

Special Meeting (Make-up for January 27th postponed meeting)

UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
02/17/14 (3:01 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.)
Mtg. #1749

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Smith** called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

No members of the press were present.

Provost **Gibson** offered no comments today.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** was absent today.

Chair **Smith** reviewed a few things that he sent in a meeting preview email Friday, including his desire to use New Business to address any concerns Senators may have over their perhaps inadvertent approval of Graduate Curriculum Proposals at the last meeting. He also noted that he would like to move Calendar Item 1227/1123 to the head of today's order and that he would like to add a late Agenda item at the end of the business today (Calendar Item 1231/1127) by going into Executive Session to discuss the granting of honorary degrees to nominees, an item under time constraints with the Regents.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for Approval

None

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1228 Administrative Restructuring re. Master of Public Policy program: Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Interim Dean **Bass**

Motion to docket in regular order (Kirmani/Walter**). Passed.

1229 Consultative Session with Bill **Calhoun** and Dave **Mason**, UNI Foundation (head of the order, 3/10/14)

Motion to docket at the head of the order on 3/10/14 (Edginton/Hakes**). Passed.

1230 Consultative Session with Scott **Ketelsen**, Director of University Relations (second in order, 3/10/14)

Motion to docket second in order on 3/10/14 (Nelson/Dolgener**). Passed.

1231 Nominations for Honorary Degrees (end of order of business today, 02/17/14)

Motion to docket at the end of the order of business today, 02/17/14 (Dolgener/Kirmani**). Passed.

4. New Business

Chair **Smith** asked for discussion of any concerns with Graduate Curriculum Proposals because they were perhaps inadvertently approved last week with Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals. Senators had the week to determine if they had questions or concerns. None were expressed.

Senator **Cutter** brought up the need for the Faculty Senate to discuss the number of credit hours required for a Bachelor of Science in Teaching Degree. This has never existed at UNI, and a determination of hours in the Program must be decided upon. It will be added to a list of discussion topics at some future meeting this semester.

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1227 1123 Department of Technology Curriculum Proposal: Technology and Engineering Education Major-Teaching restatement, BA to BS (tabled) (**Peters/Nelson**)

Motion to approve the restatement of the Technology and Engineering Education Major-Teaching from BA to BS (Heston/Edginton**). Passed.

1218 1114 Extended and Separate Exam Administration (tabled pending receipt of additional information) (**Cooley/Dolgener**)

**Left on the table for now.

1223 1119 Request for Emeritus Status, Duane **Bartak** (regular order) (**Kirmani/Nelson**)

Motion to approve this request (Nelson/Walter**). Passed.

1224 1120 Request for Emeritus Status, Phyllis **Carlin** (regular order) (**Kirmani/Nelson**)

Motion to approve this request (Terlip/Nelson**). Passed.

1225 1121 Policy on the Assignment and Changing of Grades (regular order) (**O’Kane/Degnin**)

Motion to approve this Policy (Nelson/Kirmani**). Not acted upon.

Motion to table (O’Kane/Edginton**). Passed.

1231 1127 Nominations for Honorary Degrees (end of order of business today, 02/17/14) (**Dolgener/Kirmani**)

Motion to approve nominations (Dolgener/Nelson**). Passed.

Motion to move into Executive Session (Nelson/Heston**). Passed.

**Motion to rise from Executive Session (occurred during Executive Session).

5. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn (Walter/Gould**). All in agreement.

Time: 4:45 p.m.

Next meeting:

Monday, March 3, 2014
Oak Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 49 pages, including 2 Addenda.

Special Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 17, 2014
Mtg. 1749**

PRESENT: Karen **Breitbach**, Barbara **Cutter**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Chris **Edginton**, Blake **Findley**, Gloria **Gibson**, Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston** , Tim **Kidd**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Nancy **Lippins**, Lauren **Nelson**, Steve **O’Kane**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Jerry **Smith**, Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter** (19 present)

Absent: Melinda **Boyd**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Todd **Evans**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Kim **MacLin**, Scott **Peters**, Gary **Shontz** , Mitchell **Strauss**, Jesse **Swan** (9 absent)

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Smith**: Ok. It’s time to come to order. We may not have a quorum, but it’s ok. We can operate without a quorum, I’m told. We don’t have many of the officer types here. But...

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Smith: Courtesy announcements. First off, press identification. Any such press members here? [none identified] I thought not.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Smith: Comments from Provost **Gibson**.

Gibson: None today, thank you.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Smith: And Faculty Chair **Funderburk** told me that he wouldn't have any comments. He might be getting here later. He had some kind of thing in his Department.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JERRY SMITH

Smith: I do have a few comments. Mostly just reminders from the preview email I sent out on Friday. As I said in that email, I'd like to use the New Business slot on our Agenda as the vehicle for addressing any concerns that you might have about the Graduate Curriculum Proposals that were approved, perhaps inadvertently, last week. Then, as I also said in the email, once we begin to consider the items on our Docket, I'd like to move #1227/1123, Department of Technology's Proposal to change their Technology and Engineering Education Teaching Major from a BA to a BS up to the head of the order. I've been told that we will have representatives from the Department here, including the Department Head. I don't think that's true as of yet, but hopefully they'll be here when we need them. If not, we'll delay on their thing as well.

And finally, as you know, there was a late arriving item having to do with the granting of honorary degrees, and I've created a petition for this. I'll ask us to docket that at the end of today's business. So we'll want to address this, but to do that at the end of our meeting since we need to discuss these nominations in Executive Session, and that will allow our guests to get out of here and go home and do better things. Then we can complete our business on that, come back into regular business, and finish it off. Any questions about any of that? [none heard]

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Smith: Ok. Next item on the Agenda are Minutes for Approval, of which there are none since it's only been a week since our last meeting. When we meet 2 weeks from today, we will have Minutes then, but not today.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1228, Docket #1124, Administrative Restructuring re. Master of Public Policy program: Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Interim Dean **Bass**

Smith: Which gets us to the Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing. And the first of these items is Calendar Item 1228, which, if docketed would be Docket #1124, Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Interim CSBS Dean Brenda **Bass**, regarding a proposed administrative restructuring that would affect the Masters of Public Policy Program. The Provost has requested that we have this consultative session in accordance with the recommendation that the [Faculty] Senate made in April of 2011 regarding the reorganizations of Academic Units. Is there any discussion of the wisdom of docketing this item? [none heard] And if not, then I need a motion to docket it in regular order.

Kirmani: So move.

Smith: Thank you, Senator **Kirmani**. Moved by Senator **Kirmani**. Seconded by Senator **Walter** [who indicated]. Thank you. Any discussion of this item? [none heard] Vote. All in favor, say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] Motion carries.

Calendar Item 1229, Docket #1125, Consultation Session with Bill **Calhoun** and Dave **Mason**, UNI Foundation (head of the order, 3/10/14)

Smith: Next on our list is Calendar Item 1229, which would become Docket #1125, Consultative Session with Bill **Calhoun** and Dave **Mason** of the UNI Foundation. Bill had asked me late last semester if he could meet again with the [Faculty] Senate. He's done this—I don't know when the last time was. It might have been a couple years ago. I'm not sure—to talk about the Foundation's work, fundraising efforts. And in looking ahead, it looked like our March 10th meeting was an opportune time for us to do this. So, any discussion of the wisdom of docketing this item? [none heard] If not, then I need a motion to docket this at the head of the order for our March

10th meeting, and I'd like it at the head of the order just so we can make it easy for these people. Moved by Senator **Edginton** [who indicated].
Second? By Senator **Hakes** [who indicated]. And a discussion. And as I said in my preview email, I welcome your suggestions as to questions and discussion topics that you might like me to pass along to Bill and Dave as a way of facilitating our meeting. So, what would you like to talk—I mean, they say they want to meet with us, but then they'll ask me, "Well, what do you want to talk about?" And it's kind of like, "Well, what did YOU want to talk about?" But do you have things that you think we should ask them to be prepared to talk about?

Edginton: Well, you know, one of the things that I heard when we were in this room and afterwards was the relationship between Intercollegiate Athletes and the Foundation, how that relationship is structured because it has great influence over the priorities that are established in the Foundation. So, you know, some discussion in that particular area. I would think, along with that, I would like to hear a little bit about how the priorities are developed, and I know a lot of this has to do with donor intent. And, you know, I caught the end of a meeting one time between Stacy **Van Gorp**, who is the head of the McElroy Trust, and President **Allen**. I don't know if Provost **Gibson** was in that room. It was over in the Wellness Recreation Center, and they were talking about, you know, the—to make sure that no one from the University contacted the Trust except, you know—people at the Foundation go directly through it. So there probably should also be—I'm giving you several things here, Jerry [Chair **Smith**].

Smith: Good.

Edginton: There probably should also be some conversation about how the relationship between faculty and the Foundation manifests itself, because I'm su—I don't think faculty are really clear about how all of that works, and sometimes they can work to the detriment of fundraising if you have multiple people out there talking to different, you know, funders. So, I think those would be three good topics.

Smith: Very good. Thank you, Senator **Edginton**. Any other suggestions? Ok. Then we are, I believe, ready to vote on the proposal to docket this at, again at the head of the order for our March 10th meeting. All in favor of

doing so, please say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say “No.” [none heard] That motion carries.

