that the way this passed at UCC was that course Music Ed 3040 and all related references to Music Ed 3040 within the Music Education restatements did not pass. So it's already in the UCC motion that was passed. If Faculty Senate does not pass Music Ed. 3040, this course would automatically be taken out of the Music Education restatements, since the course was not passed.

Funderburk: I see some enlightenment and some confusion created by that. (laughter and voices heard) Now, from a procedural standpoint, we're still sitting here with the full curriculum package, minus the 3 items on the table, as the action item. Are we ready to vote on that, or is there another action? Dr. **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: I'm going to move that we deal with the 3 issues first.

Funderburk: So, we have a motion to

Swan: Second.

Funderburk: a motion and seconded that we will take the 3 divided questions before the curriculum package. Senator **East**.

East: Certainly the Music courses seem appropriate to discuss, but Spanish seems not appropriate to discuss since we don't have anybody there from that program to discuss this. So it seems appropriate to say 2 of the 3 before the other comes up.

Funderburk: Being a pragmatist myself and seeing that we have 28 minutes, I would suggest the possibility of this Body passing 3 things in the next 28 minutes is slim to none. (laughter around) Senator **Gallagher** and then Senator **Peters**.

Gallagher: Well, I—I think everyone knows that when you have curriculum on the table, you send representatives. You know, and I'm not—I'm not trying to be undemocratic here, but we have to move things along. We have people coming from—for a second time to deal with issues, and—and I—I think that dragging them out constantly is—is very problematic.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Can I suggest a way out?

Funderburk: Always.

Peters: Can we—let me—let me test and see—I mean, without making a formal motion real quick, could we just—could we pass the package except for the School of Music and except for the Spanish Department's proposal?

Funderburk: Well, we have an active motion at the moment which is to take them in a diff—another order, so we'll need to deal with that motion first. I'm guessing what you're saying is, "Can we separate out the School of Music?" But that will be action.

Peters: And then pass—pass the whole thing and then come back to the School of Music.

Funderburk: That would be an alternate way of dealing with it. Currently, however, the motion is made and seconded to do the items we separated out first. Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: I—I think for—for my sake, to be able to vote on this, I—there's one more question I have, and this is from somebody from the UCC—C, did I get enough C's in there? (light laughter) The Spanish class, if that were pulled out, does that have any ripple effect on the rest of the curriculum proposed?

Licari: It's not a course.

Neuhaus: It's just simply a

Licari: It was some Departmental Policy wording changes, so I don't think it would destroy the rest of the coherence of the packet.

Funderburk: Do we have other comments? Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: I just wanted to also comment, given the fact that Modern Languages no longer exists, it seems this is a part of the problem. Because they got folded into another Department, this is part of the reason why there are not representatives, because they do not have a representative. Well, I don't know if Professor Gladden still serves as their interim representative or not, so this is—so that's why.

Gallagher: Ok.

Bruess: I'm not making excuses for them not being here,

Gallagher: Right.

Bruess: I'm just saying that that's part of the reason.

Funderburk: Anyone else for discussion? Otherwise, we're ready to vote on a—the issue of the Order, which is to take up the 3 divided questions before dealing with the curriculum. All those in favor of dealing with those

items first, say “aye.” (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (1 heard) Abstentions?

Woman’s voice: I’m abstaining on that one.

Funderburk: Ok, we’ve got 1 abstention as well. So, the motion carries. So we’ll be dealing with divided questions. It sounds as if the consensus of the group is to deal with the 2 questions regarding Music first. Shall we do them in the order the motions were made? That would be 3040 Teaching of Music in American Society is the first topic of discussion. Do we have a motion related to it? We have divided the question, but we don’t have a motion to accept, deny, follow the UCC recommendation, or what? Maybe we just want to sit and talk. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: I move to follow the UCC recommendation.

Terlip: Which was to.....

Swan: Which--then you tell me. (loud laughter) (voices attempting to clarify)

Funderburk: 3040 was a disapproval from the UCC. So, this motion would be to follow the UCC lead in not approving the course that.....just rolled off the screen (referring to the projected information).

