

Regular Meeting
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
02/11/13 (3:30 p.m. – 5:25 p.m.)
Mtg. #1727

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

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

Press present included Emily **Christensen** from the *Waterloo Courier* and Blake **Findley** from the *Northern Iowan*.

Provost **Gibson** was out of town, and Associate Provost **Licari** offered no comments in her stead.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk**'s briefly commented by offering his thanks to the community for their participation in the recent presidential search. He noted that attendance was good and that participation in the survey was also very good.

Chair **Peters** echoed the same thanks for everyone's participation in the presidential search. He noted that he anticipated that the newly selected president would be on campus regularly between now and when he officially begins on June 1, 2013. **Peters** promised to facilitate any meetings requested by the new president with Senators or other faculty groups.

Chair **Peters** also noted that he had recently learned that Jeneane **Beck**, UNI's lobbyist, sends out a weekly email to Iowa legislators about a UNI topic which might interest them and that faculty could also be on the email list to receive this information.

Lastly, Chair **Peters** wanted the Minutes to reflect that Vice-President Terry **Hogan** pays for the Union fee to set-up and tear-down the meeting room

for Faculty Senate meetings. He and former Faculty Chair **Funderburk** had presumed those fees were simply waived for the Faculty Senate, but it has been learned that V.P. **Hogan** actually pays those charges out of his budget. **Peters** encouraged Senators to personally pass along their thanks to **Hogan** for this generosity just as he, **Peters**, has done.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

Minutes from January 14, 2013, were approved as submitted.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

One motion and second (**Swan/Strauss**) took care of docketing all items under consideration today as suggested and requested by Chair **Peters**, following no response to his asking if anyone wanted to docket any item separately. Therefore, the following were docketed:

1173 1069 Consultation with UNI Foundation (out of regular order, at the head of the docket on Feb. 11) (**Swan/Strauss**)

1174 1070 EPC Recommendation regarding changes to the Attendance and Make-up Work Policy (out of regular order, immediately following consideration of 1172/1068 on Feb. 11) (**Swan/Strauss**)

1175 1071 Academic calendars 2013-2010 (regular order) (**Swan/Strauss**)

1176 1072 Request for Emeritus Status for Ed **Brown** (regular order) (**Swan/Strauss**)

1163 1059 Report of Ad hoc Committee on Changes to Policy Process (re-docketed in regular order) (**Swan/Strauss**)

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1173 1069 Consultation with UNI Foundation (docketed today at the head of the docket) (**Swan/Strauss**)

****Completed.**

1172 1068 Curriculum Changes—Women's & Gender Studies Program (regular order) (**Kirmani/Cooley**)

****Motion to bring approval up for discussion (Swan/Neuhaus).**

****Motion to call the question (Swan/Gallagher). Passed.**

****Vote to approve curriculum changes. Passed.**

1174 1070 EPC Recommendation regarding changes to the Attendance and Make-up Work Policy (docketed today to follow 1172/1068) (**Swan/Strauss**)

****Motion to extend to 5:20 (Walter/Terlip). Passed.**

****Motion to amend recommendation (Terlip/Edginton).**

****Motion to call the question. (not acted upon)**

****Friendly amendment offered. (not acted upon)**

****Motion to table until the beginning of next meeting on Feb. 18, 2013 (Smith/East). Passed**

5. Adjournment

****Motion to adjourn 5:25 p.m. [no second; no vote; meeting dissolved]**

Next meeting:

02/18/13

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 66 pages, including 2 Addenda.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 11, 2013
Mtg. 1727**

PRESENT: Melinda **Boyd**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Tim **Kidd**, Michael **Licari**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Gary **Shontz**, Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter**

Absent: Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Gloria **Gibson**, Syed **Kirmani**, Kim **MacLin**, Marilyn **Shaw**, KaLeigh **White**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Peters**: All right. We have a full schedule today, and I do note the presence of a quorum, so we'll come to order.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Peters: Let's see. In terms of the press, I see Emily **Christensen** from the [*Waterloo*] *Courier*, Blake (**Findley**) from the *Northern Iowan*, and are there any other members of the press that we need to know about? [none seen] Thank you.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Peters: Provost Gibson is, I think—I guess I don't know her itinerary, but she's on her way back from India, I think, at this time. So she will not be joining us today. Associate Provost **Licari** has nothing to share with us today.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Peters: So, Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: I have no long comments, but I do want to thank the community for taking part in the presidential search recently despite all the various plagues that beset us during that time. So, attendance was great, and thanks for participation in the surveys. I think we had a very successful conclusion. That's all.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS

Peters: Thank you. And I'll echo Jeff's [**Funderburk**] thanks as well. I talked very briefly to the next president at the reception in Des Moines last week about the tasks that face us. He does not take office until June 1, as you know, but I would expect that he'll be on campus as—I would hope as soon as possible. I would certainly expect that he'll be on campus regularly over the next several months and begin the process of meeting people and learning about our challenges. I'll be emailing him this week to offer him the opportunity to talk to Senators, and I would expect that as he does this and learns about UNI, he'll be interacting with faculty and staff in a number of different forums. And, given the amount of information he needs to gather and the sensitive nature of it, I suspect he might want—in addition to open public forums, I suspect he might want some smaller closed door forums. And I will certainly make the offer that we can arrange those kinds of meetings with Senators as well as with other groups of faculty members he might be interested in meeting with.

On another topic, Jeneane **Beck**, who is the University's lobbyist, has been sending out a weekly email to legislators. It's called the *Panther Caucus*, and it's just a—it's a short email. Each week it highlights one thing that is going on at the University that the legislators might be interested in. She asked for feedback about it, and I said I'd never seen it. And so it turns out faculty are not getting this. She wanted to know if faculty might be interested in getting it. [voices saying they are receiving it] You're getting

it? [others agreeing] Oh, ok. Well, I don't get it. [loud laughter] So, maybe it's just me. So, maybe I'm the only one who doesn't get it. [more laughter] So, anyway, I told her that I thought that we should perhaps—that she might want to send that to faculty, and it is possible to unsubscribe from it. So those of you who—those of you who aren't getting it now, if any of you other than me are not getting it, you might soon start to get it.

Licari: The rest of us will get it twice [said jokingly].

Peters: Yeah [light laughter] Now—yeah, I think Google takes care of that, and you'll only get it once.

And then finally I wanted to share a note of thanks with you. I just recently learned that Terry **Hogan** has been paying, out of his budget, for the Union set-up and tear-down fees of our [Faculty] Senate meetings for some time, apparently since the Senate moved into the Union a couple of years ago. Jeff [former Faculty Senate Chair **Funderburk**] and I had both been under the impression that the fees had simply been waived, that the Union wasn't charging us because this was the default set-up for this room, but that is not the case. In fact, Terry [Vice-President **Hogan**] has been paying for it out of his budget somewhere—has been covering that charge. So, when I learned about that, I thanked him personally. But I did want the Minutes to reflect our thanks to Vice-President **Hogan**, and if you see him on campus, maybe you could pass along those thanks as well.

Are there any questions or anything else we would like to share during comment period?

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Peters: Seeing none then, let's head to approval of the January 14th Minutes, our last meeting. Are there any additions or corrections to those Minutes? [none heard] Seeing none, we shall let the Minutes stand as approved, if there is no objection. [none heard]

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1173, Consultation with UNI Foundation (out of regular order, at the head of the docket on Feb. 11)

Calendar Item 1174, EPC Recommendation regarding changes to the Attendance and Make-up Work Policy (out of regular order, immediately following consideration of 1172/1068 on Feb 11)

Calendar Item 1175, Academic calendars 2013-2020 (regular order)

Calendar Item 1176, Request for Emeritus Status for Ed brown (regular order)

Calendar Item 1059, Report of Ad hoc Committee on Changes to Policy Process (re-docket in regular order)

Peters: And that brings us to Calendar Items for Docketing. As I indicated to Senators in an email last week, I do apologize for the two items that I'm asking you to docket today for immediate discussion, but it was unavoidable really because of the cancellation of the January 28th meeting and the inability to have a special meeting last week. Calendar Item 1163, the report of the Ad hoc Committee on Changes to the Policy Process is being re-docketed because we ended up skipping over it at our last meeting. It wasn't quite ready for discussion at that point. It is now. So I would just ask are there any of these items up for docketing that anyone wants to pull out for separate discussion of docketing? Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I would like to move that we docket 1173 out of regular order and at the beginning of today's meeting.

Peters: If you don't mind, Senator **DeBerg**, I was going to just ask if no one wanted to pull any of these individual items out right now, that we could just take care of the docketing with one motion, and docket everything at once.

DeBerg: Ok. Ok.

Swan: As you recommended earlier.

Peters: Consistent with my recommendations.

DeBerg: I see now. Sure.

Swan: No, oh, do you need a motion for that?

Peters: I will. Let me just ask one more time, does anyone want to pull any of these items out for separate discussion? [none heard] At this point, then, I'd entertain a motion to docket these in accordance with my recommendations as reflected on the screen [today's agenda projected for all to see]. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So moved.

Peters: Is there a second?

Strauss: Strauss.

Peters: Senator **Strauss**, thank you. All in favor—any discussion? [none heard] All in favor, please say "aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, no? [none heard]

NEW BUSINESS

Peters: Is there any new business? [none heard]

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1069, CONSULTATION WITH UNI FOUNDATION (OUT OF REGULAR ORDER, AT HEAD OF THE DOCKET ON FEB. 11) (**Swan/Strauss**)

Peters: Seeing none, this brings us to our first item, Consultation with the UNI Foundation. I've allotted about 30 minutes or so for this. I know they

have a PowerPoint presentation, so let's see if we can get that set up.
[works with changing cords for projection from 2nd laptop]

Mason: Scott [Faculty Senate Chair **Peters**], is this like the Christmas Vacation movie where you plug it in and all the lights go out? [light laughter around]

Peters: Let's hope not. Let's hope not. [various voices offering suggestions on how to make the 2nd laptop project properly, without success] Well, the other option is that I can just do it from here [his own laptop] for you [to Bill **Calhoun**, President of the UNI Foundation]. Still not working? Ok, I'll just do it from here for you. Give me a nod or something, when you want me to [change slides].

Calhoun: Oh, that makes it easy.

Peters: Ok, it's all yours.

Calhoun: All right. Great. Well, first of all, Scott [Faculty Senate Chair **Peters**], thank you very, very much for allowing us to come and visit the Faculty Senate today. I'd like to introduce some of my colleagues over on the left-hand side of the room from my angle. Noreen **Hermansen**, Frank **Esser**, Alli **Ingman**, and Cassie **Luze**. They are here to act as resources today, in case any of you have a question that I choose to defer to or can't answer. Before we begin, I'd like to introduce to you the Vice-Chair, the incoming Chair of the UNI Foundation, Dave **Mason**. I think Dave knows many of you here. He was on the Search Committee which hired Bill **Ruud** [the newly selected next President of UNI] and has a great deal of knowledge about the Foundation, a great passion for the University, and he had asked to make some preliminary comments, so, Mr. **Mason**.

Mason: Thank you very much, Bill. And thank you, Mr. Chairman Scott. I really appreciate the opportunity that we have today to visit with all of you. Just very quickly, it was a pleasure for me serve on the Presidential Search Committee with you, Scott, and Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**], and one of the benefits for me was to meet so many faculty members. We had a lot of great faculty members on the Search Committee, and it was really a

wonderful opportunity for me that I'll be coming in as Chair of the Foundation later in the Fall. And it's great. I have friends now all over—all over campus, and I think it will be a great opportunity for us to interact more with faculty.

So with that I bring you greetings from the Board of Trustees, 26 volunteers from coast to coast. Many are—live closer here in the Cedar Valley, but they are all dedicated to the proposition that we need to advance the University.

So with that I'm going to make 4 brief points to you. My case is today, 4 points.

1. Why are we in business? As I've said to some of my colleagues on the Search Committee, higher education, at least through some people's eyes, is in crisis today because, in many cases, some politicians and some citizens don't have the political will to properly fund it. And so it's because of that crisis that the Board of Trustees and the staff of the Foundation is working very hard to do whatever we can to raise the funds that are necessary to advance the University. So, why are we in business? We are in business for all of you, your programs, and your students. That's #1. That's why we're in business. No, we don't have any other agenda, and you may recall some earlier campaigns that were—there were—there was more capital emphasis. You know, there was the—there was the Gallagher-Bluedorn and then there was the McLeod Center. But this last campaign that we're just finishing—have just completed—was primarily for programs and scholarships. And that's going to be our emphasis. So that's point #1.