Calendar Item 1230, Docket #1126, Consultative Session with Scott Ketelsen, Director of University Relations (second in order, 3/10/14)

Smith: Third Calendar Item for docketing is #1230 which would become Docket #1126, and this, too, is a Consultative Session again scheduled for March 10th, this time with Scott **Ketelsen** who came on board at the start of the Fall semester or over the Summer, somewhere in there, as the Director of University Relations. If you remember, the [Faculty] Senate met with the previous Director of University Relations back in 2012. Scott, again, asked if he could meet with the Senate. I figured you’d all be receptive to that. Any discussion of the wisdom of docketing this? [none heard] Then I would like a motion to docket this as second in order, behind the **Calhoun** and **Mason** consultation, for our March 10th meeting.

Nelson: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Nelson**.

Dolgener: Second.

Smith: Second by Senator **Dolgener**. And discussion. Again, I’d welcome your suggestions as to questions and discussion topics that I could pass along to Scott. Secretary **Terlip**.

Terlip: I would suggest that if there have been any changes in the way that materials are processed that would affect faculty—like press releases, materials that would go through their office—that would be nice if they updated us on any policy changes that have taken place.

Smith: Ok. There might be some interest in what they’ve been doing with the advertising or marketing campaign. And I think there was some kind of turn on that.

Gibson: Yes.

Smith: [laughing] And, I mean, I know that Jeffrey [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] had talked about it, but there may be some interest in—from the [Faculty] Senate in what’s happening with that. So I’ll pass that along to him. Any other suggestions? [none heard] Then I guess we’re ready to vote on this. All in favor of docketing this item as 2nd in order for our March 10th meeting, please say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No.” [none heard] That motion carries.

Calendar Item 1231, Docket #1127, Nominations for Honorary Degrees

Smith: And the final item or Calendar Item for docketing is not on our Agenda because it arrived at my desk after the Agenda had been published, but there is some serious time pressure with this item, and I did kind of pass along relevant information. I don’t think it’s likely to be controversial, and truthfully, it’s not something that the campus at large really can weigh in on. What I’m talking about is what I’ve put up on our website as Calendar Item 1231, which, if we docket it, would be Docket #1127, Nominations for Honorary Degrees. Any discussion of the wisdom of docketing this? [none heard] Then I need a motion to docket this at the end of the order of today’s business.

Dolgener: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Dolgener**. Second by Senator **Kirmani** [who indicated]. Discussion? Again, as I said, this is something we have to act on today. Associate Provost **Licari** has informed us it has to be done to get to the Regents in time, but it requires us to go into Executive Session, which—this is all, these names, are held in confidence. So we do it in Executive Session, which is why I’d like to deal with it as the last thing we address at today’s meeting. Any further discussion of this? [none heard] Then, all in favor of docketing this at the end of the order for today’s business, please say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say “No.” [none heard] And that motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

Smith: Now, as I said in my preview email, we're on to the next topic of New Business. And I'd like to use this category on our Agenda as the means by which we can address any concerns that some of you might have about Graduate Curriculum Proposals. But before doing that, are there any other items of New Business that someone would like the Senate to address?
[none heard]

Then, let's talk about Graduate Curriculum Proposals. Now, the way I believe this would work is that we can talk about it, and if there seems to be Senate support for getting into, you know, really getting into and looking at and having a consult, in essence a meeting with relevant faculty, we would vote to Reconsider one of the College Curriculum Packages, the one that included a Proposal we wanted to take a look at. Those have already been approved. We'd have to reconsider them. We would put that—that would—by Reconsidering it, would put it on the table, and then in discussion we would vote to Divide the Question and split the particular Curriculum Proposal that we're concerned about, we'd split it off, and that—then the other we would approve. The other, I think, stands approved, but the one that we split off then I would table, and we would hold it on the table until such time as we could have relevant parties from the Departments here to talk to it, which has been our practice, or is becoming our practice.

So, to do this, any of this, we first have to believe that there are significant grounds for concern about one or more of the Graduate Curriculum Proposals. Personally, I'd expressed some concerns last week about the Department of Social Work's proposal to add 16 new courses. But, since, I've heard from Scott **Peters**, Senator **Peters**, who couldn't be here today. He's looked into the matter, and he's assured me this was mostly a restructuring of their Graduate Program, rather than a wholesale addition of courses. So I personally am no longer concerned about that Proposal, and indeed I personally have no concerns about any of the other Graduate Curriculum Proposals. But do any of you have such concerns? [pause] Going once? [pause] Going twice? [pause] Ok, then I think we can safely say that the Senate is comfortable with the actions it took, more or less deliberately, in approving the College Curriculum Packages, to include both Graduate and Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals. And, with that

established, we're done with Curriculum with the exception of one item, and that's the one that I wanted to bring up now, but is there anybody here from the Department of Technology to speak to this? [none heard] Those little buggers. They told me that they'd be here. Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: So I wanted to say something since I was the one who brought up the idea of talking about this. Obviously, if we were to ask them to change something, they would need to be here. But my concern was more about the fact that we've never had a BS in Teaching, and that we need to decide what the hours are, and that may or may not affect this Proposal. So we could have a general discussion on setting hours for this kind of degree.

Smith: Would you want to—would you be willing to approve this Proposal, and then have the discussions that you want.

Cutter: Well, the whole point was we don't know if theirs will fit into the hours or not, because we haven't decided what the hours are.

Smith: Ok, so my inclination now is to hold off on this until later in the meeting, hoping somebody gets here. And then they can talk about the hours issue.

Cutter: Ok.

Smith: So, I'm going to—I had planned to do this up front for their sake, but I'm going to hold off on it now, and do other things. If they don't get here, then it basically stays on the table. They're going to have to come here—unless we're willing to approve it without that. But they're going to have to come here and answer the kinds of questions that you and other Senators might have before we're going to vote on it. Is that comfortable?

Cutter: Well, I guess—I mean, maybe, maybe not. We have to decide. It's our job, I think, as the Faculty Senate to decide how many hours a Bachelor of Science in Teaching should have. We have not yet made that decision. That may—like I said, it may or may not affect their major. Their major may be ok within that, but we just have to make that decision at some point, I'd say, in fairness to them. And that's not necessarily something that—I mean, they can't speak to how long a Bachelor of Science in Teaching, in general, theoretically, should be. I mean, we have guidelines that we've

established in the past about Standard Programs and no new Extended Programs that we have to kind of come to terms with.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET 1123, DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY CURRICULUM PROPOSAL: TECHNOLOGY AND ENGINEERING EDUCATION MAJOR-TEACHING RESTATEMENT, BA TO BS (tabled) (**PETERS/NELSON**)

Smith: We now are going to have representative from the Department of Technology [Dr. Doug **Hotek** arriving].

Cutter: Ok, so that's handy.

Smith: Doug [Dr. **Hotek**], you're welcome to sit right here [in the guest seat at the table], because we're already—we're ready for you. So, come on over.

Hotek: I thought I was early.

Smith: Yes, we move pretty quickly around here. [laughter] When we want to. I think it was my fault. I probably told them it was 4:00 o'clock. [**Hotek** passing out handout—see Addendum 1 to this Minutes/Transcript]

Cutter: Yeah, I just—maybe the [Faculty] Senate wants to hear about what program length is since this is from the curric

Smith: Let me—let me—let me first—I'll—I'm going to put this up on—for approval, their proposal, and then we can get to that discussion.

Cutter: Ok.

Smith: So, it's Calendar Item 1227/1123, Department of Technology Proposal to restate their existing Technology and Engineering Education Teaching Major from a BA to a BS Degree. And so I need a motion to approve that Proposal. That doesn't mean you have to like it. It just means we have to get it up for debate, and that's

Heston: So move.

Smith: Thank you. Senator **Heston** moves to approve. Second? Senator **Edginton** [who indicated]. Ok, now we can begin our discussion, and to that end I invited faculty colleagues from the Department of Technology to join us today. I think I might have said that we wouldn't be getting to this until 4:00 o'clock, but, hey, we're moving right along, so we got here a little earlier. But I know Doug **Hotek** from the Department of Technology is here to talk about it. Perhaps some of your colleagues will be coming as well. So, Doug, could you talk about the reason you'd like to change this from a BA to a BS, and one of the concerns that's been raised by Senator **Cutter** is the issue of how many credits—if I understand correctly, how many credits should there be in a BS Degree?

Cutter: In a BS Teaching Degree. Yes.

Smith: BS Teaching Degree, ok. So, Doug, if you could talk to that.

Hotek: Good afternoon. It's nice to meet with you Senators, Provost **Gibson**, and the Associate Provosts. The first questions aren't too hard. I don't—the Bachelor of Science Degree, I don't think it specifies whether it's an Education Degree or not, but a Bachelor of Science Degree requires 126 credits. And this program requires 128 credit hours, semester hours. What else can I help you with?

Heston: It's been a BA Degree previously. What makes it so different that it requires it should be a Bachelors of Science Degree now?

Cutter: That was Senator **Heston**.