Gallagher: Second.

Funderburk: And that is seconded by Senator **Gallagher**.

Licari: Sorry. (light laughter) I was looking at the

Funderburk: That’s ok. So, Teaching in Music American—Teaching Music in American Society. The motion on the floor is to not approve this in the Senate. Discussion from anyone here or from the Music Education representatives or anyone else? Are there any comments, defense, or suggestions?

Heston: I—I--This is more to provide context. Number 1, the previous Body that governed Teacher Education, to the degree that it did at least, voted “no” on this proposal as well. That was shared with the UCC. The second issue that I, as a licensure officer, have about this proposal is that we have not heard, to my knowledge—there may have been other communications I don’t know about—but it was not heard to my knowledge whether the State will accept this as part of the Professional Core as meeting the requirements for licensure, and without that, I have concerns that we will be—if—if they say “no” to this course, if—if you were to—if it were to go through and they were to say “no” to this course, then we’re stuck with a Music curriculum that’s not going to result in licenses or endorsements because it’s not approved by the State. So that, to me as a licensure person, is somewhat problematic.

Funderburk: We have Senator **Roth** and then Senator **Breitbach**.

Roth: Somebody correct me if I’m wrong, and actually I—I hope somebody finds me wrong here (light laughter)—I’m sorry to say more on this—if I understand correctly that there’s references in the rest of the program because of this course we’re taking out? Something--something in my gut tells me that this--this whole thing needs more work before it can pass. So I—I—I guess my issue—and I don’t mean this un—in an uncollegial manner at all—it seems like there is a little bit undone and premature, if there are references to this course that we’re taking out and the rest of the program, you know what I mean?

Funderburk: Uh huh. I do. I think it was Senator **Breitbach**, Senator **Swan**. There may be an answer to that also back here. (voices attempting to clarify)

Breitbach: I have a question for Melissa (**Heston**). Is there a process by which we can check with the State to see if these will be approved? And what would that timeline look like?

Heston: Well, it—it’s my understanding actually that Dr. **Droe** tried to communicate with the endorsement person who reviews all the endorsements, and I don’t know if he’s heard back from her or not. At this

mo—at this point, we—the endorsement approval process is taking a far more lengthy time than we had anticipated, and I have found, as other endorsements may testify, that they are very—the person who’s doing the reviewing right now is very precise in her interpretations of what counts and what doesn’t count, and so we have had to make a number of explanations, revised syllabi, etc., so far, so I—I—I’m—I’m just cautious about anything that might not fit the letter of the law from her perspective, and this is a little different than what would be done elsewhere.

Breitbach: And I’m sensitive to that concern, but it would not result in licensure?

Heston: I—I don’t know. I--I don’t want to claim that I know it wouldn’t, but I have concerns.

Breitbach: Right. Ok. Thank you.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So, in answer to Senator **Roth**’s question, I think the gentleman answered that, right? That if—if we take this class out, everything else that is attached to that is removed. That’s the UCC’s recommendation.

Wallace: Right.

Roth: Oh, I see. Ok.

Wallace: That--that’s correct, because that is referenced in Specialization A, B, and C, so whatever isn’t approved will just go back the way it was.

Roth: Oh, I understand. I misunderstood. Ok, thank you.

Funderburk: Dr. Droe.

Droe: Yes, just in response to the syllabi. As Dr. **Heston** was mentioning, the syllabi were being revised, so as is the practice of the Board of Education Examiners, if—if there is a recommendation for something to be

revised for our endorsements, then we usually accept those recommendations and make those revisions as would be the case with this Board since there was something that needed to be revised from the Board, we would most certainly take those recommendations and revise in whatever for—whatever we had to in accordance.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: If I might ask, what's being—what's—what being—what are the requirements that are being revised? This is Teaching Music, so that it looks like a methods course, so is this a teaching methods course that's being revised? Or

Heston: The course it's to replace is a foundational course that meets a specific standard in the professional licensure requirements, which specifically say philosophy, history, sociology, political aspects of education. So, it's a broad foundational course that all Teacher Education students typically take. It's—that's the course this one is to replace.