2. I have good news for you. Bill and I and the staff have very good news for you about the campaign that's just finished, and I won't steal the thunder, so just hold that point. Good news.

3. The third point I wanted to make is "thank you." Thank you so very much for the faculty support. Can you imagine how powerful it is when we sit with a donor and we tell them about the number of faculty and retirees who have supported our campaigns. That is crucial. You can imagine it. What we hope that will come out of this is that faculty and staff will think of

the Foundation like they do the United Way, you know. And we'd like to have 100% participation, but we do have very high participation, and for that we thank you.

4. Fourth, and finally, how can you help? You can help, of course, by supporting the Foundation with your own gifts in time and effort, but also just as important, I'm sure all of you faculty have alumni. You have former students and people in the community that you know that may be prospects. We want to know who they are, and if you have contact with them, we will go with you, if you want us to. We have great staff here that's ready to go. Bill will go. I'll go, if you think I can help. And we need those prospects. We need those doors to open so that we can broaden our support.

So those are my 4 points, and we do have good news. And we'll go back to that point, and Bill is going to do it. I just want to say one more time, thank you so much from the Board of Directors, and we appreciate all you're doing for our students. Bill?

Calhoun: Very good. Thank you, David. When I originally wanted to come, or when we originally wanted to come to visit, we talked—we wanted to talk with you about the success of the Imagine the Impact Campaign, but as I was working with Scott [Faculty Senate Chair **Peters**], I said, "Scott, is there anything that the faculty would like to know from the Foundation so that we can make sure that we answer questions?" And Scott indicated that they—that the Faculty Senate would like to know a little bit more about how the UNI Foundation impacts the budget here at UNI. So, with your permission, we've got a few slides that we'll scroll through. [see Addendum 1 or go to: <http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/consultation-uni-foundation> and click on the link in the "Upload Supporting Information for Box A" area] The first couple or 3 slides will talk about how the Foundation supports the University and, more importantly, our students, and then the last few slides will enter into the campaign a little bit further. And I appreciate the fact that we don't have much time, so we'll try to move through it rather quickly. But I'd like to ask if you have questions at any time, please don't hesitate to ask. So, with

that, Scott, why don't we go ahead and go to the first slide [following the title slide].

[slide 2, UNI Foundation Facts] Just a few facts about the Foundation. We have assets right now—net assets of about \$97 million as of the end of the calendar year, and of the \$97 million, about \$76 million are endowment funds that provide spending each year, that go into spending accounts for purposes designated by the donors. And you see we have various projects. We have almost 1600 different project accounts that we use here at UNI. About 700, split just about half and half, 722 are endowed; 680 are not endowed. Then we have 200 other accounts. And these accounts are directed by the donor. The donor tells us how they would like to have their gift used, and then we will establish an account for use for that gift. And I imagine that of the 1500 accounts, it impacts every single Department on campus. I'm sure that every single Department is a beneficiary of some private support that has been directed to that particular Program and Department.

[slide 3, Support for UNI in FY 12] Scott. Here is how we break out the various areas of support for the University for this past year. I'm going to take you—for the first figure, the scholarship figure, and then drop your eye down to the bottom. \$5.4 million for program support, so all totaled in FY12 the Foundation provided about \$9.4 million to support the Programs here at the University of Northern Iowa. Of that, \$3.8 million are for scholarship support. Those funds go directly to the students, mostly through a credit on the student's tuition bill. Very seldom do we actually present a check to a student.

And then for the Program Funds, we've broken it out into about 5 different categories just so you can get a sense of it. Direct Departmental Support about \$1.4 million. In some of these areas there was a gift of software that was provided to one of the Departments that was a very significant gift. Library materials, a considerable amount of funds went to the Jacobson Literacy Center, and various other categories that comprise that \$1.4 million. Travel, just shy of \$1 million. That's for student travel, faculty travel. The Jacobson Literacy Program also had considerable amount of travel funds as they were taking staff back and forth to Arkansas. And one

of the—this is a little bit higher than normal in FY 12, the UNI basketball team went to Brazil, and there was a considerable portion of the funds that were used to support that international experience for our student athletes. Professional services of about \$600,000. A great deal of that is in programming for the Gallagher-Bluedorn Performing Arts Center. The Friends of the Gallagher-Bluedorn run all of their funds through the Foundation. We also have endowments to support that, and so a large percentage of that figure is for the visiting artists that come to campus. \$1.1 million for capitalized assets and equipment. Part of that is the reflection of some bonds that the Foundation is paying down on the Human Performance Complex and other projects. The Carver Grants that we receive, all the equipment that are purchased through the Carver Grants also float through that kind of a project expense as well. And then for Salaries, honoraria, and student stipends, about \$1.4 million for this last year, and that—those are all the endowed professorships, fellowships, chairs, that we have. The Pappajohn Center had—they run several of their salaries through the Foundation, through the gifts that John Pappajohn makes to the University. And also there are a couple of faculty members from the College of Education in the Literacy Center from the Jacobson gift that are receiving stipends from that. So all totaled, about \$5.4 million for Program Funds, and if you add that to the Scholarships, it's about \$9.4 million all totaled from FY 12 that were transferred from the Foundation or paid directly to vendors in support of students and faculty and staff here at UNI.

[slide 4, Points to Remember] Next slide, please, Scott. I wanted to make sure that as we talk through this that we all understand that the gifts that are provided by our donors to UNI, they're not used to pay for the lights and the heat and some of the things that they expect the State of Iowa to pay for here at UNI in support of our students. And we always like to tell people the gifts to the Foundation provide that margin of excellence for our students, whether it's to provide outstanding classroom opportunities, undergraduate research, scholarships, whatever, we'd like to have these gifts be additive to the support that we already receive from the State and from the tuition revenue from our students.

We always, always, always honor donor intent. That is something that is very, very important to us. We believe that the donors have great faith in the fact that their gifts are being well utilized by you in support of our students. And so, in fact, about 95% of the funds that we do receive in the Foundation are restricted for a purpose by the donor.

And as Dave mentioned, you all have been so helpful to us in the past, and here's how you have helped us in the past and how you can continue to help us into the future. The donors have great confidence that their gifts are being well used by the faculty and staff and the Administration here at UNI. And we always want to make sure that if you have some funds in a project account that they are fully deployed in support of that student experience. That's very, very important, because every year we send donors a report on how their gifts are being utilized, and for us to say that we've spent every penny that you've given in support of helping students, that's very meaningful to them, because as we all know, the best future donor is a past donor.

And we always cycle our donors through our development process. Many of you are in regular communication with your previous students who have gone on to achieve something. As Dave mentioned, they've had remarkable achievements, and we want to make sure that you continue to send a strong message that the support that we receive from our alumni and friends is absolutely critical for the student experience here at UNI. So anytime you can communicate back and forth with alumni and friends, that's just so meaningful and so important to our work.

As Dave mentioned, if you can, help identify former students who you think can make a difference for our current students. We'd be happy to go with you on a call. We'd be happy to make the phone call to set up the appointment. I know all of our trustees feel the same way. We'd love to help in any way that we possibly can to tell the story about UNI and to tell the story about how people can make a difference in the lives of our students. We also like to have—as you'll see with some of the information that I'll leave with you—we also like to have stories to tell about donors who have made a difference or about graduates who have gone on to become successful, because we think that that sends a very powerful

message, not just to our other donors or motivate other donors, but also as a—it tells a strong story for our students who have a chance to read that about what is possible after they graduate from UNI.

And finally, help identify projects that have potential for corporate and private Foundation support. Many of you are doing research, and you're looking for external funds, and Alli **[Ingman]** in particular works with our corporate and private Foundation donors to help match faculty projects with potential funding sources. So please share that information with us as soon as you possibly can.

[slide 5, UNI's largest fundraising effort] Go ahead, Scott. Thank you. Just a little bit about the campaigns that we've had in the past. As Dave mentioned, the Leading, Building, Sharing Campaign and the Students First Campaign were both heavily capital project oriented. The Leading, Building, Sharing Campaign had the Cornerstone of the Gallagher-Bluedorn Performing Arts Center. And the Students First Campaign had 5 different capital projects, including the McLeod Center, renovation to Russell Hall, the Human Performance Complex, an Early Childhood Facility on the Allen College campus, and several other things as well.

This campaign, the one that we are just bringing to a close, was all about people, as Dave mentioned. It's all about supporting our students and supporting their experience in the classroom. And as you'll notice, we'll scroll through this a little bit. There was a small component of capital projects, but it was very, very small in relationship to the \$158 million that was raised in this campaign.

[slide 6, The Vision] You're getting good, Scott. You're anticipating. The Vision for the campaign was pretty straightforward. It was embedded in the goals that you see in our Strategic Plan—be a premier undergraduate university; be a State and National leader in Pre-K–12 educational issues; and an organization that contributes back to the quality of life and the economic vitality of NE Iowa and the State of Iowa.

[slide 7, 2005-2013] The goal, back in 2005 when we began to formulate the campaign, we established the goal at \$150 million, and as Dave had

mentioned, this is all about people and programs and about building our endowment so that future generations of students can have the same kind of outstanding experience here that our current generation is having.

[slide 8, Student Impact: Scholarships] We are going to break it down into three different areas: scholarships, program support, and the capital projects that we've talked about just briefly. We received in this campaign about \$13 million for endowed projects. Now, keep in mind that we don't have this money to expend, but we invest it, and every year we generate income from that that goes into spending accounts that can be used to support whatever projects that the donor has informed us of.

We also have about \$10 million that we've received in non-endowed scholarship gifts that the donors want deployed right away. And some of the gifts that you see in that number also factored into that \$3.5 million worth of scholarship support that we've provided the students this last year.

[projected slide changed] Let's go back one more.

Peters: Oh, sorry.

Calhoun: [return to slide 8] The estate gift component is something that's really important to us. The donors from UNI who are in their prime giving ages of, you know, 65 and 70 to 80, many of those are former teachers, and so we've had a very aggressive planned giving program because these former teachers may not have been able to make large gifts during their lifetime, but they love UNI, they love the experience here, and so we've been working very closely with them about including UNI in their estate. So, as you see the figures on our campaign, we always include estate gifts as one of our component parts, because it's an important area for us, and it's important for our donors to understand that. Right now we have about \$100 million on our books in future commitments that will be received at some point in time in the future that donors have specified for UNI. Total for scholarships is \$62 million.

[slide 9, Student Impact] And, of course, it impacts accessibility and affordability and enables us to help diversify the student body. Some of those gifts are used for merit scholarships to award the best and the brightest.

And then many of the programs are—many of the donors direct their gifts for areas that are very, very specific. For example, they want to support students that were much like them when they were attending UNI, and so you might have someone from Odebolt, a donor from Odebolt that's directed their scholarship just from someone from that area, and so we allow the donors to tell us how they would like their gifts to be used. We tend to guide them to the extent that we can, but at the end of the day the donors tell us how they want their gift here at UNI used.

[slide 10, Enriching the Student Experience] Scott. Just to—hit it one more time [to bring photo onto screen], thank you. Pauline Barrett, who many of you know in the community, established a scholarship fund for Cedar Valley students, and 4 years ago the first recipient was Danny Lewis, and he happened to work at the facility where Pauline Barrett lived and got to know Pauline, and he was selected as the first recipient of her scholarship. And he now is just starting his first year at the University of Minnesota Medical School. But over the last 3 years, the scholarship has grown so that right now we have 25 Barrett scholars on campus, all from the Cedar Valley. So it's just a terrific gift that just keeps on growing and impacting our students' lives in many ways.

[slide 11, Maintaining academic excellence through program support] We also talked about the strong support that we've received for our programs, whether they're academic programs or student out-of-class learning-experience programs, we've had an outstanding reception for the donors who want to impact our students' education, not through direct scholarship support.

[slide 12, Program Support] We received about \$21 million in endowed gifts for this. Again, the income from that will be available for use as directed by the donors. About \$32 million for non-endowed program support gifts, and estate commitments of about \$32 million.

[slide 13, Program Impact, Davis] And here—hit it one more time [for photo to appear]—a couple of examples of that. T. Wayne **Davis**, who lived in this community for many, many years, his will established a professorship several years ago, and it's been enhanced by their daughters. And Elaine **Eshbaugh** from the School of Applied Human Sciences is now receiving the professorship that they established in Gerontology. And she's just done an amazing job in keeping in touch with our donor, so they feel really good about their investment, and I would imagine that they will continue to support this into the future. But she's having a terrific impact on our students as well, and that's the most important thing.