Hotek: Yes, I know Melissa. Yeah. Well, there's quite a few things that have taken place since this Program was originated as a Technology Education Program. We've had a Program Review 7 years ago, 6 years ago, Program Review. And we also had a campus-wide Program Assessment performed about 5 years ago. And from those reports, those reviewers reports, they suggested that we add this Engineering Education component to be more consistent with the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) emphasis across the country and the world. We also took a—as random as I could find, I know a lot of universities that are

comparable to ours that have Technology Engineering or Technology and Engineering Education or Technology Education, and from 20 of those—I just chose 20 off the top of my head; I didn’t pull 20 out of the hat—the first 20 I could think of I looked to see what Degree they offered. And they all offer a Bachelor of Science. The only Bachelor of Arts Degree I could find was ours, across the Nation. So, the third paragraph there (see Addendum 1, first page)—the first three paragraphs cover what I’ve just mentioned, and it’s been suggested throughout our professional societies that in the area of Technology Education and Technology Engineering Education that this should be—all of these Programs should be Bachelor of Science Programs. It doesn’t make sense to them, to people I’ve talked to, to have a Bachelor of Arts, and, in fact, it would be detrimental to have such a program. It would be less competitive to have a Bachelor of Arts in Technology Education when every other Program that we know of, that I’ve been able to find, is a Bachelor of Science.

[paraphrasing/reading from Addendum 1] The International Technology and Engineering Educators Association (ITEEA), which is part of an accrediting body for our Program, suggests we do this. The Council on Technology and Engineering Teacher Educators (CTETE) suggests we do this. The American Society for Engineering Educators (ASEE), the National Academy of Engineering (NAE), [and] US Department of Education will start assessing their Technological and Engineering Literacy as part of the assessment for educational progress.

All of the professional societies and all the reviews that we’ve received points to us changing our Program to a Bachelor of Science in Technology and adding an Engineering Education component. We’re not offering an Engineering Degree. It’s an Engineering Education—Technology and Engineering Education.

Smith: Any further questions? Senator **O’Kane**.

O’Kane: I note that the change from the existing Program to the Proposed Program reduces University Electives from 5 to 0, and I just wonder if you could speak to the wisdom of having a Program that is so prescribed. There seems to be very, very little choice available to the students.

Hotek: Yes, I'll speak to that. We used to have 5 University Electives in the Technology Education Bachelor of Arts Program. I can only say from my own experience, not through documentation, but those 5 electives were most likely, almost always, Technology Electives. Students would take that as Technology Electives, Technology courses to satisfy those electives. To meet the requirements for Bachelor of Science, we have to have at least 126 hours, and to meet the requirements for the Professional Education Sequence, we have to have a certain amount of hours in there. We don't see any room for 5 hours of University Electives and still meet all of the technical and the educational requirements, the cognate and the subject area requirements.

Smith: Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: So, since this is such a tight major, can—is your Department confident that this can actually be done in 8 semesters plus 1 summer session if necessary? I mean, are students—since they can't take, they must take—every course has to count for the major or some other requirement?

Hotek: Yes, we are confident in that. And I mentioned in the very last paragraph in the first page [of Addendum 1], we—this can be—the Program is 128 hours; 12 hours are in Level IV Student Teaching, so the remaining 116 hours can be taken in 7 semesters, if the student takes anywhere from 16-17 semester hours per semester, which can be done. Seventeen is not an overload. Sixteen is certainly not an overload.

Cutter: Right. I understand that. It's just that the—and that is an average, but a Standard Program has to be completed in 8 semesters and 1 summer session with an average of 15½ credits per semester. So, I mean, your 12 credits—you're just kind of on the borderline between a Standard and Extended by the definition. That's why I'm asking that.

Hotek: Are you asking about why only 12 that one semester?

Cutter: No, no, I'm not asking that. I mean, I understand that it averages out to just be—I mean, like, depending on if you call one class in a summer session a 3- or a 4-credit class, you're kind of at that boundary, because

yours would require—it would be if you took one 4-credit summer session class.

Hotek: Well, this Program can be done without any summers—summer credits.

Cutter: No, I understand that, but the Faculty Senate and the University has guidelines about what constitutes a Standard Program, and we're not allowed to approve any Extended Programs.

Hotek: Well, I'm confused. I don't understand the question. [Dr. Mohammed **Fahmy**, Head of the Department of Technology arrives]

Smith: We've been joined by Professor **Fahmy**, who is the Chair of the Department of Technology and is welcome to participate in this discussion. We are talking about your Curriculum Proposal right now.

Fahmy: Yes, thank you. I'm sorry for being late. I was just detained a little bit.

Hotek: Do you mean why are we 128 instead of 126? We have to be at least

Cutter: No, no, what I'm—you see, the thing is I'm asking a kind of question that relates to University Policy, which is we are not allowed to approve any new Extended Programs. And an Extended Program, by definition, is either, I would say, 127—more than 127 or 128. I could see the rationale for having 128 be Standard.

Hotek: Ok.

Cutter: But I couldn't see how any more than that could be Standard under our guidelines.

Hotek: So you can see 128 being Standard? Is that it?

Cutter: I—I can. I mean, does that make sense to other people, based on our guideline?

Heston: I would defer

Smith: Senator **Heston**.

Heston: I would defer in some sense to Mike [Associate Provost **Licari**]. It's my understanding, based on years on the Curriculum Committee, that it's 130 hours. I get that there's—they have to take a heavier load because it has—student teaching has to be that truncated semester, but it really is—if you're—the 130 hours is considered not Extended, but 131 is an Extended Program, or is that 130 is an Extended Program?

Licari: Anything above 130. We talked about this in the UCC meetings substantially because this particular program change required several meetings of discussion time, and in ours we reviewed this particular question of program length extensively, and we did determine that it was not an Extended Program.

Smith: Senator **Hakes**.

Hakes: You referred to all of the other 20 programs as all being BS programs. Are they all 128 hours?

Hotek: Some of them are 130.

Hakes: Are there any that are less?

Hotek: Some. It goes from 120 to 130.

Hakes: How is someone else able to manage the BS in 120? I was just wondering if you could

Hotek: I didn't look that deeply into it.

Hakes: It would seem to me that would be something to look at. I mean, if someone else is able [voices explaining/clarifying/questioning]

Heston: Yeah, UNI requires 126.

Hakes: For any BS?

Heston: For any BS, yes. [multiple voices still heard]

Smith: Well, I'm going to take control here and give the floor to Vice-Chair **Kidd**.

Kidd: Hi, Doug.

Hotek: Hi, Tim.

Kidd: So, the one question I had was with the electives, right? So, the classes taken in the Professional Education Sequence could be designated as classes in the major, so I don't quite understand why you have to have, you know, zero electives for students when you have, let's say, 39 classes [*sic* semester hours or credits] which are prescribed, 12 classes [*sic*] in the Tech and Engineering core, and 30 with the Professional Education Sequence. It seems like you have more than enough options to allow students to have some electives, if you wished. So, while the number of hours has to be 126, I don't quite understand why the students can't have any University Electives.

Hotek: Ok, the—are you referring to the 9 hours

Kidd: Yeah, well, that's an example.

Hotek: that's in the Appendix sheet on the last page of this report [see Addendum 1] that I handed out?

Kidd: Yeah. Yeah.

Hotek: There's 9 semester hours of electives there.

Kidd: Well, those are Technology and Engineering Electives, right.

Hotek: Yeah, Technol—right.

Kidd: So I'm just—you know, as students—they like choice. So, I—and you have many—I mean, you have way more than the required 60 minimum hours prescribed courses for the major, so, I mean, that's for a BS Degree,

right? You just need 60? So you have 128, which is double that, so why can't you let the students have some electives? Like, what is the purpose of that?

Hotek: Well, one is Technical Competency—to ensure Technical Competencies in the 5 areas, 5 cluster areas of Industrial Technology, also known as the Engineering Technological Industrial Sciences. The Board of Educational Examiners who award teaching licenses require that any student with a—to be licensed in this would have to have at least 6 hours in any 3 of the 5 areas, which makes up 18 hours. And they need—and 3 hours at least in the other 2 areas, which make 24 hours. We have to have at least 24 hours of cognate area, which is technical area. We offer 48 because we—part of that is our science and mathematics requirement that—we believe that's important. It's very important to have chemistry, math, and physics in this as well. So there's 12 hours. It takes—that's not part of the Board of Educational Examiners requirement. That's a requirement that we feel that's necessary—chemistry, mathematics, and physics. So it just boils down to what we've heard from external reviewers, from our colleagues, from different people in the profession, that we should be offering at least this much technical expertise in the cognate areas. In fact, they wish we would offer more, of course.

Smith: Senator **Heston**.

Heston: I have kind of a little technical question. I noticed that you have 41, or had, 41 hours listed for the Liberal Arts Core, because you're counting one of the Professional Education Sequence courses. That's only a 3-hour course, and I thought the Liberal Arts Core was 45 hours. Is it 44 hours?

Licari: It's 45 hours.

Heston: It's 45 minus 3. That should be 42. I don't know that that makes a big difference, but it's just a little

Female Senator [? **Nelson**]: Well, they're counting the Physics or Chem and the Capstone plus

Heston: Well, that was before they counted the Physics or the Chem. So, I just am not sure. So Chem is 4 and Physics is 4? Ok. So there's a 7-hour double count.

Hotek: Yeah.

Heston: Ok. I was just trying to make sure my math was correct.

Smith: Any other questions? Is there anything else that you folks [to **Hotek** and **Fahmy**] want to communicate at this point? Then, Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: I mean, I don't have any more questions for them, but—and I'm, you know, satisfied that this is not extended, but I do think we have to, after this is done, still set the limits for this kind of Program.