East: For Music majors.

Heston: For Music majors only.

East: So they wouldn't have to take another course from

Heston: They would not take another course. A—a slightly, and in terms of how the Board of Education works, it's not a question sometimes of—of changing a syllabi. It's a question of being told a course itself is not acceptable and therefore the endorsement is not going to be approved. And we have had that happen with at least 1 of our majors, and it meant basically lengthening the program without actually adding the course to the major, because they have to have it to get the license, so we just tell them, "Well, we didn't lengthen your major, but the State says we can't use this course we've been using. You're going to have to take this other course, but we are not going to go take it through the curriculum process and actually add it to your degree," which I find very unappealing. So essentially one of our majors got 3 hours longer because the State won't

take the course that had been accepted before and says “Now you have to take this new course,” but that was not added in this curriculum cycle. So students have to be advised properly. It’s a—it’s a—it’s an interesting conundrum to have a situation where we don’t know what the State will actually say, and if they don’t take the course, then it’s—it’s not tweaking the syllabus. It’s a much bigger issue.

Funderburk: Additional comments or questions regarding this? Anything from Music?

Droe: (to **East**) Did that answer your question, Senator? Because the—it’s not being revised, but the discussion about revision would be if the State was to have something that we needed to revise in the syllabus, then we would revise it. It’s not the revision of a—of an existing course. It’s a—it’s a brand new course.

East: It’s just the way things—what this changes is the way things get counted by the State, and it doesn’t change a Teacher Education’s—well, it does change a Teacher Education’s major—a Teacher Education major’s requirements in that if they are a Music Education major, they can now take this course instead of some other course that was normally taught in the College of Ed. or someplace.

Edginton: If—if the—if

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: Excuse me. If the—if the Senate voted to remove this from the packet, and the Board of Examiners came back and endorsed the course, what’s—what would the recourse be for inserting it back into the curricular cycle? Or if—if we pull it out, are—will they be done for another 2 years?

Funderburk: My understanding of that is they’re done until next cycle.

Heston: Which starts next Fall.

Funderburk: It could be resubmitted in 2 years. I mean, for—for—2 years for us to deal with it, but other people could deal with it for the next 2 years. Comments? Questions? Are we ready to vote on this? Anything else from Music? Senator **Shaw**.

Shaw: How does that impact the Music Education program? If we take it out, will they then go back to the other class they had to take?

Droe: Yes.

Heston: Yes, and there are—there are seats available, and so it's not a question of resources.

Shaw: So resources are ok?

Heston: Yeah. Resources are ok to serve the Teacher Education students with the current course.

Funderburk: I think for clarity, the impact would be nothing would change from what it is now. Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: Just to be clear. So this—this was not approved by the UCC because it has not been approved by the Department of Ed.?

Heston: Well, no. It—the UCC made its own decision based on input from Department Head, from other kind of comments from whatever. I don't—I wouldn't say that it was specifically because of the—I think that's one factor that was considered. I don't know, Mike (**Licari**), do you want to try and

Dolgener: What was the problem with the course?

Licari: I think the problem—well, I will preface my answer with a state—a statement that I was not present at that UCC meeting (light laughter), but I think the resulting questions, all of the surrounding lack of clarity over whether or not this course was going to be acceptable by those on campus and off campus made it so that the UCC was not willing to—to okay this

course. There was too many potential problems with it. You know—with—then the knowledge that it would—a Departmental appeal could bring it here, too, so it wasn't the last—it wasn't the last step in the process either.

Funderburk: Senator--Senator **Terlip** and then Senator **Gallagher**.

Terlip: I—I just wondered, what were the other objections?

Heston: The issue, I think, Senator—well, ok, Barry (**Wilson**), go ahead. It's your Department.