[slide 14, Program Support, Finkelstein] One of the other projects I wanted to lift up because it was funded by one of our own, Judy **Finkelstein** and her husband have established a holocaust program that takes information and gets it out into the high schools and the middle schools to inform people about some of the human rights issues associated with the holocaust. And it's been a very, very powerful program, and working with Stephen **Gaies** we've been able to leverage that into other gifts for other aspects for the holocaust effort.

[slide 15, Capital Project Support] One more time, please, Scott. [to bring photo onto frame] Thank you. Capital Project Support, as I mentioned, we did have some capital projects that we were raising funds for in this campaign. A small amount of that was for Russell Hall. Russell Hall was mostly in the Students First Campaign, but there are a few things that we wanted to get done in the facility that we continued to raise funds for to achieve. We also, in fulfillment of Chris's **[Edginton]** vision that he had for the Human Performance Center, we had a second phase to that project, and that was funded by a generous gift from Dick **Jacobson** as well. So we were able to renovate a great deal of the old Physical Education Center. And then we did raise some funds for the McLeod Center, mostly to construct that connector between the UNI-Dome and the McLeod Center itself. But again, a very small component part of our entire campaign effort. [\$7.3 million as shown on the slide]

[slide 16, Campaign Gift Table] I like to share this because it shows how we go about doing our business in the Foundation. Before the campaign, we established a gift table. And we said to ourselves, “If we are going to raise \$150 million, how are we going to do it?” And so we analyzed our donor pool and decided that we needed so many gifts at certain levels in order to get to that \$150 million number. And so you can see that, you know, 12 gifts of \$1 million, and we actually received 15 gifts of \$1 million. And so at the end of the day we felt very, very good about where we ended up and about the donors who felt so strongly about UNI that they wanted to make those kinds of commitments to support our students. And at the end of the day, we had about 35,000 gifts as you can see from the lower right-hand column, second from the right.

[slide 17, How was the money raised?] About 42% of our campaign total came from gifts of \$1 million or more, and 36% came from gifts between \$25,000 and \$1 million. But also we received \$34 million from 34,000 other donors, and so every gift to this campaign counts. And every gift that was made during this period of time we did count towards the campaign, and this wouldn't have been possible without the support from everybody around this table, from the Deans and Department Heads and the faculty that went with us on calls. It's a very, very important part of maintaining the relationships that we have with our alumni. And just a couple of quick statistics, last year our major gift staff made 1,657 personal calls on our alumni, accompanied with many of you and many from the campus, and also I know that our Panther Call Center calls some of our faculty every now and then. Last year the Panther Call Center, our students there, made over 52,000 phone calls to alumni and friends of the University and some faculty asking and encouraging their support for UNI.

[slide 18, Outstanding Outcomes] The outcomes? It's no surprise because you saw it—have seen this on other slides. We ended the campaign—actually we exceeded the goal of \$150 million a full year ahead of schedule and that was done during some of the worst economic times that we've ever been through, and so it's just a testimony to our faculty and staff and the efforts that they have to encourage our alumni to contribute. And the alumni feels so strongly about helping our students out that they would—even though it's a sacrifice of their own portfolio, they would make a gift of

appreciated stocks or made a multi-year pledge, knowing that “maybe the time wasn’t right right now to pay it off, but if I could extend it over a few years, then I could fulfill that pledge without any problem.” The statistic that is so impressive to me and to others with whom we’ve shared this information, we have a faculty and staff of 1800, 1900 approximately, over 1600 UNI employees and emeritus faculty and staff made gifts to this campaign. And that’s an extraordinary number. I would stake that up against many private schools in terms of the buy-in that our faculty and staff have to the work that they do every day and how they want to make additional contributions in support of our students. So, to everyone around this table, thank you very, very much for being part of that effort. One more.

[slide 19, Thank you!] And on behalf of our students, you know they’re the beneficiaries, they thank you as well. And that concludes the formal comments, and thank you very much for your time and attention and the opportunity.

Peters: Thank you. We have a little less than 10 minutes for any questions that anyone might have. Vice-Chair **Smith**.

Smith: Going forward, what’s the most important thing that this institution and the faculty can do to lay the foundation for successful fundraising in the future? What do we need to do to be even better going forward?

Calhoun: Well, part of what you’re doing comes naturally. You’re making sure the kids have a great education when they leave this University. And I think, to the extent that we can, to, as they leave, to allow them to understand the importance of the private support and the importance that the gifts from our alumni and friends provide that margin of excellence that perhaps they’ve had a chance to experience during their education here at UNI. So, if they’re being taught a class in the College of Business by a faculty member who’s getting a fellowship or a professorship, make sure that they know that and that the gift from **McGladrey**, or whoever, was responsible for allowing that great teacher to stay here at UNI or to be recruited to UNI so that that’s part of their educational experience. I think that’s really, really important, Jerry. And then some of the things that

we've talked about before, just making sure you keep in touch with your students and communicate with them. Keep them thinking about UNI. We don't want them to get separated from the University. We always want them to feel a part of this school.

One of the things that will be—that I did not mention that we'll be pursuing right away, actually immediately, is a scholarship initiative in response to the tuition set-aside issue that we've all been discussing. The Foundation Board authorized a \$40 million scholarship initiative that we will be pursuing right now that will generate scholarship support for additional generations of students. If you know alumni and friends who might be interested in supporting a scholarship fund here, let us know. I know that all of you around the table keep in touch with alumni and friends of this University, and so keep talking about the importance of private support. Keep talking about the importance of setting up scholarship funds for our students.

Mason: Bill, I also think it's important for this Body, the [Faculty] Senate, you represent various constituencies among the faculty around campus. And as more information comes out on this new initiative, we would really appreciate your support and endorsement among your colleagues, so that they will know and will pass on all the information that you need, because we want the faculty to understand what we're doing, so they don't just say, "Oh, they finished the campaign, so I guess that's that." No, we're on to the next right now. So we'll want your endorsement, and we'll want your support.

Calhoun: [to **Smith**] Great question. Thank you for asking.

Peters: Other questions? Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, how are decisions made about what's done with unrestricted monies that you all have?

Calhoun: We have two unrestricted funds. One is what we call the Annual Fund which is—when we do our calling program, primarily they are raising funds for two different purposes. One is for the Annual Fund, which is a

source of unrestricted funds that we have, and it's about \$800,000 that we get from that every year. That account goes right to the Foundation's Operating Budget so that we can go out and use that to leverage it to raise more money. And so it's an investment back in our fundraising operation, Betty [Senator **DeBerg**]. The second unrestricted fund we have is what's called our Vision Fund, and gifts of \$25,000 or more that are sort of—maybe someone leaves an unrestricted bequest in their will for us—those funds go into the Vision Fund, and then every year the Board of Trustees votes on a recommendation from the President about how the income from that will be used every year. It's an endowment fund, quasi-endowment fund. And this last year I believe the Board authorized the investment to go towards student scholarships. So those—we really do not have much in the way of unrestricted funds. So those are the two purposes for which they are used. Good question, and thank you.

Peters: Christopher **Edginton**.

Edginton: Bill, how are decisions made on investments? I mean, you have your endowment, and how do you—how's that—how does that process occur?

Calhoun: Well, I'll start, and then I'm going to—I'm going to kick it over to the former Chair of our Investment and Finance Committee. We have a committee comprised of Foundation Trustees. It's probably 10-12 members strong, maybe that's light. And we have an investment consultant. And on—every other month we meet telephonically to talk about investments, performance asset allocation and so forth, and then the Foundation Investment Committee gets very involved in working with the consultant to make recommendations on the investment.

Mason: Sure. We have investment advisors, and this is something that every so many years we put out with the request for proposals. And these people are vetted. And we're actually right toward the end of our term. We're going to be putting it out for bid again. We're—right now, we are with Graystone Consultants out of Columbus, Ohio, and they have really done a great job. They provide us with recommendations, and, of course, our responsibility as trustees is to preserve principle and maximize earnings

with reasonable risk. And you can imagine what we went through in 2008 and 2009. And—but I will say that these consultants have done a very good job. I was Chair of that. I've just moved on to First Vice-Chair, which relieves me of that responsibility, but I had that responsibility for some time, and I was in weekly contact with these people. And whenever there would be some cha—market conditions or whatever—they would recommend some changes, we were on the phone. And we had committee members that were empowered to make some decisions, so sometimes, as you know, with investments, you have to make some moves very quickly. And we did that, and they were on top of it. So, I couldn't say enough good things about the consultants that we have. They are very knowledgeable. They're—we—I think we've enjoyed, you know, very, very good returns given the conditions, and I think they've certainly helped us fulfill our fiduciary responsibilities, to preserve the endowment and to maximize the return for the programs that you've just seen.

Edginton: Do we target a rate of return? Or

Mason: Oh, yes. Yes and no. You know, it just sort of depends on the—on the climate that we're in. You know, we don't—we don't buy junk bonds, but we are into some—into some alternative investments. As you know from investing—I mean, you've all done investing, and to some extent been involved with some organizations—so much of it is in your asset allocation. It almost doesn't dep—it almost doesn't matter. It does matter, but it doesn't matter as much what stocks you might choose or whatever, it's built into your asset allocation, and what our—our advisors are so good at choosing the money managers. They really vet the money managers, and we have money managers in each of the spaces, you know, blog (?), your growth equities, your value equities, your alternatives, your fixed. And I know that we would—we would love to enjoy a consistent, you know, 8 or 9% return, but, you know, in some years, in 2008 there was a significant negative, and in some of the good years we enjoyed some returns of 20%, you know. So, it's hard to say what the target is. You look at what the conditions are, and you try to manage prudently. That's about the best way I can answer your question.

Peters: Thank you, and I'm sorry we didn't have time for more questions today. I don't know if people had more questions, but we might be able to direct them to get answers if we do, but we do have a couple other things are our schedule today, so I think we have to move on, if there's no objection. Thank you very much, Bill and Dave, for the information. [light applause] Thank you for the successful campaign as well, more importantly.

Calhoun: We do have a leave behind brochure on the campaign. It's enjoyable reading with lots of good student stories, so thank you very much for your time and your patience while we had the presentation. And if anyone does have any questions that they did not get answered, please don't hesitate to contact our office. Thanks again.

Peters: Thank you.

DOCKET 1068, CURRICULUM CHANGES—WOMEN'S & GENDER STUDIES PROGRAM, REGULAR ORDER (**Kirmani/Cooley**)

Peters: Next up we have Calendar Item 1172, Docket #1068, Curriculum Changes for the Women's & Gender Studies Program. Can we get a motion to approve those changes so we can begin our discussion? Moved by Senator **Swan** [who indicated]. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator **Neuhaus** [who indicated]. So with that I'll invite Professor **MacGillivray** up, if you want to take a seat up there for us? And anyone else. Professor **Cutter**, are you joining her?

Cutter: Yeah.

Peters: I didn't know you'd be joining us. I thought you'd be—[voices welcoming her and joking]. Barbara's on PDA this semester. [more joking, several voices] And Professor **Chananie-Hill** as well. All right. Why don't we begin—could we have just a—I mean, people have had the chance to look at the suggestions, maybe we could get like a quick couple a minute summary of the curricular changes to begin our discussion?

MacGillivray: Yes, absolutely, and if I could also just take a moment to introduce myself, Catherine **MacGillivray**, from the Department of Languages and Literatures, and as already stated I brought my team because as Interim Director starting this Spring I've been in this job for all of—I think I'm going on my 5th week now. So I figured I might need some support, so Barbara **Cutter** and Ruth **Chananie-Hill** agreed to accompany me.

In terms of reminding everyone why we're here, last Spring the M.A. program in WGS [Women's and Gender Studies] was suspended, and we were asked to restructure. So this is our restructuring effort that we're presenting here today. And I would also like to note that this is—that we are very lucky and thankful to be fast-tracked in this effort, because, of course, we're anxious to be unsuspended as soon as possible so that we can start admitting graduate students again. We didn't admit any students this year, but we hope to admit as early as next Fall.