Smith: Yes. I was going to say we are committed to talking about the distinction between BA and BS Degrees, and as part of that discussion, we can talk about what, you know, should be the limits et cetera of the BS Degree, if that's what you're getting at.

Cutter: Hour limits.

Smith: Hour limits, that's right. So—but that's a discussion that the [Faculty] Senate will have at some other time.

Cutter: Ok.

Smith: Right now—and thank you for reminding us that we are committed to talking to that—right now the question on the floor is should we approve this particular Proposal from the Department of Technology? And, if I'm not mistaken, I think we've discussed it to the extent that we want to, so we're ready for a vote? All in favor of approving this proposal, say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [one heard] It—one "no;" the rest "yes." It is approved. Thank you. And that, if I'm not mistaken completes all of our work on Curriculum Proposals for this cycle.

Fahmy: Well, thank you very much for allowing us to be part of this discussion. And just we wanted to be on top of every other Program and

being a very strong Program, and that's why this was one of the things that were done. Thank you very much.

Smith: Thank you, Professor **Fahmy**.

DOCKET 1114, EXTENDED AND SEPARATE EXAM ADMINISTRATION (tabled pending receipt of additional information) (**COOLEY/DOLGENER**)

Smith: Ok. The next item on our Docket, #1218/1114, Extended and Separate Exam Administration tabled pending receipt of additional information. I haven't yet had the time to get the needed information, so that will remain on the table for now, unless someone wants to bring it up for consideration, which is probably not a good idea. [none heard]

DOCKET 1119, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, DUANE **BARTAK** (regular order) (**KIRMANI/NELSON**)

Smith: So, moving on we come to Calendar Item 1223, Docket #1119, Request for Emeritus Status for Duane **Bartak**. I need a motion to approve that.

Nelson: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Nelson**. And a second? Seconded by Senator **Walter** [who indicated]. And now we're open for discussion, and I believe that Professor Laura **Strauss**, Dr. **Bartak's** Department Head is here today to make a statement on behalf of his request for emeritus status. Thank you for joining us, Dr. **Strauss**.

Strauss: [moving to the guest position] I'll—I'm just going to read my letter of support for Duane's emeritus status:

"Dear Senators,

"It is my most sincere pleasure to write this letter of support for Dr. Duane **Bartak's** application for emeritus status. Dr. **Bartak** was a valuable member of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry for 21 years. Duane was

hired as the department head in 1992. And at that time, the landscape at UNI was changing to increase the scholarly research profile of the institution. The efforts of Dr. **Bartak** during his time as department head greatly facilitated the growth of the research opportunities for our faculty and students. He was instrumental in the hiring of several new faculty members, which supported our department's growth towards a higher research activity. He advocated on the candidate's behalf for reasonable start-up funds so that a viable research program had a chance. During his time as department head, he also secured funding to expand our instrumentation holdings, to renovate laboratory spaces, to supply stipend support for high school students and to start our now very active summer undergraduate research program.

"Dr. **Bartak** also fostered active research exchange programs with institutions in Russia and in France. The program with Herzen State University in St. Petersburg Russia, allowed Russian students to earn dual master's degrees from both Herzen and UNI. Our program with ENSCR in Rennes, France stills provides French undergraduate students the opportunity to participate as interns during our summer undergraduate research program. The inclusion of these Russian and French students has provided an excellent way for UNI students to interact with students from very different undergraduate experiences, broadening their world perspective.

"After serving as our department head for 10 years, Dr. **Bartak** returned to the faculty. The change allowed Duane to pursue other research opportunities first by taking a professional development assignment to learn more about nanoscience and nanotechnology. He and Dr. Cliff **Chancey** developed and co-taught our first course in nanoscience and nanotechnology. They both saw the potential and the future opportunities of this burgeoning interdisciplinary field. They worked diligently to engage our pre- and in-service secondary teachers so that nanoscience and nanotechnology would be introduced at the high school level. To that end, they co-taught the course several times with an on-line presence for the lecture material and full Saturday labs once a month to make it possible for in-service teachers to take the course during the academic year. The Saturday labs were often in addition to the weekly labs held for our full-time students. Their efforts were financially supported through grants from the Roy J. Carver Charitable Trust and the US Department of Defense. These

two grants allowed for the acquisition and instrumentation lab renovations needed to continue to support the nanoscience program.

“The instrumentation acquired for the nanoscience program not only supported course offerings but supplied the critical instrumentation for those interested in materials science research. As a materials chemist, I have directly benefited from these instruments now housed at UNI when I previously had to travel to either Iowa or Iowa State. The works of Drs. **Bartak** and **Chancey** has led to very fruitful collaborative research projects between the Chemistry/Biochemistry and the Physics departments and has attracted new faculty with a materials science experimental focus in both departments.

“As Dr. **Bartak**’s research program was winding down, he shifted his role in the department to support junior faculty by voluntarily taking a 4/4 teaching load. His willingness to accept a larger teaching load gave the department flexibility to assign a one course reduction for a semester to our junior faculty. This one course reduction has allowed our junior faculty to focus on scholarship needed for tenure and promotion during that critical fourth probationary year. Dr. **Bartak**’s contributions to support the growth of our departmental scholarship remained strong throughout his career at UNI.

“On a personal note, Duane hired me twice. I was first hired as a visiting assistant professor for one year in 1996-97. The teaching experience gained during that year doubled the number of invitations that I received to interview for tenure-track positions at institutions like UNI. The following year the tenure-track position became available here and I applied for the job, even though I was quite happy with my tenure-track position at the time. I was the successful candidate and we might say, the rest is history. Now 16 years later, I have the distinct honor of serving as our department’s head -- a department that has truly been made better because of Dr. **Bartak**’s tireless efforts to put the needs of our students and faculty as his highest priority.

“Sincerely,

[signed]

“Laura Hoistad Strauss”

Smith: Thank you, Dr. Strauss. Are there any comments bearing on the request for emeritus status for Duane **Bartak**? Yes, Vice-Chair **Kidd**.

Kidd: I'd like to chime in and say that she's absolutely correct. Duane did amazing things with Cliff [the late Professor **Chancey**, who served as Department Head of Physics] to support nanoscience research, all research, I think, in Chemistry, and I know that my own work here has benefitted greatly from what he's done.

Smith: Thank you. Any others? [none heard] Then I believe we are ready to vote on this item. All in favor, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say "No." [none heard] That motion carries. Yes, thank you, Dr. **Strauss**.

DOCKET 1120, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, PHYLLIS **CARLIN** (regular order) (**KIRMANI/NELSON**)

Smith: Next we come to Calendar Item 1224, Docket #1120, Request for Emeritus Status for Phyllis **Carlin**. And I need a motion to approve this request.

Terlip: So move.

Smith: Moved by Secretary **Terlip**.

Nelson: Second.

Smith: Seconded by Senator **Nelson**. Discussion. And in this case I was provided with a statement by Chris **Martin**, who is the Head of Dr. **Carlin's** Department. I'm going to read that statement of support into the Minutes. He is writing:

"To the UNI Faculty Senate:

"It is hard to imagine the University of Northern Iowa, Department of Communication Studies without Phyllis Scott **Carlin**. In 1976 a newly minted Ph.D. from Southern Illinois named Phyllis **Scott** came to Cedar Falls

as a faculty member of what was then called the Department of Speech. Without suggesting she is old in any way (because she is very young in spirit), Phyllis alone holds the wisdom and understanding of knowing our department's origins from that time. She is the one person on our faculty with the experience of Department of Speech becoming Communication and Theatre Arts in 1981, and then Communication Studies in 1992.

“It is also hard to imagine how the UNI Department of Communication Studies would have developed without Phyllis **Carlin**. Phyllis, who grew up in rural Missouri, planted herself at UNI and cultivated deep roots here. Dr. **Carlin** was the creator and director of the Interpreters Theatre program at UNI for 17 years (1976-1993), and initiated involvement of UNI students in scripts, productions, and curricula based upon folklore, oral history and ethnographic research, advocacy, and social action. Our Interpreters Theatre and Performance Studies programs are now highly regarded across the nation, and Phyllis started it all.

“Phyllis Carlin leaves a rich legacy at UNI. She has taught a number of courses, with specialties in cultural performance, qualitative research (ethnography and oral history), conversation and discourse analysis, community and communication, and performance as social action.

“Most recently, her research has focused on disaster narrative, environment and social change, including the relationship of expressive communication and place, and the creation of community. Her research on this appeared in the leading journal, *Text and Performance Quarterly*, in a co-authored essay.

“Her creative work includes a touring production of James Hearst’s farm poetry, which was sponsored by a grant from the Iowa Humanities Board. She completed ethnographic photography/video and qualitative research on rural women for the American Folklife Festival and the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C. Her other published research includes articles on rural women’s narratives and farm crisis narratives, and an essay on evolving changes in performance studies. She has also published research about hospice volunteers. In 2002, she was guest editor of an *Iowa Communication Journal* special issue on the topic of performance, communication, and ethnography. Phyllis also has presented her research at conferences, including the International Qualitative Research (Canada),

National Communication Association, and the National Women's Studies Association. She has served as the secretary and as an executive board member of the Performance Studies division, and has served on the editorial boards of *Text and Performance Quarterly*, *Central States Communication Journal*, and *Literature in Performance*.