Wilson [in audience, Department Head, Ed. Psych. & Foundations]: Well, we had extensive deliberations over this at the Teacher Education Council as well as the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. And it would be hard to summarize those, but it—you know, there's—Music has always said, "Well, we'll modify it to do whatever the State wants." Well, it's hard to say what the course is, if it's modifiable to whatever they want. The—eventually I think they would come and—and as we viewed several modifications of the course, it came to look very similar to the course taught in my Department, so you can say either it's something different, which may not be approved, or it's essentially the same, which essentially is duplicative, and who needs duplication in these times?

Heston: I think there're—there were issues of, "Is it right?," rather like the LAC. Do we have specialized LAC courses? And we do in some cases, so I want to be clear that that doesn't occur. But is there foundational knowledge that all teachers, regardless of their content--that it's there to prepare them to be professionals in education? That's its purpose. Not to train them to be this kind of or that kind of teacher. It is viewed as core content in many places. It is historical, philosophical. And questions of what happens when you start Balkanizing Teacher Education students into tiny, little groups who have all of their licensure core courses, do we then have a common licensure core that people can build on and have a common language? And right now, we do. We have a pretty common licensure core that almost everybody takes all of. This—there's the slippery slope argument which may or may not carry any weight with you. I think—I think that that kind of issues—there were some (sighs)—the--the question

of why the current course doesn't meet the Teacher Education Cert—or the Music Education student's needs was never really clarified. There seemed to be a real goal of adding some hours for Field experiences, and it wasn't clear why those hours couldn't come from courses already in the major, which is a fairly extensive major, rather than out of the Professional Sequence in order to get those hours in. There were lots of questions about this particular course.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: I have difficulty understanding how this can be good for Teacher Education majors. If I had a son or a daughter majoring in Teacher—in Music Education, I would want them to take their foundational course by somebody who has a PhD in Social Foundations of Education, and that's what they're getting now. So I—I—I don't know how taking them away from that depth of knowledge and that authority of knowledge is good for their, you know, education in general. So I question that.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I was just going to ask if anyone wanted to make a case for the course? I haven't really heard anyone make a strong case for it yet. And if not, then I would suggest that we call the question.

Funderburk: I'll take that as a motion to call the question.

Breitbach: Second.

Funderburk: And I've heard a second to call the question from Senator **Breitbach**.

Terlip: Does anyone from Music want to make the case, though? I mean.....

Funderburk: I see no motion.....

Droe: I—I was going to respond but—but you—your comments were very appropriate that I didn't hear anything from the Senate at this point that's in support.

Peters: I mean, I—I—that was a genuine invitation for you, and when—when you didn't speak up, I thought I'd suggest to call the question. But please, I didn't mean to cut you off from speaking. I'm sorry.

Funderburk: So, the question has been called and seconded. All those in favor of calling the question, say "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? None—one abstention. Ok, so all—the motion is to follow the UCC recommendation, which is to disapprove of the course Teaching Music in American Society. All those in favor of disapproving of 3040, say "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? One abstention. So, the motion to disapprove passes. We have 9 minutes. The next one we would be taking up then would be the 3050 course, which is Music in Special Education. Do we have a motion?

Breitbach: Isn't this part of that package?

Funderburk: That--I can't read things that fast. The question that was raised here was, "Is that part of the--the package that would have been affected by our retraction of 3040?" By disapproving that, did that already remove 3050? (someone responded nonverbally) The answer is "no," according to that. So, do we have a motion on course 3050?

Gallagher: I'm going to move that we disapprove it.

Funderburk: So, you move to disapprove 3050? Music Education 3050? Do we have a second?

Edginton: I'll second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Edginton**. Discussion? Ah, yes (to **Heston**).

Heston: I just want to provide a little more context. The Council on Teacher Education disapproved this particular motion as well, but the UCC approved this course. So, just to be clear here what is not a consensus of opinion between the Teacher Education Council and the UCC, which was the case with the other course.