[see the following website for details:

http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/restatement_of_program_and_drop_new_courses.pdf]

In terms of the restructuring plan itself, the major points that we want to discuss and point out are the creation of a new applied or professional, aka non-thesis, track. This is the major change. And the applied track for now will have two specific focus areas, one in Women's Health and Gender and one in Gender and Violence Prevention. Ok, now these two areas—we decided to just start with 2 areas, but the idea is that if this works, there could be a possible expansion to more focus areas. But we decided to start with these two because, as you know, these are two areas where we already have strong resources here on campus, in both Women's Health and in Gender and Violence Prevention. So that's why we went with those two. So, again, these are the major revisions.

Moving on, you'll note the minor revisions—what I'm calling the “minor revisions which are related to curriculum,” specific curriculum changes, and that includes a revised set of core courses. So that's one thing. The addition of a 1-credit WGS Graduate Pro-Seminar, that's another curricular

change. The addition of a new 6000 level, 4-credit internship, and obviously this was an important addition to go with those applied tracks. And finally 3 new methods courses were added for—in terms of a wider variety of choice for the students.

So, to sum up, putting—yes, please.

Cutter: I'm sorry. They're not new courses. The methods courses are existing courses, but we added them to our list.

MacGillivray: Thank you. As choices for our students, exactly—they are existing courses. So, again, in terms of how we are envisaging the program moving forward, we're envisaging it as continuing to have a focus on—for students who are considering the M.A. as a step to the PhD, that's the way the program has been to date. In addition, adding the specific tracks for applied areas of focus. So that's the big change, if you will.

Peters: Questions? Secretary **Edginton**

Edginton: I just wanted to ask you a question from my perspective within the School of Health, Physical Education, and Leisure Services, because we have had a focus, at least at the undergraduate level, in Women's Health. Dr. [Michele] **Devlin** and also Dr. [Diane] **Depken**, you know, have interest, and I'm sure you are working with them collaboratively to develop this [program]. That group was, I don't want to say "forced," but strongly encouraged to eliminate the focus on Women's Health at the undergraduate level, so I'm sure they will welcome an addition of Women's Health at the graduate level. But should not this be offered as a collaborative degree between Women's Study and the Division of Health in the School of Health, Physical Education, and Leisure Services? I mean, is there an opportunity here to do it as a collaborative activity, joint degree possibility?

MacGillivray: And since I was not intimately involved in putting the package together, because, as I mentioned, I just came into the position this semester, I'm going to defer to Barbara on that.

Cutter: Yeah, I mean, that's—I think in the future that could be something that could be explored. But in our conversations, I mean, you're right, we talked to the people involved in Women's Health—that they seemed to like getting on to our Master's, you know, our focus area. They didn't seem to be trying to move right now to that sort of thing, and before we went to that, I think I would have to ask the unfortunate question of "Who gets—whose numbers do those people count for?" because if we have an M.A. and our students are going to have to count as the graduates, or we're going to run into the same problem we just had in terms of being told to restructure because our numbers were low. So, that's kind of—I mean, I don't know how we deal with that issue of—you know, they—apparently they only count for one program. Isn't that true?

Licari: Well, if it's just—well, I guess we're in a hypothetical area here, but, I mean, if it's a joint interdisciplinary program, it would be "a" joint interdisciplinary program.

Cutter: So, it wouldn't count for Women's Studies Master's?

Licari: I guess I don't quite understand the question, but if you changed it to something that it was one program but run more jointly, you are interdisciplinary, then it would be one program and it would be one set of program numbers then.

Edginton: You see, it seems to me that you would have a better opportunity building the numbers in the program if it was set up as an interdisciplinary program drawing, you know, from both programs. I mean, it would strengthen it. It would make it much stronger to have that route, you know, available for students. The other thing I would say is it is unfortunate that we have to be bound by these kinds of rules. We should be unbound to promote interdisciplinary activity.

Cutter: I think that is unfortunate, but I do think that it is interdisciplinary with the collaboration between faculty in Women's & Gender Studies, which is interdisciplinary itself, and Health. It—I think that we can make that work, but unfortunately in the environment we live in, if when we're trying to restructure a Women's and Gender Studies M.A. program, if we

took that part of it out and put it in a different program, it wouldn't count for our numbers, and so we'd be in the same problem we were, you know, we were just in because we really need to grow our numbers of our program.

Edginton: Except that—except that if you did it—if you did it collaboratively, you might add more numbers total to the entire effort.

Cutter: Well, but what about the other aspects of our program? You see, it wouldn't count altogether.

MacGillivray: Yeah, I mean, if I might add. I think that your idea is a very exciting one, and I think that that's something that, you know, I definitely want to make a note of and think about moving forward. I think in the short order we want to focus on this package that we've put together, and I would also add that at least for now the M.A. in WGS with this particular focus is a different degree. It would be a different degree from the kind of degree that you're proposing, but again, I mean, I hope that, you know, if we can get this package passed, and we can get back on board, and we can start recruiting, and we can show the viability of this type of focus, then we could move towards something like what you're suggesting. I think that sounds very exciting.

Peters: Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: I'm fairly unclear on what the guidelines were, in the programs that were slated for restructuring, actually meant. Did you actually get any guidance as to exactly what objectives you had other than increase numbers and suggested changes, and if so, can you say how these changes would affect or relate to any guidance you had?

Cutter: Yeah, we did not get guidance except in so far as we were told we had to restructure because our numbers were low. Therefore, we needed to raise our numbers. Now, Women's and Gender Studies faculty across Departments met to talk about this, and we formed a committee based on—and we looked at, you know, like we said in the report, like all our student outcomes assessments. We talked to other schools around the

country. And the idea was “how could we keep what we liked about our program and expand it in ways that we thought were intellectually viable and positive and grow our numbers?” I mean, so that was really, you know, how could we keep a program we were intellectually happy with and have it be big enough to be sustainable at the University?

Funderburk: Can you say maybe why you think these changes will help grow the numbers though?

Cutter: Well, we actually looked at programs around the country, you know, the National Women’s and Studies Association [sic] has a list, so we looked at all that were on the list, which is going to be the vast majority of programs, and virtually none of them had a thesis-only option. They all had non-thesis options, and so we contacted via email or phone call some specific schools, especially like peer institutions to ask them questions about this. For example, UNC Greensboro has the applied track and a thesis track, and one of their applied tracks is something like Gender and Health and the other is Community Leadership and Gender. And so it seemed—that seemed very close to what we were interested in. And, you know, we asked them about their numbers. Their numbers seemed very good. They’ve been getting about 15 applications a year. They have about 20 students in the 2-year program right now. I mean, that’s kind of where we were envisioning being—is about, you know, 10 students with some choices in our applicant pool. So it seemed like those programs at our peer institutions were getting better numbers than we were.

We also listed all our outcomes assessment data, and we did find a lot of students said that they liked the flexibility of the program, but it actually was confusing. Like, some of them were afraid to apply because they didn’t know what they’d do because our program was so flexible. And we didn’t want to lose that part of it, but we wanted to add something more concrete. And we talked to our external advisory board, and that’s really one of the places we got a lot of good feedback about Gender and Health, because, you know, some people on our advisory board are associated with Allen Hospital and the Nursing College and that we figure we can get some potential students from the Master’s program there who want to do this as

well, or students who got their B.A. in Nursing want to get this Master's, that kind of—B.S. in Nursing, sorry. So, those kind of things.

Funderburk: Ok, thanks.

Peters: Vice-Chair **Smith**.

Smith: Yes, I wanted to talk about some concerns I have about the purpose of the program based in part on my belief that UNI is and should be primarily an undergraduate institution, and, when we have graduate programs, they need to have a really strong rationale. Typically, and I've looked at a list of our graduate programs, they almost have a—typically have a rationale in terms of preparation for some professional career, and so I was concerned when I read about the purposes of your program, the one you cited, to prepare students for a PhD program somewhere else. I can understand that. I just don't think given our limited resource that we should be doing that. If you want to get a PhD program in the field, you should go to that PhD-granting institution and get your PhD.

It also talks about satisfying strong intellectual interests and curiosity of the students. Again, I have questions about that. We've got students racking up all sorts of debt and not being able to get employment. Should we be encouraging that at the graduate level? It's bad enough at the undergraduate level.

But I'm appreciative that you have revised the program to make it more in a way career-centric to prepare for professional responsibilities, but then the question comes, are these efforts likely to be successful? And I know Chair **Funderburk** raised the questions.

You talked about the enrollment rates at other institutions. Did you find out anything about their placement rates? What kinds of positions do they place people in? What are the rates of placement of the graduates? And then internally, we've talked about this, and I've expressed on many occasions—and my argument is that enrollment numbers or graduation numbers are not the proper criteria for evaluating programs here. What we really should be looking at are course enrollments. And so I'm

wondering what about the enrollments in the courses that you're offering here? Are they high? Low? Whatever. Because in my view, we should not be offering programs that force us to offer very low enrollment courses. So there's a number of questions there, but

MacGillivray: Yes, and I'm going to start by making a few overview comments and then I'm going to defer to Barbara [**Cutter**] for more of the numbers questions. And, but to speak to your larger point, I would say that I hear you, and I know that this is a discussion that's going on on campus in general. I don't think it's a discussion that has been decided one way or the other, so I would say that until it is, it is not inappropriate for us to be pursuing this M.A. It's not the only M.A. on campus today that has a focus on preparing students for PhD programs. That would be my first point.

My second point would be that I think the—actually the way the program has been restructured speaks to your concerns in that students are being offered a choice, and this will allow us to collect the data that we need over time to see if your contention is, in fact, valid in this particular case. So what I mean by that is if we are admitting students and we're giving them the choice between the thesis and a non-thesis option and over time we see that no one is choosing the thesis option, well, then we'll have the information we will need, say in 2 years' time, to decide whether we want to restructure yet again. The way that it's set up now, it doesn't harm the program in any way if all of the students who come to pursue the M.A. in WGS here at UNI do not choose the thesis option. And I think that that's the beauty that it is currently structured. So that's my first major point.

I would also like to add in terms of your question about what these programs do for education in general here at UNI, I would like to say, and I think this is a very important point, that WGS is unique, I would argue, in its contribution to the campus in that we do quite a lot of programming which is very important for the diversity mission here at UNI, which I know we are all focusing on and have been focusing on for some time. And that programming takes part in place—takes place in part because we have graduate students. We have had for some time a graduate student programming assistant, and frankly there's no way that we could get our programming done without that graduate assistant.

So, again, if we get rid of the M.A. in WGS, I really think we all need to think about, you know, what that would mean for this campus. In the case of WGS, it's not just a question of losing an M.A. in a particular discipline. It's more than that. It's also about losing this unique programming component that we have offered this campus now for many, many years, and it would just go away. There's just no way that we could continue to have that kind of programming.

And then the other thing that I would like to add—and this is very personal to me, but I'm sure that I'm not the only one who's in this position, as someone who comes from a WGS background, and this is since I was an undergrad. I was a WGS major in college and then went on at the M.A. and PhD level to do all of my research focused on questions and issues of gender. When I was interested—when I was on the job market, I can tell you that when I saw an ad that interested me and I started to do my research about the institution, the first thing that I would look at as a scholar of gender is whether or not there was a WGS program. At the time, this was admittedly many years ago, but at the time it was very rare for there not to be a WGS program. Every once in a while it did come up, and I can tell you that if a university did not have a WGS program, I did not apply to that university. And again, I have to believe that I'm not the only one, so I would also argue that having a WGS program in particular at the Master's level helps us to attract scholars and candidates for positions campus-wide who might not otherwise be interested in our institution, because to not have a strong WGS component on a campus sends a strong message, and for people like myself, a negative message about what they can expect coming to a campus. But, again, I'm going to defer to Barbara about the numbers issues that you mentioned, placement rates and course enrollments.

Cutter: Right. And I want to follow-up on the course enrollment issue, the way—I mean, this is a strength and weakness of an interdisciplinary program, that one of the huge strengths is that we only have 2 courses in the program that are WGS courses in a classroom setting. I mean, I'm not including research hours and internships like everybody has where you don't have a scheduled class time. We have a 3-credit seminar and a 1-

credit pro-seminar. And all our M.A. students will take those classes. It doesn't matter if they're thesis or applied. So, if students don't take the thesis option, it won't have any effect if they all want to take the other option on our enrollments.

Smith: And what kind of enrollments have there been in those courses traditionally?

Cutter: Traditionally, they've been about—well, they've ranged from like 4 to 13, depending on the year, and sometimes on the years where we have 13, it's because people have done a good job attracting students from other programs as well, because—other M.A. programs. I mean we've had people from the History Department, from Communication Studies—that's a big one—come over. Back when Sociology had an M.A. So we can get people that way. But if we have a bigger program, I mean, for a graduate seminar, you know, 10 students would be just fine. And so that's—those are the only two classes we would run that are only for WGS M.A. students. All the other classes are offered anyway because they're through other Departments.