"In March 1976, the department head at Southern Illinois wrote a letter of recommendation for Phyllis's application to UNI. What that person wrote in his letter about Phyllis 38 years ago was remarkably accurate and describes the same Phyllis we know today. He wrote: "Phyllis is a gem...She listens as well as she talks. But look out. When it's her turn to take the floor or ask questions, you know she is on top of everything." He concluded, "She is without a question an outstanding human being."

"That's the Phyllis Scott **Carlin** all of us know, and we will miss having her in our midst on a daily basis. But we are happy for her, wish her the very best, and hope that her family and the rest of the world gets more time to be with this outstanding educator and outstanding human being.

"With the highest regards from the entire UNI Department of Communication Studies,

[signed]

"Christopher R. Martin, Ph.D.
Professor and Interim Head"

Smith: Is there anyone else who would care to speak on her behalf?
Secretary **Terlip**.

Terlip: I think Chris did a commendable job describing Phyllis's contribution to scholarship, particularly Performance Studies. On a personal note, Phyllis was one of the great collaborators and consensus builders in our Department, and I think across the campus. She was able to bring diverse groups together because of what that letter described. She was a great listener, and she could also pull groups together. Sometimes she worked miracles in meetings, and I wish I had her skill.

In addition to the kind of service that Chris spoke about professionally and in the Department, I also think that one of the great things that Phyllis did

was she was instrumental in getting the IRB [Institutional Review Board] set up on campus, and, in particular, getting folks to appreciate and understand qualitative research, which struggled for some time in terms of developing guidelines and sort of getting a foothold. And she did great work there, along with her other colleagues in other Departments.

Finally, I would just say that Phyllis did a lot of things locally. Her research was talked about in Chris's letter, but she had a lot to do, for example, with the Silos and Smokestacks project in terms of involving some of our students and getting some of those collections going. And so she did a great deal both for the campus and the community, and she will be greatly missed.

Smith: Thank you, Laura. Any other comments on this? Yes, Marilyn [Senator **Shaw**].

Shaw: I'm going to speak about Phyllis from a different point of angle because I came back as a teacher to work on my degrees, and Phyllis was the very first instructor I ever had, and I can honestly say every class she ever taught I probably took with her. She is the most fantastic educator that you could ask for. And while they talked about her accolades to other areas, I just want you to know, she is a fantastic teacher as well as a fantastic person.

Smith: Thank you, Senator **Shaw**. Other comments? [none heard] Then I believe we are ready to vote on this request for emeritus status. All in favor, say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say "No." [none heard] That motion carries.

DOCKET 1121, POLICY ON THE ASSIGNMENT AND CHANGING OF GRADES (regular order) (**O'KANE/DEGNIN**) (<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/policy-assignment-and-changing-grades>)

Smith: Next on our Docket is Calendar Item 1225, Docket #1121, Policy on the Assignment and Changing of Grades. First, again, I'll need a motion to approve this proposal. [see URL above or Addendum 2]

Nelson: So move.

Smith: Approved by Senator **Nelson**. Second? Senator **Kirmani** [who indicated]. Our trusty twosome. Discussion. Now, to head this off, we've received this from the EPC [Educational Policies Commission], which responded to the Senators' request from last year to rework this Proposed Policy. And those of you who were on the [Faculty] Senate last year know this came up, and it was messy, and we sent it back to them, and they've come back with a rewrite that they think—they believe answers our objections. Francis **Degnin** is the chair of the EPC, and he's also substitute [alternate] for Senator **Swan**, and he hoped to be here, but he sent me an email saying he didn't think he was going to get out of his driveway. Cedar Falls is not good at handling snow. But—so as a result, he won't be here to answer questions. We can move ahead with a discussion of the Proposal, and again, no matter how much time we have to take, we want to make sure we have time for our final item, the Honorary Degrees that we talked about. But we are doing very fine on time. Or we could table this until such time as we have Professor **Degnin** here to contribute to our deliberations. Which way do you want to go? It's on the table right now. Would you like to engage in some discussion of this? Do you think you'd be willing at this point? Do you have any big objections? Do you think we might be willing to approve this? Or do you want to hold off on that because people have concerns that they feel we wouldn't be able to answer by ourselves? Basically, this is up for discussion right now. Senator **O'Kane**.

O'Kane: Personally, I'd like to hear what Professor **Degnin** has to say.

Smith: He's—he, you know, says, "Hey, here's our Proposal. We think it's pretty good." And then he sent me an email answering what he thought might be questions. [Reading] "Given the snow, I might not make it now. My street typically isn't plowed for 24 hours." What's going on here? "So let me raise two questions I wanted to mention to the Senate. First, the *instructor of record*, does that need to be further defined?" And then he offered a definition of what would be meant by the *instructor of record*. "Second, when it comes to Administrators being able to retroactively withdraw students from courses with a W and, again, for special and compelling circumstances. We discussed whether we needed to include language that students could only be withdrawn from all the classes for an

entire term and not just from one or two classes with a W. We agreed that this was generally understood—that, if they were going to do that, it would be for all their classes, is the way I’m understanding this—“so it probably did need to be spelled out. On the other hand, the Senate may feel other ways in which to add language to that effect.” So those are the things that he thought might be contentious or kind of up in the air about this Proposal. Any other? Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I thought that the reason that this Policy came into play was because there were some, I don’t know if *abuses* is the right word, but there were changes of grades up the chain of command that were made where faculty were not involved and really not knowledgeable or maybe even disagreed with the decision to change a grade. And as I looked at the Policy, I know that it was written in a way that was intended to be very positive, but I’m just—and I think it is, you know, is a positive statement—but I’m just wondering if it’s really strong enough to prevent what was perceived as an abuse up the chain of command? And, you know—and I’m not really sure where it occurred in the chain of command. I know we had some incidents in HPELS that occurred over the Director’s position or at the Director’s position and above. So, I don’t know. I mean, you know, personally I don’t think that the verbiage is strong enough to address the intent that, you know, created a concern for having this Policy strengthened or in place.

Smith: Ok. And just I’ll pretend to be EPC here. I think they would say that under II.1 here [see Addendum 2], their argument is that that first sentence is—kind of gets to your point. “The assessment of student academic performance, including the assignment of particular grades, is the responsibility of the instructor of record of each class.” Now, you know, if the [Faculty] Senate would like something stronger than that, we, of course, can propose an amendment. But that, I think, is their feeling—that that’s how they addressed that concern. I think that’s how they would feel about it. Other discussion? Senator **Gould**.

Gould: I did notice at the bottom of the document that you shared with us—I’m assuming that was from the EPC—it said “Questions.” It’s at the very bottom.

O’Kane: “Instructor of record if multiple teachers or teaching assistant”

Gould: Right. Is that something we need to address?

Terlip: Yeah, I guess. Can I speak, Jerry [Chair **Smith**]?

Smith: Yes, Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: For example, in our Department, we have an instructor of record, but we have TA's who teach multiple sections. So, who's the instructor of record? I mean, it is the supervisor, but the classroom activities, everything is done by the TA's, so if there's a disagreement there, who is the instructor of record, I guess?

Smith: And this might be a point for me to insert the language that Senator [sic EPC Chair] **Degnin** sent to us in this email. "The instructor of record is the person with primary responsibility for teaching and assigning grades in a given course and section. Others may be involved. For example, a teaching assistant may both teach and grade, but they do so directly or indirectly under the supervision of the instructor of record. In team taught courses, one person is still assigned the role of the instructor of record, though they may, by agreement, share the grading in other ways. The instructor of record cannot be changed during the course of the semester in which the course is active without the instructor's consent, unless the instructor becomes unable to teach the course due to some sort of unusual event such as death, illness, or separation from the University. Once the term is completed, the instructor of record cannot be changed." So that's the language that he [EPC Chair **Degnin**] is suggesting to clarify that. Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: I am a little concerned about "once the semester is completed the instructor of record cannot be changed" because this happens all the time with graduate students in research. They—they, like, sign up for the wrong person, or they change advisors, and they have continuous registration, and the old person, since they are not their advisor anymore, doesn't want to give them the grade, so they get switched to the new person.

Smith: Someone want to talk to that?

Licari: It happens all the time—[laughter all around]—particularly with graduate students, not so much at the undergraduate level. But with graduate students, we’re talking about a very fluid situation, oftentimes, as committee members go on and off committees, as advisors change. So that—Francis’s [**Degnin**] proposed language there wouldn’t work in many of those particular cases. It would be incredibly disruptive and create a tremendous amount of bureaucracy just to handle that.

Smith: So, if I understand correctly, if you’ve taken a course, a graduate course during the Fall semester, and next semester you’re changing your advisor or whatever, how would the instructor of record for that Fall semester course be affected by that?

Heston: It’s not a semester course.

Smith: Oh, it’s something else. [voices clarifying it’s the ongoing research situation; not a grade given but RC for Research Continuing must be assigned]

Licari: You’re getting a Research Continued. Somebody has to assign that, and if you go by the letter of what Francis [**Degnin**] wrote, there would be instances where that assignment wouldn’t be possible. And, you know, we just got done in the Graduate College of whittling down the bureaucracy that was required in order to get Student Requests processed. I think Shoshanna [**Coon**, Associate Dean of the Graduate College] is now down to only 3 pending Student Requests. I don’t want to have the situation now where we artificially increase it back up to, you know, several hundred backlogged Requests for something as simple as that.