Funderburk: Thank you , very much. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So, just so I'm clear, so now the motion is to go against the UCC recommendation in this case and to take out of the curriculum this course?

Funderburk: That would be correct. Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: It is unfortunate in light of my previous dis—or comment, but there was no one—there was no representation at the UCC about this course that—when it met?

Heston: There was no one from Special Education.

Gallagher: Special Ed., right.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I'd be interested in knowing what were the arguments on both sides of this issue that made it controversial.

Heston: I—I think the arguments to a large extent are the same as with the—this is one of—it would replace one of our foundational courses. Dr. **Gallagher** has taught it. She could talk—speak to it more, I think. You've taught it as well [to someone else in the room], I think—so—so it has all of the same questions about it that the other course did. So same arguments against. The argument for that may have been a little more persuasive is there is a perception that music is a unique kind of environment and so working with children with special needs, youth or adolescents or young kids, requires certain kinds of methodologies that are best taught by the music educators, and my understanding of it was—and Lynn (**Dykstra**), I think you were there as well—was that it—that that issue of the unique

context—there’s nothing unique about Social Foundations and Music Education. There might be something about the music classroom and teaching diverse learners.

Dykstra: Well, at the UCC meeting there wasn’t anybody else to speak to the other side of it, so.....

Heston: Yeah. There—there was nobody to—to—to speak on behalf of Special Education other than my general comments which I made at the same time about them. It—it faces the same challenges, from my perspective as a licensure officer.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher.**

Gallagher: Well, I understand that there’s that sense of “music is kind of special and teaching kids with some what we refer to as *disabilities* would be—would be considered unique.” Would this better be handled as a class in Music Education, not—not to replace Diverse Learners, because Diverse Learners deals with—I—I’ve looked at the syllabus in depth, and it—it—it’s entirely centered on disability, whereas the Diverse Learners class in Special Education required of all of our teaching majors deals with diversity writ large. For one thing, in the syllabus that I read in the curriculum packet, disability—I—there’s—there’s a very uncom—uncomplex view of disability in here. I mean, there—there’s just “Here are the disabilities that these kids have,” and it’s a very textbook approach that is uncomplicated. In our classes, that concept of “What really is a disability?” and “How do we understand disability?” is dealt with. Moreover, we deal with other forms of diversity. And major key—key issue that we deal with is that there’s—there’s an intersectionality. Very often kids from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds are mistaken as having disabilities. Their—their differences are taken to be a disability. And I see nothing in this proposal that—that is going to deal with that very crucial issue. The Diverse Learners deals with diversity among a number of, you know, areas, not just disability, and they would be missing that entirely. Moreover, I understand your expertise in music, but you must also understand our expertise in disability.

Droe: We do have a board certified music therapist that's on our—our faculty _____

Gallagher: Right. But in terms of studying it as an academic area—I'm sorry, I'll let you go, but

Funderburk: Dr. Droe.

Droe: And you also—one of the other reasons why we wanted to propose this was it would be similar to how Physical Education has their own course to address diverse learners, and we—we're dealing with music teachers, working with music teachers in the classroom singing and playing musical instruments. We need to be able to come up with strategies and adaptations for our teachers to use to be able to work with these students, and at—at this point, who are soon to graduate, they don't have those types of—they don't have that content base before that, so we were trying to come up with a way that we can—we can address this--this deficiency within our degree program.

Funderburk: Did I see another comment in the back? Please speak loud for the microphone, please.

Christina **Curran** [in audience, from Special Education]: Yes, I—I—I'm also an instructor for 3150 [sic], and I speak on behalf of my Department and not just myself. One of the aspects of the Diverse Learner's class that was currently taught is the interdisciplinary nature of diverse learners. As schools, whether they be secondary schools or elementary, we are based on a problem-solving system, which takes professionals from diverse disciplines to look at the struggles that kids have, the challenges they have, and to utilize a problem-solving approach, and Diverse Learners in its current format allows us to have a music teacher, a secondary biology teacher when in secondary, or an elementary teacher, and we can—we can look at these issues for kids who are struggling or disproportionately identified. So that interdisciplinary nature of inclusion is key to our class, one of the key components, and is one of the differences, I think, in—in the loopholes so that we do have from the Music Department. We are willing as a Department, certainly, to collaborate with the Music Department