Smith: Now, again, I was interested in if you had gotten information on placement rates from other schools, but let me also ask, what are—what are your placement experiences with graduates of your program? Where do they go? What do they do? How did their degrees help them?

Cutter: You know, I wish I'd brought our form, because this is all based on memory. I mean, our graduates get jobs, or they go on to PhD programs. We've had a number of graduates go on to PhD programs, you know, like University of Illinois, Carbondale, Bowling Green, University of Chicago, and they all get jobs. We don't have unemployed graduates. They do things like getting jobs in, you know, residence halls. When people are looking for, you know, residence life directors who have, you know, experience dealing with LGBT issues, experience dealing with gender issues. Actually, the field, if you broaden it out to these professional jobs working in domestic violence shelters, working in all kinds of non-profit organizations on gender and women's issues, there's a lot of jobs like that out there. There's no shortage of those kinds of jobs.

It's just a matter of—and that's why we think these applied tracks will be helpful for people who don't want to go on to PhD programs. I mean, a lot of our students, a lot of our undergraduates are thinking in very practical terms right now. And I don't want to—I mean, I don't want to lose the fact that we're a liberal arts institution and just focus on kind of vocational things, but—and that's why I think it's very important to allow students, if they're interested, to be on a kind of PhD track. It doesn't cost us anything more to have that option for people who want it, but a lot of our students these days are really focused on—you know, their parents are saying, "You gotta get a job. You gotta get a job." Well, they're not going to have, you know, a particular problem of getting a job with a Master's Degree in Women's and Gender Studies, not any worse than most other degrees at this point in time. There are a number of jobs out there.

So, I think that this will be more appealing to our students, and that's one of the areas. I mean, we get a lot of outside students for our M.A. program. We don't do as well with UNI undergrads, and I think this will help us a lot in that area. Not that we want to have all UNI undergrads, but I think we need a higher percentage. I mean, we have very—we've gotten very few UNI undergrads in the past, and, you know, the minors have been pretty interested in this sort of more applied degree.

Peters: I'd like to interject here and ask that we try to be mindful of time. I don't want to shortcut discussion, but we do have one important issue still to discuss today. We probably will need to extend our time. Senator **Dolgener?** No? Senator **Kidd.**

Kidd: Yeah, I just had a quick question. On your internship, how many hours is that?

MacGillivray: It actually was just changed. As we've gone through this process, it's now 1-4 credit hours the students have to take. Correct me, if I'm wrong. Over time, they have to take 4, but we made it more flexible. They can either take 4 at once, or they can take 1 or 2 at a time, but for a total of 4 by the end of the program.

Kidd: I'm just asking because I had an internship as a part of my undergraduate degree, but it was 0 credit. It was required, but it was 0 credit.

MacGillivray: Oh, wow.

Kidd: Which meant it was free, and so a lot of students that are in Master's programs have these 4-credit internships, and they end up having to pay a lot of Summer tuition for this. So, if you can spread it out, that's great. And why do you have it required to be a number of credits? I mean, it's an internship, so how is—I don't understand why it has like hours in the first place, I guess. Like, why not just 1 hour?

Cutter: Well, they—all internships have a credit value, if that's what you mean. But the credits can in turn translate into hours.

Kidd: Yeah.

Cutter: And they—that varies by program. There's not an absolute definition of hours. I think—what—what was it? Is it 45?

Chananie-Hill: 40

Cutter: 40 per credit. We're doing 40 per credit [several voices due to confusion in the meaning of the question]

Kidd: Then why do you have to a number of credits for this internship? Like why 4? Why not just 1?

Cutter: Well, it's part of their academic program, and, I mean, we didn't feel—I'm not even sure we are allowed. We didn't feel comfortable making them do academic work without giving them academic credit for the hours. And part of the 4-credit internship isn't just the internship. They also have a written component. The idea is to help them get started on their culminating project. So, I mean, a Master's Degree, you know, they're going to have to—they're going to have to take a certain amount of coursework. So they're going to have to pay for a certain amount of

coursework, so why not give them credit for the work they're doing in their internship?

Kidd: Ok. I was just curious. As long as you are having it split up, I think it will work great, because a lot of students were very annoyed that they would get a Summer internship and then had to pay a lot of tuition for that.

Cutter: Well, and we are par—we're trying to make it more flexible for part-time students, and so that's another reason.

Kidd: Ok. Thank you.

Peters: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Just real quickly, I appreciate the concern about the credentialing, the vocation thing, but I think it does need to be said that education is about much more than that. And people, as you mention, do get jobs. You know, Art majors work at Rockwell Collins, and things like that happen a lot. Finally, I have a lot of your—whenever I have your minors, I'm in the College of Education, who are going to be teachers. Thank you very much. They are among the most articulate, bright, sharp, can think, can speak, can write, and I just thought I'd add that.

MacGillivray: Thank you.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Nope.

Peters: Is there any further discussion? Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So I've got a couple of questions for you, Mr. Chairman. When this was—when this program—and others, but this is the one before us—was asked to reorganize, there was no reason other than numbers of graduates given? And [Faculty] Chair **Funderburk** asked then if they got any other guidance, and they said—the response was “no.” So, my questions for you

are what—well, first, please remind me what's the number of graduates that was the target?

DeBerg: 10. Oh, graduate programs?

Peters: In graduate programs?

DeBerg: 5

Swan: Mr. Chairman, which—what's the answer?

Peters: I think it was 5.

Swan: And so, for 5, but then what's the cost for Departments and Programs that have 5 or more graduates per semester or year, whatever the cutoff is, what's the usual typical expense for that program?

Peters: I would have no way of knowing the answer to that. And I would assume it varies greatly, based on a variety of things.

Swan: Based on the number of faculty.

Peters: Number of faculty, amount of infrastructure and equipment required.

Swan: Do we know then the cost of the Women's and Gender Studies Master's Degrees?

Peters: I do not know.

Swan: I mean, it's typically—whatever it is, it's a lot less than programs in Departments because as they talked about today, we all know it's a hybrid thing, it's an interdisciplinary program that has minimal costs, extraordinarily minimal costs. It's, yes, extraordinarily minimal costs, and it draws on what already exists. And so doing away with it is just not exploiting what already exists, not using to capacity, or as much as capacity, what already exists. The proposal seems to further capitalize on what

already exists without adding unique requirements in the program. I think the program should be applauded for making these changes with no guidance as to what triggered the need for the changes. Thank you.

Peters: Any further questions or comments briefly, please?

Smith: Yes, Dr. **Cutter** and I both serve on a committee appointed by the [Faculty] Senate to develop a process for reviewing academic programs for managing this, and we both recognize—we all recognize the importance of having an effective way of the faculty to manage programs, because if we don't manage it, the Administration does. We saw how that works. Not very good. But, of course, if we're going to manage the programs, that means we have to make rigorous, hard decisions about whether programs are effective or not. You can't just pass on everything and say, "Oh, that's good. We like it." etcetera, etcetera. Now, I'm not saying that that means this cour—this program doesn't meet those standards, but I am saying when we talked about having this program management, what we've said is that there would be a period where a program would be kind of put on notice. Whether you want to call it probation, whatever, but you're kind of warned that your numbers aren't up, you're expensive, you've got low enrollment courses, etcetera, and if you don't improve, then you're at risk of being terminated.

Smith: I don't have a problem with us approving this and moving forward so that the program can enroll students, but I do have a problem if we just say, "Fine. No problem here. Everything's great, and we're going ahead."

Smith: And I think if we're going to approve this, we need to do it with the understanding that this will be reviewed again over the next several years to make sure that the promise that our presenters are talking about, in fact, is realized, that we do get the enrollment numbers and that the program does deliver for our students and for this University because, yes, inevitably our resources are and will continue to be scarce.

Peters: Highlighting debates to come or a preview of debates to come. [voices agreeing] Are there any other—is there any other comment,

though, about the merits of the Women and Gender Studies proposal?
Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: Part of this is a statement of the obvious. It makes it very hard to judge when we don't really know what was supposed to be restructured.

Funderburk: But I would pose that we've got a number other of these we're going to have to consider over the next year or so, so I hope we'll be able to push for guidance. But I really appreciate the very direct answers to the question that you gave and that you're trying to do something based on not being sure what it is you are supposed to be trying to do other than generate bodies [light laughter around], and obviously about all we can do then is approve it and then count eventually to see if that worked or not. But I do hope that with some of these other restructurings we get a little more guidance so we know if we're approving something that is in line with what the administrative-think was or if, in fact, we're going in the opposite direction of what they thought.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I'm sorry. I—has the Graduate College ever come up with some, you know, like qualities of excellence? For instance, you can't accept everyone who applies. I mean, has the Graduate College completed its own self-study and revision of its—how it's going to do things on campus? I mean, we can't have graduate programs who accept almost everyone that applies. That's just unacceptable.

Licari: And you're right about that. There are admissions standards that the Graduate College sets minimally, and then each individual program is free to go higher than those standards in order to gain admission to graduate studies. So, you're correct about that. We do have some barriers. And we did put—when I say “we,” it was really the graduate faculty—put together a Strategic Plan for Graduate Education recently, and then the Graduate Council, now over the last series of meetings, has begun to address components of the plan in order to seek more clarity for themselves, really, on what we want to do at UNI for graduate education

more generally, what specific things we can do, and then there is a component to the Strategic Plan for Graduate Education on quality and self-review, outcomes assessment, whatever you want to call it. So, I think we are making progress in those areas, Betty.

Peters: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: I call the question.

Peters: Thank you. Is there a second?

Gallagher: Second.

Peters: All in favor of proceeding to a vote on this, please say “aye.” [ayes heard all around]. All opposed, say “no.” [none heard] Ok, so we’ll proceed to a vote. All in favor of approving the changes to the Women’s and Gender Studies Master’s program, please say “aye.” [ayes heard all around]. Opposed, please say, “no.” [none heard]. The motion carries. Senators, we are [light applause breaks out]—thank you for a good debate. It did take longer than I expected, though, and we have a number of people here waiting for our next item of business, and I would ask Senators to be willing to stick around, please, to try to get this item of business done, since it is one that is important to campus. Thank you very much [to WGS presenters who responded in kind].

DOCKET #1070 EPC RECOMMENDATION REGARDING CHANGES TO THE ATTENDANCE AND MAKE-UP WORK POLICY, OUT OF ORDER, IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING CONSIDERATION OF 1172/1068 ON FEB. 11 (**Swan/Strauss**)

Peters: And so Gayle [**Rhineberger-Dunn**], do you want to come up and join us, if you guys have the time? Can we go ahead while we’re waiting here [for presenters to move to the table] and just get a quick motion to extend to let’s say 5:20? That will give us 30 minutes to discuss this, and we’ll see how that goes.

Walter: So move.

Terlip: Second.

Peters: Moved by Senator **Walter**. Seconded by Senator **Terlip**. All in favor of extending to 5:20, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around]. Opposed, please say, “no.” [none heard]. The motion carries. Professor **Rhineberger-Dunn**, let’s see, we referred this to you. You have reported back to us, and so your report puts it—makes it automatically a topic of discussion upon completion of the report, so we’ll just go ahead and start with having you summarize your Committee’s [the EPC, Educational Policies Commission] work here for us, and we’ll jump right into questions. Thank you, as always, for the good work of your Committee.

Rhineberger-Dunn: Thank you. Also here with us today is Francis **Degnin**, who is also a member of the EPC. The Faculty Senate first approved the revisions to this Class Attendance and Make-up Work Policy [3.06] in April of 2012. The President’s Cabinet approved it in July—on July 30th of 2012, and then this Fall we were asked to revisit the Policy. The EPC has met several times, thoroughly examined all of the concerns and questions, and attempted—our attempt, really, is to balance the interests of the students and the faculty. No policy change comes without negative consequences to one or both groups and positive outcomes for one or both groups, and our job really is to thoroughly examine what potential unintended consequences might be of any policy change that might initially seem to be a good idea. [see Addendum 2 or go to:

[revised attendance and make-up work epc policy sent to faculty senate.doc](#)]

In our deliberations, our discussion, we took into account things that were said during the special Faculty Senate meeting regarding the issue of student veterans being included as a required absence for military duty, and so we’ve done that. We made—well, in the process of doing this, we made some additional adjustments to B-2 of the policy that is not—that part is not really related to the require excused. It’s more of the things that could be considered excused and examples of what—how we might mitigate an excused absence in terms of what kind of make-up policies could one have?