Smith: So, it sounds like I’m hearing a concern that the Policy as drafted doesn’t adequately address

Licari: That proposed language about of student—of instructor of record is a bit too strict.

Smith: Ok. Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: I mean, it might work to just add something like, “Could be,” you know, “only be changed with consent of the instructor.” Or—unless they’re

gone, right? That _____ that issue. But some language to deal with that.

Smith: Ok. Senator **Nelson**.

Nelson: It would seem like the issue is that it's when the course is actually completed, and in the cases that are being described with the graduate students, RC is given to the student because they have not completed their research. So, if that wording were revised to take into account that not all courses are completed at the end of a semester, then perhaps the wording would be flexible enough to address all of the issues.

Smith: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I wanted to add one other comment to the statement that I made before. I actually plead to be guilty as an Administrator to changing grades, and so when I looked at that—I looked at that Policy, I asked myself the question, “Would that have prevented me, you know, as Director of the School of HPELS, from changing those grades?” And I don't think it would have. That's the concern that I had. And I did change grades.

Smith: Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: So, can I ask Senator **Edginton** why it wouldn't have prevented you? What's missing?

Edginton: Well, sometimes, you know, most—the times where I changed the grade were when I felt that the faculty member had made an error in calculating the students' grades and/or they had changed the requirements of the course and without really giving the student proper notice. And so, you know, the question is how can you—how can you grade the student, you know, on materials that you haven't included in the course outline and hold them accountable for that? And so, in fairness to the student, you know, we would—I would ask the instructor to recalculate those grades, and sometimes they would and sometimes they wouldn't, you know, and then I'd calculate them. And then there were times when there were calculation errors made. I mean, the faculty member would put their matrix in front of me for grading students, and you add the points up, and they just didn't total out correctly. So those were two cases that I can think

of, you know, in 19 years, where there was some intervention that took place. Now, I want you to know that then that faculty, they, you know, the faculty member that I did that with was not upset with me. They accepted the decision that I made to change that grade, but subsequent to that there have been a lot of conversation at HPELS about changing of grades, and a lot of people have been upset about it—or a few people have been upset about it. So, I don't know. I just—I'm trying to give it to you raw.

Smith: Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: But the issue is who makes the grade change over at the Registrar's Office? And what kind of documentation do they have to have to make the grade change? Whether or not you want to do it, when it gets over there, there's got to be some kind of a Policy as to who can change this grade.

Smith: Associate Provost **Licari**.

Licari: I'll speak as a non-voting member of the EPC. Just to remind the [Faculty] Senate of the first paragraph under #II Assignment of Grades [see Addendum 2]. The second sentence starts: "The faculty member teaching a course has the sole responsibility for the evaluation of student course work and is the sole judge of the grades received by the students in that course, subject to the right of students to appeal..." So, in our situation, Senator **Edginton**, this Policy would have blocked you from making an assignment of grade. If the student has a problem with how she's graded in a course, the proper recourse for that student is to file a Grievance. That's the advice always that my office gives when they come to me to complain about a grade. I just hand them a copy of the Grievance Policy and direct them now—it used to be a paper copy, but now it's online—to the link that has the Grievance on it, because that is the proper recourse for a student who thinks that he or she has been graded improperly.

Edginton: What's the first step in that Grievance Process? Go back to the instructor and then go to the Department Head?

Licari: Yes, exactly, but the point is we don't have this Policy yet. And your concern was that this Policy wouldn't block a future Department Head from doing what you did, and, in fact, it would.

Edginton: Well, if the student follows the Grievance Process, and it leads them to the Department Head, does that enable the Department Head to intervene?

Licari: No.

Edginton: Is the language strong enough there? That's all I'm asking.

Licari: No, it does not.

Smith: Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: My question has been answered.

Smith: Ok, are there any other questions? Secretary **Terlip**.

Terlip: I know one of the central concerns was that faculty members were not notified when grades were changed, so that definitely is here now. I guess my question is "What happens if somebody changes the grade and you get notified? What do you do, if you disagree with it?" I don't understand. So, then, you're just upset? I mean, I don't know where it goes from here. There don't seem to be any consequences if the call's not to your liking. That's my question.

Smith: Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: But based on the Policy, the grade can't be changed unless the person who's responsible changes it, so—I mean, that was my point before. When it gets over to the Registrar's Office, you know, are they adhering to this Policy?

Smith: Senator **Heston**.

Heston: Yeah, that was actually—I think that it's nice to have this lovely Policy that makes it very clear what can and can't happen. How do the people who receive the paperwork, because we fill out this little piece of paper, and it has our signature on it, and it may have our Department Head's signature on it or sometimes not. I mean, who's going to instruct

the Registrar's Office to disregard—under what circumstances to disregard Policy changes? Are we basically saying that all Department Heads and Deans will be well educated on this Policy so that they cannot—they would never consider doing anything else but letting the grades go through and having students follow the appeals process?

Lippins: Yeah. I mean, I'm in agreement with the Policy.

Heston: Right, I mean, I

Lippins: And training is part—I mean, if there are things that happen, Policies that go forward, that you need to make sure that it's made apparent.

Smith: Is Senator **Heston's** point that mechanisms are at the Registrar that would block, say, a Department Head from putting through a grade change that hadn't been—wasn't justified, wasn't authorized? Is that a point? [voices saying that it has to be signed by the faculty]

Lippins: Yeah, it has to be signed.

Smith: And the Registrar's Office would stop anything that wasn't properly signed or authorized? [many voices clarifying, restating] That the Registrar's Office is going to be the bulwark there? They will enforce the Policy?

Licari: I don't understand why they wouldn't.

Heston: Well, because of something called "situated social power." I mean, and that's going to play out with faculty as well. Faculty who end up having negotiations with their Department Head over a Student Appeal Process, which is actually where the Student Appeal Process starts. It starts between the faculty and the student and brings in the Department Head early. They don't go immediately up the line as a rule, do they? They try and reach some sort of magnanimous agreement supposedly. I mean, there is situated social power that a Department Head has, especially over untenured faculty, and, you know, for all I'd like to believe the best of all Department Heads, but I think they often make a decision based on what they think is the best interest of the Department, not necessarily in the

interest of an individual faculty member, which is maybe their primary responsibility. But I, you know—there are all these ways around these things. There are all these little—it's a question of trust, and so I assume that there was, for this to even have come up, at some point something violated the sense of trust of faculty, or this would never have come up as a major issue.

Smith: Any other comments? Senator **Walter**.

Walter: The first thing was it's obvious the students have a Grievance Process they can file to address their concerns. What happens when this actually does happen? We find out a month or two later that someone up in Administration has changed a grade. Do we have a Grievance Process that we can file to follow this backward? Where would they go?

Smith: Should I take that as a question for our Administrators?

Walter: Whoever is capable of answering it. What is our procedure when that actually does happen?

Edginton: I don't think we've had a Policy in place.

Terlip: Well, there's been no place to go. [voices commenting]

Walter: Would that fall under Grievance, or is that a separate ballgame?

Licari: I mean, there's the Grievance Process that faculty have if they feel that conditions at the University are such or the Administration is not abiding by the rules, you've got a Grievance Process. There are other mechanisms that the faculty have as well, things that have been exercised over the last couple of years.

Smith: NISG Vice-President **Findley**.

Findley: Yes, I was on the EPC when this was—I think it was my first meeting on the EPC when this was talked about. I think that process is outlined in Section V of the Policy. It says that "If an instructor believes that a grade has been inappropriately changed, she or he has a right to file an appeal within five days of receiving the automatic notification of a grade

change from the Registrar's Office." And then it highlights like what the process is, and there's an eventual committee that would vote on that.

Lippins: In the academic _____ grade change.

Findley: Yes.

Lippins: Yeah, he's looking at

Findley: No, in the Administrative Grade Change Policy, [pause] at least that's what I have on this document that I've checked out from the Senate's webpage. [long pause as others are looking for this wording or another document]

Smith: Yeah, I don't see anything in the Policy in front of us that fits that description. [many voices overlapping]

Findley: Ok, so I was really confused, I see.

Smith: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: Maybe the Policy can be strengthened by just simply inserting what the faculty's rights are in terms of that Grievance Policy. It would be a simple way to handle it.

Smith: Ok. I'm taking all of these proposals as things that we're going to feed back to Francis [**Degnin**] and the EPC, and so I'd like to get that out so that when they—if they go through another round of revisions, that they have our major concerns in front of them. Any other comments? Yes, Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: I think based on what Associate Provost **Licari** said earlier that it needs to be some kind of a simple mechanism to change grades, especially incompletes and RC's, when the faculty member of record originally has left the University. That happens all the time, sometimes a year later, and so without, you know—there's a process here, but it's pretty convoluted to do actually. So I think something—because I think that's probably the most common circumstance that leads to a grade change after someone has—is no longer around.

Smith: Other comments? Secretary **Terlip**.

Terlip: Their Policy does say like when a person leaves that the Department Head or the Departmental hat gets to define that, so, I mean, I guess once the Department sets a rule, that would work, but it might not be consistent across Departments, and I don't know if that troubles people or not. It seems to me one Department could say, "Well, just let the Department Head do it," and another could say, "It has to be a committee," or I don't know.