should it be through—if there is a way we can strengthen ours. So this Fall we'll offer visiting sections. We do for secondary educators. We certainly would be willing to—to do that. But for the reasons that Dr. **Gallagher** has stated as well as the Department has shared the Music Department's, we feel strongly that the current option needs to be retained.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**. Senator **East**. I mean, Senator **Smith**, sorry. It's the beards. (light laughter)

Terlip: Would there be—I mean, I don't know if you all have discussed this, but it seems like it could be handled very easily by just having a section of the course for Music Ed. students and make sure that that content gets in there. Is that something that could be done?

Funderburk: I'm not sure who you want the response from?

Terlip: _____

Curran: Well—well, certainly we—we do have separate sections for secondary versus elementary. We can identify a section that I might teach and would be glad—or anybody who might teach it, we certainly could consult or even co-teach. We—I think that suggestion might have been—been offered. But we do certainly have a—a—a syllabus that would provide an interdisciplinary nature collaboration, so we would be able to collaborate, but we do have sections which are offered for elementary or secondary. I don't know if the whole Music Ed. group would fill one. But we—we certainly would want it to be interdisciplinary, you know, in that nature. I mean, just.....

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Well, the language here says that it meets State licensure requirements. I'm wondering—it hasn't been tested? Is there any reason to think that it wouldn't?

Heston: I don't think it's been tested, but Kevin [**Droe**] may have—no, I did offer to send it to the Board, to the person to see, and they—chose it--to

do that communication themselves, which is fine. So I—**Kevin**, you’d have to say whether you heard anything from the Board on this.

Droe: They just accepted it into their—as one of the artifacts for under review for our University. That’s all I

Smith: Is there any reason to think that it wouldn’t meet State requirements?

Heston: They have a special section pulled out that’s very specific regarding diverse learners in the Professional Core. One of the things it include—it includes, as Dr. **Gallagher** says, is it’s a much broader view of diversity than—than specific disabilities. And so in terms of the content, and I have kind of mixed feelings about saying this, one of the areas I didn’t see in there as “gifted.” And you have to have con—instruction in gifted education. Now, I would argue that, of course, music students are often gifted, but still that doesn’t mean that you’re preparing—I—I—I—this one was obviously le—more controversial, more difficult for both, I think, the Council to decide on and for the UC--but less so for the UCC, because I think the UCC was persuaded by the human context argument. Again, there was no one from Special Education, though, to speak against it, and I tried to speak relatively generally. I don’t know. I truly don’t know if this would be accepted. I think it would be more likely to be accepted than the one that was voted down, but I’m not placing any bets. I mean, let me give you an example of how specific they are.

Funderburk: But before that, please, 5:02. We’re supposed to be in adjournment. We either need a motion to extend this discussion, table the item, but--Senator **Swan**, then Senator **Peters**.

Swan: I move to extend discussion to its conclusion and a vote on this issue.

Breitbach: I second.

Funderburk: All those in favor of extending until the conclusion of this, which is, by the way, an open-ended move (laughter and voices). All those

in favor, “aye.” (eyes heard all around) All those opposed? One opposition. And abstentions? (none heard) Please. Sorry to interrupt.

Heston: Just to give you an example of how meticulous the review is, Music is now going to have to change their elementary curriculum syllabi and their secondary curriculum syllabi to include Reading Methods, including Reading Recovery. And that’s going to have to be added to their current methods syllabi. And they are going to have to add for any kind of secondary course at some point reading in the content area as well, because the person who’s making these interpretations believes it says “reading” and therefore reading means “reading reading,” not reading music, but “reading.” So this is the mindset that we’re kind of working with and—and I don’t—I don’t—I always think about students in this case. What—what’s the consequence for students if they say “no.” The consequence for students is we have to—if we put something in and they say, “We will not accept that,” then they’ve been given one program, and we’ve got a program that won’t lead to endorsement, so I would feel much better if we heard from the State.