So, in 1B you'll see—B-1, I should say—is a change: “1. Required university-related absences (including but not limited to athletic games/matches/meets or their equivalent) or legally-mandated absences...” This is the biggest change, is the “legally mandated absences due to military duty, jury duty, or court subpoena must be considered excused and the student must be allowed to make up missed work, to complete an equivalent assignment, or the professor and the student may mutually agree to waive the assignment without penalty.”

We did not separate military out by itself, because we also believe that these other two things, jury duty and court subpoena, are also legally required. If you don't show up for jury duty, you could be arrested. The same with court subpoena. So we've incorporated them there. We also added that [see B-1-a, here orally paraphrased] if students participating in these required university or legally mandated absences must inform faculty members of their known or anticipated absences as far in advance as possible. Failure to do so, when clearly it's possible to inform faculty in advance, may be treated as an excused absence.

Degnin: Unexcused.

Rhineberger-Dunn: As an unexcused absence, yes. And then [see B-1-b] “b. Faculty are not required to offer make-up work for extra credit tasks or assignments.” Our belief there was that faculty would simply change how we teach, not offer such things, if we were going to be required for a small 1-, 2-point assignment, extra credit or other things in class, to allow everyone to make those up who missed in these—in this capacity that people just wouldn't do it, and it would not actually be beneficial to the student in that regard. Ok? I think I will just leave it at that and let people ask the questions that they have or comments.

Peters: Thank you. Questions? Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: Ok, I'll ask, because I know that there's an issue that has been raised about V.A. appointments that are apparently very problematic and missing. Was there discussion, within the group, of having those included on these guidelines that you can share?

Rhineberger-Dunn: There's lengthy discussion over whether or not

Funderburk: Can you share what—how you came down on that?

Rhineberger-Dunn: We had lengthy discussions over where medical appointments should be. And the issue for us was, again, a balance of faculty and students, and all students, not—not one or two groups of students but all students. We have an increasing number of students on campus with disabilities who have specialized medical appointments. We have faculty and staff who have specialized medical needs—terminal illnesses, debilitating illnesses—and need specialized treatment at U of I or the Mayo or somewhere else. I myself go to the Mayo, and I am able to get my appointments on a Tuesday/Thursday. And I understand and we sympathize that sometimes we don't have a choice, but the issue becomes these 12,000 students on the campus and what is a reasonable required absence and determining what is really a hard-to-schedule medical appointment versus a doctor's appointment. And so we were thinking of this in the whole of the University, of what best benefits the University, and given the fact that we have 12,000 students and a growing number of disabled or debilitating diseases that with specialized medical appointments necessary that we did not include it there. It certainly would be a reasonable absence, and I—it's not listed there. We have illness listed, but we certainly could list it as an example of counter number B-2 of what could be included as a

Degnin: And oddly I think it was there at one point, and I'm not sure why it's not still, but I think the reason may have been because somebody or some of the people thought that it was really already covered by "illness." You know, your doctor's appointment is your seeing a doctor about a condition that would be illness. But it wouldn't be a problem to put it back in there. The difficulty is if it's just—if it's completely mandated, somebody could just make an appointment with their doctor to avoid a test, you know, things along those lines. It needs to be—there needs to be some standard of judgment on that.

Peters: I saw 2 hands over here [in the audience area]. I saw Mr. [Timothy]
Tolliver. I saw

Tolliver: My name is **Tolliver**, and I'm a Social Work studies student here at UNI, also a student veteran. While I appreciate the thought given to the illness, the problem that I see with this Policy is that it will fall under—it still falls under the faculty member's discretion.

Rhineberger-Dunn: Uh huh. It does.

Tolliver: And generally speaking I think probably the faculty members that this would address are not the ones that it would really kind of apply to, and by that I mean that the people that are going to be reasonable enough to say, "Oh, ok. You have to have a medical appointment. I got it. Don't worry about it. I'll see you Tuesday." are probably not the ones that need to follow this Policy. And that being the case, it's still up to their discretion. It's not—it's not "shall;" it's not "will;" it's not "can't."

Rhineberger-Dunn: Correct.

Tolliver: It's "you can do this if you want to, but you're not required to."

Rhineberger-Dunn: Exactly. That is our point.

Tolliver: Yeah, but that's the problem.

Degnin: We have identified that. It's in the words. We're giving them strong encouragement to do so, but you've still got a recourse. If a faculty member is being unreasonable, that's exactly what the grievance process is for, and that's what—you know, we can't cover every contingency. If we simply make it mandatory that these are covered, then all sorts of things can slip in that they wouldn't—that wouldn't be reasonable to cover. You know, people could game the system very easily.

Tolliver: And I do realize that.

Degnin: That's why you have a grievance system.

Rhineberger-Dunn: And our purpose—our purpose is that we wanted to—this Policy really is about legally mandated absences. Truly. And I can understand that it's hard to schedule appointments. It is hard to schedule specialized medical appointments at times, but to make it a mandatorily excused absence to us did not fit with the goal of this Policy, which is to represent—this is a University Policy. It has to represent The University. And it isn't just to include one group of students in a mandatorily excused absence for medical necessity when we wouldn't do that for the rest of the students.

Tolliver: And no one has said to include veterans and/or military to get their medical needs taken care of at the expense of other students. No one has implied that or suggested that to my knowledge.

Rhineberger-Dunn: That isn't—but that—we understand that's not what you're implying, but that's that type of issue.

Degnin: [overlapping R-D] Well, let me—let me—maybe let me ask you a different question. How would you—this is what we struggled with, right? So how would you rephrase it in a way which both avoids—which addresses your concern and avoids the other worry that we have? Is there a better way of saying this?

Tolliver: I think that there probably is, and generally speaking my own personal opinion is that if the student misses class, that's the student's detriment. That's something that they're losing by not attending there. If that's not the case, then there's probably some other issues that need to be addressed. And so ultimately, you know, I myself would support a policy in which you need—which supports students getting their medical needs, including mental health, taken care of. You know, I recognize that veterans are also a little bit different than the contemporary college sophomore or freshman or senior or whatever. We have a little bit—or we may have different needs and require different services, so with that like it is—I understand it's a balancing act, and no one wants to give any student, veteran or not, a free pass to just not go to class whenever you want. But at the same time, I think that it would be completely reasonable to give

students more flexibility. If you do have a professor that says, “No, I’m sorry. I’m not going to excuse this absence.” you know, without needing to resort to the grievance process of letting students get their medical needs taken of. You know, how many students have you run into that have shrapnel in their knees and that have a hard time walking around when it’s cold, or have a TBI [traumatic brain injury] and needing to get that addressed, or have serious liver problems that they need to go to Iowa City periodically to get it taken care of?

Degnin: So what I’m still asking is in this—because we struggled a lot with this question, right?

Tolliver: And I appreciate that. Thank you.

Degnin: You know, if you—you know, I certainly think that’s what I’m asking. Can you have a better way of saying this? You know, can you think of a better way of saying this that both addresses—well, because if you have, then—then we haven’t come up with a better one, at least not as a committee. We had different ideas, but we couldn’t all agree on them.

Heuer: Well, something that I was just playing around with

Peters: Excuse me. Sorry. I’m sorry, but could you identify yourself for the minutes?

Heuer: Oh, my name is Julia **Heuer**, and I’m the Military and Veteran Student Services Coordinator.

Peters: And spell your last name for us.

Heuer: H-e-u-e-r.

Peters: Thank you.

Heuer: Something that I played around with which probably wouldn’t be satisfactory, but something to the extent that “extenuating medical and phys”—or “mental and physical care that without treatment would

negatively impact academic contributions or performance.” I think something to realize here is many students are balancing mental and physical health with their academic life. And having that not negatively impact by attending class is something that we need to think of when we are addressing an academic policy for best success of the student. So that’s some wording that I’ve come up with as far as wording that covers every single medical or mental condition.

Degnin: Yes, that’s difficult, and even that’s so long. You know, we’re trying to make this—I think some people—we had some wording that was suggested along those lines, and I think some people thought it was just too long and awkward.

Rhineberger-Dunn: But as a Committee, we agreed we did not want to recommend that up there for the reasons we sort of stated. I mean, this was a Committee decision to not have that be a part of the mandatory excused absence.

Peters: In the blue shirt. I’m blanking on your name. Could you identify yourself for our minutes, please?

Adams: Yeah, I’m Darin **Adams**. I’m a senior Criminology major here at this sweet University of Northern Iowa. I’m a little tired. I woke up at 3:30 this morning, had to work for 8 hours, so excuse me if I kind of fall asleep during my little speech. You know, in the civilian world, not dealing with the V.A., you can get appointments within 2 weeks or what not. I have an appointment scheduled at the V.A. 2 months out to go see a urologist and go get a fertility test because there’s a pretty good chance I’m infertile due to being around DU (?). That appointment was cancelled yesterday by the V.A., not by me. My next appointment, I’m going to have to schedule out a month and a half or 2 months out. To me, is it going to be an academic consequence knowing whether or not I’m fertile? No. But it’s certainly going to have some serious personal ramifications for myself and my spouse. And I’m going to worry about working with a University professor so I can go to that appointment. To me, it’s just like, well, the University putting their needs above my needs as students, and I find it kind of ironic, you know, members of this Committee were beating on Ben **Allen** for not

putting students first, and yet, to me, by saying, “Well, V.A. appointments, we’re not going to make those mandatory to be excused” is basically saying, “We’re not going to put students first.” So that’s really all I’ve got to say, I guess. I really hope you do consider putting V.A. appointments in there, because it’s not just like a regular medical appointment. Two months out. Who has to make an appointment two months out? [numerous hands raised throughout the room and voices noting their own distant appointments]

Peters: Senator **East**.

East: [many voices overlapping, then quiet] I have an appointment 4 months out, and I—they only meet on it, this particular doctor only meets on Tuesdays and Thursdays, which is my teaching schedule. It’s not unusual for these kinds of things to happen. I think we all need to just decide that we all make personal choices about what’s most important in our lives. I don’t—I absolutely do not discourage you from deciding, “It’s more important for me to go to this appointment than it is for me to attend class. I’m going to do everything I can with my professor in order to be able to make—do things in advance and do things after the absence to make sure that I minimize what’s missed.” I think that—it’s been suggested that, you know, we don’t expect students—or we don’t want to give students a free ride. There are going to be some students who will, you know, take advantage of any kind of thing that you write into this. There will—most of the students will not. Similarly, there might be one or two faculty who will take advantage of this and say, “It’s not written here that I have to excuse you.” Most faculty will take that into account, and it won’t be an issue. And if it is an issue, there’s a recourse. So, I think that we’re making a problem where one doesn’t exist.

Benson: I’m Eric **Benson**.

Peters: Go ahead.

Benson: I’m the student NISG’s Veteran and Non-traditional Students Representative. I am a student that’s had to make that choice. I have a GI tract issue, and I’m up for service-connected compensation and pension for

it. I have actually had to make two appointments. Both appointments I've had to miss because—not because I was going to miss a class, because there was tests on those days. Now, I'd be happy to say "too much is great," but I literally right now had to go through this digestive issue for the next 4 months just to say in June I have to go there. Now, I'd take away any of that discomfort, running out of class and having to go to the bathroom when I don't really want to. I have an idea that I know what it is, but when it comes to these appointments like compensation and pension, if I miss 2, right now my appeal is on hold for a year. And I have a year to make that. I've also had to make the choice with mental health, which is part of my Voc. Rehab. Program which pays for me to go to this institution. And I have to mandatorily make a mental health appointment twice a month. Now, when it was in Iowa City, they gave me a furlough because the closest therapist was in Iowa City, and I was trying to go once a week, but unless I'm threatening to blow my brains out, they could only see me once every 3 months. So that's the hardest part for me as a student. I know there's not legal ramifications of going to jail, but there is the ramifications of the fact that I have gone through the system. I have tried to do it. Now, I've never had a professor tell me, "If you miss a class, that's one thing." But I also had a professor tell me, "If you miss the test, you miss the points." And so I've had to make that choice. Yes, it was more important to me, but is that willing—allowing me to go through 4 months of pain and discomfort to get an appointment for me to get a service-connected disability or medication? Because I don't have a healthcare plan. I rely on the V.A.