Smith: Do we have any other comments to make on this Proposal? What I'm going to suggest is that we vote to table this, and, having done that, then the EPC, Senator [*sic* Chair] **Degnin** can look at our comments and, from that extract a sense of what our concerns are and make revisions that they think are appropriate here. So, I'm looking—unless somebody—Senator **O'Kane**.

O'Kane: I move to table.

Smith: Move to table. Thank you. Second, by Senator **Edginton** [who indicated]. Any discussion of the tabling motion?

Terlip: I thought of something else, but I'll just give it to you to add to the list, if that's ok. I was thinking there's no statute of limitations on like it saying "when the extraordinary circumstance is eliminated" like they find the instructor of record, then they can go back and change it. I'm thinking of the student who gets it changed and gets it changed back. I think there needs to be some reasonable time limits put in there.

Smith: Ok. Any other discussion of our motion to table? [none heard] Then, let's vote on that. All in favor of tabling this, say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] It passes and is tabled.

DOCKET 1127, NOMINATIONS FOR HONORARY DEGREES (end of the order today, Feb. 17, 2014) (**DOLGENER/KIRMANI**)

Smith: Now, we've got one item left on our Docket for today's business, and that's the one we added today, Calendar Item 1231, Docket #1127, Nominations for Honorary Degrees, and it is our practice to discuss these matters in Executive Session with only Senators in attendance so that the names of nominees are not made public. We will do that for the discussion, but first I would like a motion to approve the recommendations that have been forwarded to us by the Honorary Degrees Committee.

Dolgener: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Dolgener**. Seconded by Senator **Nelson** [who indicated]. And now to discuss the matter, which will be the last business item that we will transact today, we need to go into Executive Session. I need a motion to do that.

Nelson: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Nelson**. Seconded by Senator **Heston** [who indicated]. And we all vote on—or discussion of moving into Executive Session? [none heard] Vote on Executive Session. All in favor of moving into Executive Session, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] We are now in Executive session, so all you non-Senators can go on with your lives. Thank you. [audio turned off; all non-Senators exit the room]

[Senators rose from Executive Session, and technical staff returned to room.]

Smith: Are we online again? Good. Ok, thank you. So now we're back in our regular session where the motion on the table is to approve the nominations for honorary degrees that were forwarded to us by the Honorary Degrees Committee. We've already discussed the matter. We are ready to vote. All in favor, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say "No." [none heard] That motion carries. And that completes our work for today.

ADJOURNMENT (4:45 p.m.)

Smith: A reminder that the Senate will not meet next Monday. Some of us will be going to Des Moines for UNI Day at the Capital, and I'm guessing there's room for at least one more person in the car. If any of you want to go, let Scott [Senator **Peters**], Gretchen [Senator **Gould**], Tim [Vice-Chair **Kidd**] are going, as myself. I'm coming from St. Paul, but otherwise we'll be back here in 2 weeks on March 3rd. All we need to do now is to adjourn. Moved by Senator **Walter** [who indicated]. Second by Senator **Gould** [who indicated]. And we're done. Thank you very much.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Administrative Assistant and Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

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

Follows are 2 addenda to these Minutes.

**Proposed Curriculum Program Change
B.S. Technology and Engineering Education—Teaching**

**Dr. Douglas R. Hotek
Department of Technology
February 17, 2014**

JUSTIFICATION OF CHANGE

Justification for this program change can be derived from the most recent program review and recommendations reported by external reviewers, asking the department to be consistent with the emphasis on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education, and by having the program award the Bachelor of Science degree.

During the academic year of 2009, the University of Northern Iowa conducted a campus-wide assessment of most of its academic programs. Acting at the request of then Interim Provost Lubker, an *Academic Program Assessment Task Force* reviewed the B.A. Technology Education program, and through a report provided to the Department of Technology, recommended the program have “closer alignment with engineering.” This program change coincides with the recommendation of that task force.

This program change also echoes the rationale, curricular, philosophical, and name changes of leading professional organizations including the International Technology and Engineering Educators Association (ITEEA), the Council on Technology and Engineering Teacher Educators (CTETE), and the K-12 Division of the American Society for Engineering Educators (ASEE). The inclusion of engineering in technology teacher preparation programs is supported by the National Academy of Engineering (NAE). Furthermore, the US Department of Education will begin assessing Technological and Engineering Literacy as a part of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

During a recent internet search of 20 comparable institutions known for their K-12 teacher preparation programs all were found to offer a Bachelor of Science degree in their *technology education* or *technology and engineering education* programs, all ranging from 120 to 130 total semester hours. The University of Northern Iowa was the only institution found in our search to offer a Bachelor of Arts degree in Technology Education. None were found to offer a B.A. in Technology and Engineering Education.

For all these reasons, we feel that a Bachelor of Science degree is most common and desirable for the UNI Technology Education—Teaching program, and that a change to add an engineering education is necessary and essential to the wellbeing of the program. This change is motivated by a recent external program review, a campus-wide program assessment, an ability to stay in step with comparable programs of other higher education institutions, and to coincide with reflections of leading international/national professional organizations in the field of technology and engineering education K-12 teacher preparation.

The total program hours for this proposed B.S. are increased from 126 to 128. Twelve of these hours are in the Level IV Student Teaching Internship. The remaining 116 hours can be taken in seven semesters at 16 to 17 hours per semester.

COSTS

The current program consists of 50-53 hours. This proposed program consists of 60 hours (39 hours in Technology and Engineering Core; 9 hours of Technology and Engineering Electives; 12 hours in Technology and Engineering Teaching Core)

Hours dropped from program = 10 hours

Existing courses removed:

- TECH 1017 (0-3hr swing) will be retained for other programs.
- TECH 2036 (3hr) will be retained for other programs.
- TECH 4178 (3hr) will be retained until students in the pipeline of the existing program finish their degree.

Hour reduction within course = 1 hour

- TECH 1022 (changed from 4 hr to 3 hr)

Hours added to major = 17 hours

New courses:

- TECH 1006 (3hr) Facilities, materials, and other startup costs were funded by external grants. New tenure-track line was hired in 2010 specifically to teach this course and has been teaching it as an experimental course.
- TECH 3010 (3hr) Facilities, materials, and other startup costs were funded by external grants. New tenure-track line was hired in 2010 specifically to teach this course and has been teaching it as an experimental course.
- TECH 4290/ PHYSICS 4290 (3hr) facilities, materials, and other startup costs were funded by external grants. Faculty provided in collaboration with Physics Department are currently teaching it as an experimental course.

Existing courses:

- MATH 1140 (4 hr)
- PHYSICS 1511 (4 hr) or PHYSICS 1400 (4 hr)

COMPARISION OF TOTAL PROGRAM HOURS

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
Major	50-(if TECH 1017, 3hr to major electives)	60
Prof Ed Seq (PES)	30 (INSTECH 1020 is waived)	30 (INSTECH 1020 is waived)
LAC	41 (PES: EDPSYCH 2030 for Cat. 5C) PHYSICS	38 (PES: EDPSYCH 2030 for Cat. 5C; Major 1511 or PHYSICS 1400 for Cat. 4B)
Univ Electives	5	0
Total to graduate	126	128

COMPLIANCE WITH UNI B.S. DEGREE CURRIULA

Source: <http://catalog.uni.edu/generalinformation/undergraduateinformation/>

To meet the expectations of a B.S. degree, this new Technology and Engineering Education—Teaching program includes an engineering component, which is more relevant and rigorous than the current Technology Education—Teaching program. There is a higher degree of advance-level concentration in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) courses.

“The Bachelor of Science degree should be elected by those students who are preparing for careers in areas where effective application of knowledge and training requires a higher degree of concentration in subject matter and cognate areas, particularly in advanced-level course work. This degree is especially appropriate for students planning post-baccalaureate study in graduate or professional schools.”

It is very common for technology and engineering education teachers to plan on post baccalaureate study in graduate schools. In fact, it is required for any teacher who expects to advance in his or her career.

“Since this degree assumes a higher degree of concentration in subject matter, a major leading to this degree will ordinarily require at least eight 100-level* semester hours of credit more than an identically-named major leading to a Bachelor of Arts degree. A minimum of 126 semester hours is required for the Bachelor of Science degree.”

This a proposed program name and degree change. That is, from Technology Education to Technology and Engineering Education. Therefore, no “identically named major leading to a Bachelor of Arts degree” will be offered. Of the 60 hours in the courses of this program proposal, a minimum of 18 hours are at the 3000/4000 level (not including major electives). Of the 30 hours in the professional education sequence courses of this program proposal, 26 hours are at the 3000/4000 level. The program requires a total of 128 semester hours.

“Requirements include:

1. a minimum of 56 hours in the subject and cognate areas with: at least 36 hours in the subject area; at least one 100-level* course in cognate areas;”

Cognate areas for the B.S. in Technology and Engineering Education are understood by the Department of Technology, the Iowa Department of Education, and professional organizations in the field to be the five occupational clusters of Communication, Construction, Manufacturing, Transportation, and Power and Energy identified in *Engineering/Industrial/Technological/Sciences* (Iowa Dept. of Education, 1999; Iowa Board of Educational Examiners, 2014). Subject areas consist of Technology and Engineering Education and Professional Sequence Education courses.