Funderburk: Additional comments? Questions? Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: I—I—I guess if we disapprove this, I—I would really like to encourage both Music and Special Education to try and come up with something that has a lot more music in it. I think this is right-headed in the sense that I think there are those people out there that are probably not served as well currently, and so I—if we disapprove this, I—I—I for one would really like to see some effort on both parties to try and arrive at something that delivers a bit more of this.

Funderburk: Senator **Breitbach** and then Senator **Gallagher**.

Breitbach: Melissa [**Heston**], I have a question, because the very first statement there leads us to believe that this has already been approved. It says that “It meets State licensure requirements for Music Education majors to complete coursework focused on diverse learners.”

Heston: That is—that is the Music Department’s interpretation.

Breitbach: Ok, so it hasn't—it hasn't actually been approved by the Department of Ed.?

Heston: No. It—it's—it's—it has not.

Breitbach: Ok.

Heston: The—the Department of Ed., I think—have you sent that to **Jerry** (?), the syllabi? So, the person who does the review has had the syllabus to review it.

Breitbach: But she—we haven't actually gotten

Heston: We have not gotten anything back

Breitbach: back?

Heston: and the current Music Endorsement has not been approved because of the reading issue.

Breitbach: Ok, because that's a little misleading to me.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: One thing I liked about the syllabus—or the plan—is that there is a sense of—and this is our—an acknowledgement of inclusive education, and that's great. I agree, Chris—Senator **Neuhaus**, about addressing the students' needs, but if—if they would infuse the needs of the diverse learners and that methodology into existing teaching methods classes in the Music, which would also encourage inclusive education, that would be an ideal solution without having to replace this course.

Heston: I would also point out that that's exactly how most programs do it. Special Educa—or Physical Education is the only one that has its own kind of pull-out version of this course. Everybody else does inclusion.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: From what little I know about education, this seems to be going kind of in the backwards direction to what current trends are with respect to special education. This sounds like a some sort of what used to be called in my day a “pull-out” versus an inclusive education where you have, to the extent possible, all students in the same classroom. This appears to be not providing that specific kinds of—kind of instruction. Rather it says, you know, “We’re going to pretend that we still get these students as a small group and separate from the rest of the students, and we deal with them that way.” I mean, that’s the sound of it, to me at least. I don’t know how it would be implemented, but.....

Funderburk: Does anyone from Music want to comment on that?

Droe: Well, we teach music in music classrooms, so we have separate—I mean, students come to music. They go to—you know, we have a separate music teacher and a separate classroom dedicated for music as their own period of the day to get music. So that’s—in that way it’s--it is separated out. This is actually more innovative than anything because we are actually moving towards putting—meeting the needs of diverse learners in the musical context, which we’ve never—which we haven’t done before. So, we’re—we saw the needs of our Music Education majors, that they need more of this in relation to how we teach music. And that—and because of that, that’s why we have put forth this proposal.

Funderburk: Ok. Senator **Shaw** and then Senator **East**.

Shaw: I think Senator **Gallagher** maybe can address this. Is that inclusiveness what you see missing from their proposal?

Gallagher: What I was saying is that there seems to be an expressed value on the idea of inclusion, and I thought that was a good thing. I was trying to congratulate them for that, but—but then the idea of, you know, sort of creating this separate class..... One of the big problems I have is that there’s a huge overrepresentation of minority and poor kids in special education. Their cultural, linguistic, and ethnic differences are often

interpreted as disability, and moreover when you take the categories of disabilities that are so neatly laid out in the syllabus that I read—are—are—there's not a neat separation between children with behavioral problems. You—you can have a child who exhibits characteristics of 3 of those categories, and—and they're laid out as if there's some neat separation. These are the kinds of things we deal with in *Diverse Learners* in—in the class that we teach, and I see none of that nuance, if that makes sense.