Peters: Professor **Rhineberger-Dunn**.

Rhineberger-Dunn: I would say that we understand that, and we are—you know, we are horrified that our students have to deal with this. One of the issues becomes that there is an immediate and a fast grievance process for in the event that you had such an appointment on a test day and the faculty member said—and you tell them in advance, because you know in advance that it's coming.

Benson: It was a final, though. So

Rhineberger-Dunn: Yes, but the point is that there is a grievance process and an expedited one that you could start before that test day ever comes in order to get that through the grievance process where a committee of people would decide if it is unreasonable or not to say, “You can’t miss the test.”

Benson: So then I have to go face the professor who I just put through a grievance process based on their decision not to allow me to do it. I mean, that, to me

Peters: Professor **Degnin**.

Degnin: Look, here’s the problem. Even if we put in the language that you suggested, for example, right? There’s still—it’s still going to be up to their professor to say, “Ok, does this determine—does this negatively impact,” and so forth? And so if the professor still says that, you know—because we can’t say in language just “whenever you have a doctor appointment”—“when anyone has a doctor appointment.” Right?

Benson: Oh, I understand that.

Degnin: So, you know—so—and I actually am sympathetic with the language of—that you’ve suggested. But the problem is it’s still going to be—the professor’s still got to make that judgment, and then if they make the judgment against it, you still have to go through the grievance process.

Benson: I just have a reg

Degnin: And those will probably be the exact same professors in both cases is the problem.

Peters: Mr. **Benson**, you had one more quick thing?

Benson: I just had to write up a student disability form that—ok, I register with the Student Disability Services Office, and this could be for all students. It doesn’t just have to be that student. But if I identify with the Student Disability Services Office that these are the appointments that I

need to make and they can call my care manager and they can tell them that, then, ok, the professor can check with that Student Disability Services Office. Then wouldn't that eliminate that ability for somebody to fall through the cracks, if I have to register with somebody through that office.

Degnin: I think that's a great idea. I'm not sure it's practical, but I think it's a great idea, and we should think about it. That's a good—excellent point.

Peters: Ok. The young woman with her hand up for a long time. Can you identify yourself for our Minutes, please?

Greif: My name is Courtney **Greif**. I am a student and a veteran. I'm a non-traditional student.

Peters: Can you—I'm sorry, can you repeat your name? We didn't get it.

Greif: Courtney **Greif**. G-R-E-I-F.

Peters: Thank you. Go ahead.

Greif: I do not agree with the fact that it is up to the professor's discretion. I recognize that professors aren't exactly like their professors. They have those students under them. However, military members are AWOL. We are absent without leave bringing (?) UCMJ action. We have legal ramifications. Right now I am dealing with a plethora of issues. The typical college student, sure, they may have a traumatic event in their life, but they don't have like 15 or 20 that they're doing (?). And currently, and I'm reading off of this, because if I don't I'm not going to be able to stay on task—I have been mandated to military medical care which requires me to drive to Iowa City at least once a week. And while academics are my priority, there may be days where I miss class and I plan to successfully complete my coursework; however, I understand how my grades will slip. But that is something I will personally have to deal with. I do not want to be penalized for the occasional appointment that is mandated by the government that conflicts with my schedule. And also due to my military service, I have legal obligations I have to participate in. Again, I take my academics very seriously, and I also take my military obligation seriously.

And, as a student in good standing, I don't want to be penalized, nor should I be penalized for the occasional days when duty and classes may conflict, completely out of my control. Because, yes, I signed up to serve my country; yes, I volunteered. What I have endured and the ramifications and the things I'm dealing with is out of my control, and I should not, and legally am not, allowed to be punished for that.

Degnin: This actually is for the way you described it—the legally mandated absence due to military duty. Is that right?

Greif: But it's up to the professor's discretion.

Degnin: No, no. Not that. [several voices clarifying] If it's military mandated, then that—even though it's a medical appointment—if it is mandated by the military, and so that would actually come under clause 1. So it would actually be a required excuse.

Peters: Do you have a quick follow-up on that, Senator **Heston**?

Heston: Yeah, I think there's an interesting question here. If there are consequences with the V.A. that are unavoidable, that, to me, makes it in a sense "mandatory." It's militarily mandatory. They said, "You must be here or you will have these consequences." Period. And that, to me, makes it—takes it out of the student's hand as a choice of will and puts it into the V.A.'s hand as a choice of requirement or a decision to require and in some ways takes it out of, I think, a faculty member's hands to say, "I'm sorry, you can't fulfill this requirement that's being put onto you by this outside entity, legal entity, because we're going to make you be in class." [**Degnin** audibly agreeing through this turn at talking.] I think that we need to be very clear about certain—it sounds to me like if they are required by the V.A. for you to be here at this time at this date, that falls within this category. If it's a situation where you have a choice and you can, like any other ill person, call and make your appointment yourself, and yeah, you gotta make it 2 months out or 4 months out or 10 months out, but you have the choice about when it's going to happen to some extent, that's a different issue, and you're not required to be there for that appointment in

order to satisfy some other edict that's coming on from the military that if you don't, there's a cost. I mean

Gorton: [Joe, in audience] Except that the V.A. is not the military. [others quietly agreeing]

Degnin: But it's still a result of their military duty. [overlapping discussion with audience member about this distinction]

Peters: Secretary **Edginton** has been champing at the bit here.

Edginton: I agree with Secretary [sic Senator] **Heston** completely. Gotta get it right. [light laughter]—completely about this point, and I would like to move that we include the veterans' preference in that statement above, that veterans be given the opportunity—provided with the opportunity to have their V.A.-related appointments included somehow in that statement above.

Peters: And I need—for a motion, I need some language. I need some specific language.

Edginton: So that the....

Peters: Professor **Gorton** might be

Edginton: Can I amend that statement so that it says that "1. Required university-related absences (including but not limited to athletic games/matches/meets," comma

Peters: I think you want the next phrase, "legally-mandated absences."

Edginton: Well, why won't it go—why wouldn't we go to the next phrase? [several voices attempting to offer suggestions and to clarify]

Peters: Ok, so you're asking—are you asking to insert the phrase "appointments at the—for Veteran's Affairs" or

Edginton: Yes.

Peters: I'll let Professor **Gorton** come in here, because it sounds to me like he's going to try to wordsmith this a little bit.

Gorton: Yeah, well, I think we wordsmithed this a couple of times already, but I'm going to try it again. I just want to make a couple of preliminary comments. One, any—and I've been in both sinks. Anybody who wants to

Peters: I've got a—I'm sorry, I've got a motion. I've got sort of kind of a motion on the table, so I need—so if you're going to help frame that motion better, that's what I'm looking for. [**Gorton** audibly agreeing through this turn at talk.]

Gorton: All right. Yeah. Well, you can piece this out, but “all military- and veteran-related absences, including those that involve the Veterans Administration, shall be treated as equivalent to university-sanctioned events.”

Peters: Ok, now we're into a substitute plan. Going back to Secretary **Edginton**.....

Edginton: I would say, you know, “legally-mandated absences

Peters: We're getting there.

Edginton: due to military duty” and then insert something about the “appointments at the Veterans Administration Hospital.”

Peters: Is that what you [**Terlip**] were going for?

Terlip: I was going to say, why don't you, just after “military duty” and before the comma, in parentheses, put what Joe [**Gorton**] said. [several voices still clarifying].

Peters: Ok, I think the motion that Secretary **Edginton** has made is to insert the words “for appointments at the”—medical appointments?

Edginton: Medical appointments, sure.

Peters: “medical appointments for Veterans Affairs.” [voices rising, clarifying, commenting on “Affairs” vs. “Administration”] All right. We can’t wordsmith. This is why I sent an e-mail to Senators saying that if there were going to be amendments, you had to come with language, because we can’t wordsmith with 25 people.

Terlip: I still would like to offer this just after “military duty” parenthesis “(which includes mandatory appointments at the Veterans Affairs).” [voices commenting] That covers everything. That should do it, shouldn’t it? [more voices commenting, disagreeing, offering other wording] That’s what I’m asking. It’s because of the

Degnin:jump in here because the way that you said it, it means that it has to be a mandated appointment with the V.A., which might be the way you want to go, but some people would

Terlip: Let’s all agree that that is mandatory.

Degnin: but it’s not—well, no, but for the way you quoted it just now, it was mandatory, but if you just make it “appointments at the V.A. for health,” then you may still have to wait 2 or 3 months to get it.

Terlip: Well, frankly, if I have to wait, if that governs my benefits, then I think it’s militarily mandated, so that’s my feeling.

Degnin: Well, no, no. I’m just saying—I’m just saying that it would be—that if it’s—right, so I’m saying, if it’s governing your benefits, then it is also mandated. Let’s just say “you have an appointment.”

Funderburk: Point of order.

Peters: Chair **Funderburk** has a point of order.

Funderburk: I believe I heard her [Terlip] make a motion and Senator Edginton seconded it.

Peters: Thank you.

Funderburk: Which would then mean that we can move to discuss it, but until we finally have something to discuss, we're kind of getting confused again.

Peters: Thank you. Thank you for helping us. [many voices] So [indicating Degnin]

Degnin: What I'm seeking to clarify is that this—the way that you said it actually wouldn't cover every single possible V.A. appointment. That's what I'm just saying. And you may not want to, I just

Terlip: But I think that we all agree that whatever we write isn't going to cover everything, because somebody is going to disagree. This is as good as we can do. [several voices commenting]

Peters: The motion that has been moved and seconded is to insert the phrase—uh oh [computer pop-up warned of low battery or some such] [light laughter]—is to insert the phrase

Peters: “which includes mandatory appointments at the Veterans Administration or Veterans Affairs” immediately following the “military duty,” so between “military duty” and “jury duty.” That's the motion that has been moved and seconded.

Edginton: Can I call

Peters: Discussion must be about that motion.

Edginton: Can I call for the motion?

East: No, you may not. [laughter all around]

Peters: You can, but I did see Professor **Gorton**'s hand up first, so I'm going to recognize him first, even though we are bumping up against our time here.

Gorton: Ok, so, so this is in discussion. I just wanted to say first of all any attempt to compare civilian medical treatment to V.A. medical treatment is immediately categorized as someone who doesn't know what is involved in getting V.A. medical treatment. Number 1. It is a nightmare. Number 2, sometimes these V.A. appointments are so important that if we don't have a policy at this University which makes it crystal clear, then we are going to have a situation where we're going to have veterans and others, even active duty military, who are going to have to choose between, "Do I take this exam, or do I go see, you know, my V.A. health provider?" And this could be—these can sometimes literally be life and death decisions. So, you know, this Policy should not leave any doubt in the student's mind, or the faculty member's mind, that this student is authorized to have this absence. And the only way that I know to do that is to alter the wording on this. I mean, I couldn't support this because you have to have something that takes away the faculty member's discretion to penalize the student for taking that—for having that appointment. And I don't know any other way to do that other than to say, it should be treated as equivalent to a university-sanctioned event. [many voices commenting that it now says this]

Peters: Professor **Rhineberger-Dunn** and Professor **Degnin**, I mean, I'm sure your Committee talked about this. Any reaction to the amendment that you want to share with Senators?

Degnin: We just talked it over amongst ourselves, and in a sense, we already think that that's included in the way it is, but the clarification is fine.

Rhineberger-Dunn: The clarification "mandatory appointments," — "medical"—"mandatory medical appointments" would fit more, would be ok, because it fits with the general majority of the group decision that elected this particular Policy.

Peters: Ok. I know we're bumping up against our time limit here. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So, I don't know why we can't include all disabled students who have such appointments but not through the Veterans Affairs, such as with SSI? If you don't go to your SSI mandated appointments, you lose your SSI, and that's life and death. I don't know why we can't have a policy that applies fairly and equitably to all students in similar situations? And that's what I've been asking for. And I would support that. Right now we're saying if you're disabled and you're not a veteran, you then don't get these benefits, and I don't think the faculty at large wants to say that. The faculty at large wants to look out for all the students and provide the best learning experience for everyone and the most fair and equitable one. And so here for—I don't know why we can't include, so let's say we don't have to let veterans who, you know, go to V.A., because lots of veterans, of course, don't, and pursue private healthcare as well. But those who go to V.A., one can't have those who depend upon other government agencies that have the force of law and major effects also covered. And that's why I think the Committee should consider that. It's always a bad thing to change things on the fly in 5 minutes in a large group that then dissipates. I mean, it's a—it's also—well, that's just bad procedure, too.