This program proposal offers a minimum of 60 hours in the subject and cognate areas. There are 42 hours in the subject area, with a minimum of three 3000/4000 level courses in the cognate areas (not including 3000/4000 electives and a LAC Capstone option TECH 3102).

2. “the completion of undergraduate research or internship carrying 1-2 semester hours of credit applicable to either the subject or cognate area(s). This project should result in the completion of a written report. The major department must certify to the Registrar that the research requirement has been met before the degree is granted;”

Majors are required to complete a research project with an accompanying report (typically in their senior year) while enrolled in course TECH 3114, *Product Development and Enterprise*.

Department of Technology faculty were unable to find a UNI document that defines the term “internship” required for the BS degree. However, the following quotations provide reasonable descriptions of what an internship is and the spirit of its purpose.

Definitions

Internship: *a period of time spent receiving or completing training at a job as a part of becoming qualified to do it: (as in, “He served his internship at a local hospital.”)* (Cambridge, 2014).

Internship: *a period of undergoing practical instruction in one's job or career (as in seeking a summer internship at a local television station)* (Merriam-Webster, 2014).

Work experience internship: *Most often this will be in the second or third year of the school period. The placement can be from 2 months to one full school year. During this period, the student is expected to use the things he/she has learned in school and put them into practice. This way the student gains work experience in their field of study. The gained experience will be helpful to finish the final year of study* (Wikipedia, 2014).

- **Internships** exist in a wide variety of industries and settings. An internship may be paid, unpaid or partially paid.... Internships may be part-time or full-time. A typical internship lasts 6–12 weeks, but can be shorter or longer, depending on the organization involved. The act of job shadowing may also constitute interning (Wikipedia, 2014).
- **Intern:** *an advanced student or graduate usually in a professional field (as medicine or teaching) gaining supervised practical experience (as in a hospital or classroom)* (Merriam-Webster, 2014).

Intern: *a student or trainee who works, sometimes without pay, at a trade or occupation in order to gain work experience* (Oxford Dictionary).

The following synonyms also help in describing the spirit of an internship. The last is a synonym used by the University of Northern Iowa, Career Services.

Synonyms

Internship: *externship, practicum, training* (Merriam-Webster, 2014).

*“To get ahead professionally, all students need to complete an **internship** or cooperative education experience. These experiences allow students to apply what is learned in the classroom, while at the same time building experience and a professional network”* (<http://www.uni.edu/careerservices/students/co-op/>, retrieved 10/24/2013).

The internship requirement is clearly met by the proposed B.S. in Technology and Engineering Education—Teaching program. Technology and engineering education teaching majors do four work experience internships at four different levels during their program, and each of these are specifically designed for technology and engineering education teachers, very distinguishable from other teaching majors. Students are required to write a report resulting from their Level III field experience internship and likewise upon completion of their Level IV field experience (student teaching) internship.

3. “the completion of the Liberal Arts Core requirements selected from courses included in the six Liberal Arts Core categories.”

This program proposal requires the completion of all LAC requirements.

Appendix of Proposed Curriculum Changes AY 2014-2016

B.A. B.S. Technology and Engineering Education—Teaching

CHANGE

Technology and Engineering Core	26 39 SH
--	-----------------

CHANGE

CHEM 1020, * Chemical Technology (Fall)	4
MATH 1140, Precalculus	4
ADD	
PHYSICS 1511, * General Physics	4
ADD	
OR: PHYSICS 1400, * Conceptual Physics (4 SH)	
<i>* Any one of these courses can also be used to satisfy Liberal Arts Core Category 4B and/or LAC 4hr. lab requirement.</i>	
TECH 1006, PLTW: Introduction to Engineering Design (prepares for TECH 2014 entrance exam)	3
NEW	
TECH 1008, Manufacturing Processes I	3
3	
TECH 1010, Manufacturing Processes II	3
TECH 1017, Computer aided Design and Drafting	3
0 (3 elect) DROP	3
TECH 1018, Construction Resources	3
TECH 1022, Communication Technology	-4 3
CHANGE	
TECH 2036, Power Technology (Fall)	3
DROP	
TECH 1024, Technical Drawing & Design (requires proficiency entrance exam)	3
3	
TECH 3010, PLTW: Principles of Engineering	3
NEW	
TECH 3114, Product Development and Enterprise (Fall)	3
TECH 4290/PHYSICS 4290, PLTW: Digital Electronics	3
NEW	

Technology and Engineering Electives	9 SH
---	-------------

Note: Technology and Engineering Education majors take courses in areas of Communication, Construction, Manufacturing, Power and Energy, and Transportation, and should have at least 6 sem hr in any three of these areas. For electives, choose courses that, combined with the technology and engineering core, will help meet this requirement.

Technology and Engineering Education Core	15- 12 SH
--	------------------

TECH 1019, Introduction to Technology <u>and Engineering</u> Education and Training (Fall)	3
CHANGE	
TECH 3120, Technology <u>and Engineering</u> Education Curriculum Planning (Fall)	3
3 CHANGE	
TECH 3178, Contemporary Instruction in Tech Ed: Spring	3
DROP	
TECH 3190, Technology <u>and Engineering</u> Education Teaching Methods*, (Spring)	3
CHANGE	
TECH 4195, Technology <u>and Engineering</u> Education Program <u>Laboratory</u> Management (Fall)	3
CHANGE	

** Includes Level 3 Field Experience: Prerequisite or co-requisite: EDPSYCH 3128 Level 2 Field Experience*

Professional Education Sequence (Teacher Licensure)	30 SH
--	--------------

TEACHING EDPSYCH 2017, * <u>Level 1 Field Experience</u> : Exploring Teaching	1
CHANGE	
EDPSYCH 2030, *+ Dynamics of Human Development	3
TEACHING EDPSYCH 3128, <u>Level 2 Field Experience</u> : Teacher as a Change Agent	1
CHANGE	
EDPSYCH 3148, Learning and Instruction in Classroom Contexts	3
SPED 3150, *Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners	2
MEASRES 3150, Classroom Assessment	2

SOCFOUND 3119, Schools and American Society

3

TEACHING 4170, Human Relations: Awareness and Application

3

TEACHING 3138, *Level 4 Field Experience*, Student Teaching

12

* Can be taken prior to full admission to teacher education program

+ Satisfies 3hr LAC Category 5C Topical Perspectives.

Note: INSTECH 1020, Education Media is waived for Technology and Engineering Education majors.

Major

50 60 SH

CHANGE

Professional Education Sequence (Teacher Licensure)

30 SH

Liberal Arts Core

41 38 SH*

CHANGE

* When using EDPSYCH 2030 in PES to satisfy Category 5C, and PHYSICS or CHEM in Tech& Eng Core to satisfy

Category 4B ~~University Electives~~

~~5 SH~~ DROP

Total Program

126 128 SH

CHANGE

Addendum 2 of 2

Policy on the Assignment and Changing of Grades

I Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to articulate how grades are assigned and changed at the University of Northern Iowa. This policy supersedes all other university, college, and departmental policies regarding how grades are assigned and changed at the university.

II. Assignment of Grades

1. The assessment of student academic performance, including the assignment of particular grades, is the responsibility of the instructor of record of each class. The faculty member teaching a course has the sole responsibility for the evaluation of student course work and is the sole judge of the grades received by the students in that course, subject to the right of students to appeal a grade by following the Student Academic Grievance (12.01) policy.
2. Under extraordinary circumstances listed in IV, the judgment of others can be used to determine grades. In this type of situation, the faculty member's department head should assign a faculty member in that department who is qualified to teach the course to review the course work of the students and the standards set by the instructor of record to assign grades. In the event no other faculty member in the department is qualified to teach the course, the department head should select the faculty member who is best qualified to teach the course. Under no circumstance should this provision be used to substitute the judgment of an instructor of record who is *not* incapacitated with the judgment of another faculty member. If the extraordinary circumstance is eliminated (i.e. the instructor of record is found), the instructor of record can change any grades assigned using this procedure by using the procedure in III.2.a below.

III. Grade Changes

1. Anytime a grade is changed, the Registrars' Office must notify the instructor of record of the change.
2. Once grades have been assigned by a faculty member they can be changed in only the following ways.
 - a. The instructor of record may initiate a grade change at any time after a grade has been recorded by the Register's Office with the approval of the department head.
 - b. A grade can be changed as the result of a decision made through the Student Academic Grievance (12.01) policy.

- c. Under one of the extraordinary circumstances listed in IV, a grade can be changed by following the procedure in II.2 above.
 - d. Retroactive withdrawals that are approved by the Provost's Office for extraordinary circumstances.
3. Changing a previously assigned grade to a W (withdrawal) can only be done by following one of the above methods.
 4. Incompletes/research continued that extend the maximum time limit for completion automatically turn into an F letter grade.

IV. Extraordinary Circumstances

Other than the circumstances below, the Department PAC has the responsibility to determine if circumstances warrant the use of II.2 above.

1. Death or incapacitation of the instructor of record
2. The instructor of record is no longer employed by the university
3. The instructor of record refuses to assign grades after multiple attempts by the department head/dean to compel the instructor to assign the grades.
4. The instructor of record did not report the grades in a timely manner and cannot be found despite multiple attempts to locate and/or communicate with the instructor of record

Questions

Instructor of record if multiple teachers or teaching assistant.