Shaw: And that's what I wanted to know. What is missing?

Gallagher: That—that's a more sophisticated nuance than I—and I—I don't mean that to be an implicit critique, but it—it's not there, as far as I know.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: This—the notion of—of individual maj—teaching majors including more instruction for diverse learning in their—in their—in their programs is certainly a good one, and—but what this would kind of presage is the notion that math and biology or science and—and—and foreign language and history and all the departments that would then be wanting to teach math in special education or history in special education and—and it seems to me that—that—that's not the direction we wish—we would want our curriculum to add. And this certainly seems like that's the way it's headed, or that you would recommend we do that for other things since we are doing that for you.

Droe: Even at the local elementary, you know, when they talk about specialists in the curriculum, they're—we're talking about our music and P.E. So throughout the school day, music is already separated out as—I mean, just—just by the mere environment that it's in at schools, it's separated out as—as a separate—separate entity, so it's not—it's not infused, it's not included into a regular school schedule within the coursework. It's a separate class, so, you know, music is, you know, it's a different—it's a different atmosphere there. So that's why—I mean, we're teaching—when we're—when we're teaching these students, and, you know, what types of—what are they using right now to be able to impress students with—in diversity or for having special needs? And if you were to

ask our students when they graduate, you know, “What would you do if you had the students with special needs in that music context?” They wouldn’t necessarily know. Now, the practicing teacher may know, if that teacher has been taking some workshops and clinics, but it’s a deficiency not just in our degree programs, it’s a deficiency in education right now.

Funderburk: Dr. **Heston**.

Heston: I—I think part of the issue is, “What is the purpose of this course, or that component, in the State requirement?” That component is not a methods course. It is not saying methods in teaching diverse learners. It is far more foundational, philosophical, kind of historical as well. It is a foundational orientation to diversity and inclusion and to disability and so on. The way Dr. **Droe** describes this course, which I think is probably a very necessary chunk of content, is a methods course. And what we’re talking about is taking a professional sequence course and replacing it with a methods course, and that’s a choice. I—I’m not going to make judgments. Both of those things, I think, both of them are critically important, and I don’t like the idea that we’re having to trade one for the other, but we can’t add hours to the major, and apparently Music cannot find a way to reconfigure their hours to provide that content in another way, but I do think Dr. **East** is right when he says that other programs may indeed pursue this same avenue, and we get duplication. I mean, it’s almost like, “Well, I want my own reading and writing course for English, and we’ll teach it for our students. So all the Teacher Ed. students will now take our Category Competency I course because we know what we want to teach them, and you all don’t do a good enough job of it.” There’s the same contradiction, same challenge, that you’re going to face—I mean, it’s a—it’s a challenge.

Funderburk: I’ve got Senator **Breitbach** and then Senator **Swan**.

Breitbach: I would like to call the question.

Funderburk: The question has been called. Do we have a second? Second from Senator **Roth**. Discussion about calling the question? Seeing none, all those in favor of calling the question, say “aye.” (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? One abstention. The question

has been called. For clarity, the motion is to disapprove of Music Ed. 3050. That would be going against the UCC recommendation. Just so we are all clear. So all those in favor of disallowing 3050, say “aye.” (ayes heard) All those opposed? (several heard). I think it was clearly the “ayes” there. And abstentions? Ok, we’ve got two. We’d better do a hand count on this one, just so we’re clear. All those in favor of this disallowing 3050 raise your hand, and we’ll get a count. Ten. All those opposed to this? Two oppose. And abstentions? One abstention. No, two abstentions. Ok. So, the motion to disallow 3050 passes.

ADJOURNMENT

Funderburk: Do we have a motion to adjourn since we

Dolgener: So move.

Funderburk: Senator **Dolgener**.

Bruess: Second.

Funderburk: Second **Bruess**. All those in favor, “aye.” (ayes heard all around at 5:21 p.m.). See you in a few weeks. Three weeks, yes.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

February 13, 2012
Oak Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.