Peters: At the moment, the motion on the floor is still the amendment.

Terlip: I just want to say I think that's a discussion beyond what we're dealing with now. I think that if we pass this, that gives—certainly gives those people a right to grieve, because they can claim equivalency, so we've made a step in that direction. And I think we ought to pursue the comment that was made back here. Scott, if you would contact the Disability Services people and see maybe they can change their form to include the mandatory appointments, and that would take care of everything without having to do another policy change.

Peters: Senator **East**. We are over our time, so at this point, I think we either need a motion to extend, or we need a motion to go ahead and proceed to a vote. [many voices calling the question] Senator **East** has the floor now.

East: Point of order. What is the amendment?

Peters: The amendment is to insert the words “which includes mandatory appointments at Veterans Affairs” immediately between the words “military duty” and “jury duty” in the EPC’s proposal (3.06-B-1).

East: “which includes mandatory

Peters: “mandatory appointments at Veterans Affairs”

East: Just addition, so Veterans Affairs is the same as other

Peters: That’s the official—that’s the name of the—yeah, the Cabinet Department, yeah.

Degnin: For a problem—and again, that’s the problem. I actually think that that and your other concern are both covered, because they are both kind of mandated, but the problem is if you have an appointment, Veterans Affairs requires you to go to a health counselor that’s not at Veterans Affairs, that’s not covered. So you might want to change the suggested language—change the word to “by Veterans Affairs.”

Peters: Could that be accepted as a friendly amendment? [voices commenting]

Funderburk: Did you hear there was a motion to call the question?

Peters: I did. There was a motion to call the question.

Swan: But, no, I had the floor. Who called that? [voices commenting]

Peters: Is there a mot—is there any further discussion? [voices commenting]

East: “which includes mandatory appointments made by Veterans Affairs”?

Peters: I think at this point we need to either—if we can’t get the language quite right, then maybe—is there a consensus at least that if we can get this language right, we should—we can take it up at the beginning of our next—at the very beginning of our next meeting to finalize it? Our next meeting will be a week from today. Ok? Is there any objection to just asking—let’s see, it was Laura’s [Senator **Terlip**] motion, but to ask Laura to fine-tune the exact language, to have her circulate it? We will, if there is no—if it’s ok with everyone, we can get a motion to table this. We’ll take it off the table at the start of next Monday’s meeting, and we will have a concrete motion in front of us. We can then discuss that to begin the meeting. If others think that it needs further work than that, it can be referred back to EPC for work at that point, but I think we’re trying to cram in about what might only be about 10 minutes of work, but we’re trying to cram it in to about 1 minute of work, and that’s not going to work. Ok? So, could I get a motion to table?

Smith: Move to table.

Peters: Vice-Chair **Smith** moves to table.

East: Second.

Peters: Seconded by Senator **East**. All in favor of tabling, say “aye.” [ayes heard all around]. Opposed, “no”? [**Terlip** voted “aye,” with a laugh; none others heard] [laughter all around and a loud female voice saying “You’d keep us here until midnight!”] So, I apologize for going over time, but I do think we had a very valuable discussion. I think we made a lot of progress, and it’s this close to the goal line at this point. We will have a special meeting next week. I’ll get the agenda for that out tonight. Apologies that it wasn’t out yet today.

ADJOURNMENT (5:25 p.m.)

Peters: Can I get a motion to adjourn?

Edginton: So moved. [many voices and meeting dissolves]

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

Date: 02/18/2013

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Follows are 2 addenda to these Minutes.

Addendum 1 of 2

FOUNDATION POWERPOINT SLIDE SHOW (18 slides)



and



► 2005-2013



UNI Foundation Facts

Assets and Project Accounts	12-31-12
Assets	\$97 million
– Endowments	\$76 million
Projects	1,591
– Endowed Projects	722
– Non-endowed Projects	680
– Other	189



Support for UNI in FY12

Fund	Dollars Transferred to University
Scholarships	\$3,879,470
Program Funds	
Departmental support	\$1,407,322
Travel	\$ 949,919
Professional Services	\$ 588,792
Capitalized Assets/Equipment	\$1,142,299
Salaries, honoraria & student stipends	\$1,392,676
Total	\$5,481,008



Points to Remember

- Gifts provide a margin of excellence
- We always honor donor intent
 - 95% of funds raised are restricted by the donor
- How the faculty can help
 - Steward gifts
 - Past donors are future donors
 - Communicate with alumni and friends
 - Help identify your former students who can make a difference
 - Help identify graduates who would like to share their success stories
 - Identify projects with potential for corporate and private foundation support



UNI's largest fundraising effort

Leading, Building, Sharing		
	1990-95	\$34 million
Students First		
	1997-2005	\$112 million
Imagine the Impact		
	2005-2013	\$158 million



The Vision

For the University of Northern Iowa

- Premier undergraduate program
- State and national leader on Pre-K through 12 educational issues, especially in math and science
- An organization that enhances the economic, social and cultural development of Iowa



2005–2013

- ▶ Goal: \$150 million
- ▶ Focus
 - People and programs
 - Endowment



Student Impact Scholarships

Endowed	\$13,525,824
Non-endowed	\$10,199,965
Estate gifts	\$38,281,744
Total	\$62,007,533



Student Impact

Directly on:

- ▶ Accessibility and affordability
- ▶ Diversity of student body
- ▶ Quality of students

Uses of funds:

- ▶ Merit-based scholarships
- ▶ Need-based scholarships
- ▶ Scholarships for students entering select programs
- ▶ Other areas defined by donors

Enriching the Student Experience

- ▶ Pauline R. Barrett Endowed Scholarship Fund
 - Recipient Danny Lewis
 - Danny's dream: become a pediatrician
 - Now medical student at University of Minnesota



Danny Lewis '12, biology/chemistry major



Maintaining academic excellence through program support

- Ability of the faculty to provide a quality educational experience
- Quality and quantity of out-of-classroom learning opportunities
- Overall educational experience for our students



Program Support

Endowed	\$21,096,748
Non-endowed	\$32,806,781
Estate gifts	\$32,827,238
Total	\$86,730,767



Program Impact

- ▶ Adele Whitenack Davis Professorship in Gerontology
 - Retain outstanding faculty member
 - Promote careers in aging and research on aging



Elaine Eshbaugh,
Associate Professor
School of Applied Human Sciences



Program Impact

- ▶ Drs. Judith and Melville Finkelstein Holocaust and Native American Education Project
 - Traveling exhibits/kits
 - Middle/high school students learn about human rights



Capital Project Support

▶ **\$7,391,333 raised**

Russell Hall

Jacobson Human Performance Center – Phase 2

McLeod Center



Campaign Gift Table

Projected Gifts			Actual Gifts thru 12/31/12	
Size of Gift	# of Gifts	Dollars	# of Gifts	Dollars
\$25,000,000	1	\$25,000,000	0	
\$10,000,000	2	\$20,000,000	2	\$21,000,000
\$5,000,000	4	\$20,000,000	2	\$11,480,000
\$2,500,000	6	\$15,000,000	4	\$12,248,000
\$1,000,000	12	\$12,000,000	15	\$22,265,000
\$500,000	24	\$12,000,000	23	\$13,606,000
\$250,000	40	\$10,000,000	47	\$15,165,000
\$100,000	75	\$7,500,000	110	\$15,953,000
\$50,000	150	\$7,500,000	115	\$7,327,000
\$25,000	250	\$6,250,000	163	\$5,108,000
< \$25,000	Many	\$14,750,000	34,177	\$33,706,000
Campaign Total	564 +	\$150,000,000	34,658	\$157,858,000



How was the money raised?

Type of Gift	Percentage of Campaign Total
Leadership Gifts > \$1 million	42%
Major Gifts between \$25,000 and \$1 million	36%
<i>Fewer than 500 donors made \$124 million of the contributions 78% of the dollars raised</i>	

Gifts were obtained through individual requests by gift officers with the help of the president, faculty, heads, deans, coaches and staff.



Outstanding Outcomes

- ▶ Raised \$157,857,610
- ▶ More than 34,000 alumni and friends supported the campaign
- ▶ More than 1,600 UNI employees and retirees contributed

UNI CLASS ATTENDANCE AND MAKE-UP WORK POLICY (revised)

Policies Home » Chapter 3: Student Policies

3.06 Class Attendance and Make-Up Work

Purpose:

It is the expressed focus of the University of Northern Iowa to further the educational development of each of its students. On occasion events will necessitate a student's absence from class. This policy delineates the responsibilities of faculty members and students relating to class attendance and make-up work.

Definition:

The term "faculty member(s)" when used in this policy includes all regular, full-time faculty and all part-time course instructors, regardless of any other University employee classification which applies to the individual who teaches on a part-time basis.

Policy:

A. General Provisions

1. Faculty members who choose to have policies related to attendance and make-up work must distribute those policies by the end of the first week of instruction.
2. Students must adhere to each faculty member's policies regarding attendance and make-up work.
3. Faculty members who require attendance at activities or events that may conflict with a student's otherwise regularly scheduled classes are expected to be reasonable in setting these requirements. If a faculty member will require student attendance at an activity or event outside of the regularly scheduled class period, the affected students must be provided with written notice at least 10 university class days in advance of the event during the fall or spring semester and by the third day of the course for any summer term class. The faculty member must provide each student with a notice that can be given to the faculty member who instructs another course affected by the required attendance of the student. It is then the student's obligation to notify the other faculty member. In the case of extracurricular activities, a semester-long schedule should be prepared and distributed to the participating students at the beginning of the semester. It is the student's obligation to provide the schedule to his/her other faculty members. A student may not be penalized for missing a course activity which conflicts with his/her other scheduled courses. If a faculty member has course activities which require attendance outside of scheduled class time, that faculty member must either provide the student an opportunity to make up the missed activity or event, or have in place a make-up policy that does not unjustly penalize a student for the missed activity or event.

B. Absences

Occasionally, students will have reasonable cause to miss class. In order for both faculty members and students to plan effectively for these absences, the following procedures have been developed. Faculty members are encouraged to take into account the reason for an absence and make appropriate accommodations. Students are still responsible for demonstrating achievement of course learning goals, even when absences are necessary

or reasonable. In situations with many absences, it may be most appropriate for the student to withdraw and retake the course in a future semester.

1. Required university-related absences (including but not limited to athletic games/matches/meets or their equivalent) or legally-mandated absences due to military duty, jury duty, or court subpoena must be considered excused and the student must be allowed to make up missed work, to complete an equivalent assignment, or the professor and the student may mutually agree to waive the assignment without penalty. Faculty members have the discretion to determine what constitutes an appropriate make up work or assignment. Some course requirements may not require a make-up, such as in cases where the class work has a very minimal point value or where the course requirement of minimal point value is a part of a series of dropped assignments.

a. Students participating in required university or legally mandated absences must inform each faculty member of their known and anticipated absences as far in advance as possible. Failure to inform faculty beforehand, when it is clearly possible to do so, may be treated as an unexcused absence.

b. Faculty are not required to offer make-up work for extra credit tasks or assignments.

2. Except as outlined in B1, faculty members have the discretion to determine the reasonableness of absences due to extenuating circumstances, either predetermined or unexpected. Such absences include but are not limited to: non-university sanctioned educationally appropriate events and activities (e.g. attendance at a professional conference, lecture on campus); illness; significant personal emergency; bereavement; obligatory religious observances, etc.

a. When an absence is deemed “reasonable”, the faculty member provides the student an opportunity to make up missed work, or has in place a make-up policy that does not unjustly penalize a student for the absence.

b. Remedies for missed work due to a “reasonable” absence include but are not limited to replacement assignments; policies which may allow students to drop a certain number of assignments or exams; policies which might average a score for a missed exam or account for it in other ways, etc.

c. In each of these remedies, a “reasonable” standard should apply. In determining whether a remedy is reasonable, consideration should be given to the published syllabus.

C. Make-up Work Grievances Arising from Absences

Should a faculty member refuse to allow a student to make up missed work, the faculty member’s decision can be appealed by the student using the grievance process outlined in Section 7 of 12.01 Student Academic Grievance Policy.

Faculty Senate, approved April 16, 2012

President’s Cabinet, approved July 30, 2012

ADDITIONAL EPC REVISIONS SUBMITTED TO FACULTY SENATE IN
JANUARY 2013

Comment [GMR1]: These are the sections that have been modified.