

Special Meeting  
**UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**02/18/13 (3:30 p.m. – 4:52 p.m.)**  
**Mtg. #1728**

SUMMARY MINUTES

**Summary of main points**

1. Courtesy Announcements

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

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

Provost **Gibson** offered 2 brief comments. First, thanks for all the hard work faculty and Department Heads have put into revising the curricula that was offered. And, second, a report on her recent trip to India to visit 4 institutions, 2 of which may result in many faculty and student exchanges.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** reminded everyone that President-select **Ruud** will be on campus at a reception in the Gallagher-Bluedorn lobby next Thursday, February 28<sup>th</sup>. He encouraged all to attend to show their interest and to provide faculty leaders with issues they want brought up with the next president.

Chair **Peters** stated that he, Faculty Chair **Funderburk**, Professor Dan **Powers**, and Vice-Chair **Smith** all will be meeting with President-select **Ruud** on his visit to campus next week to begin discussions of current issues. **Peters** will also invite **Ruud** to attend a Faculty Senate meeting yet this semester.

Chair **Peters** also noted that **Funderburk** is serving today as alternate for Senator **Boyd**, so he will have a vote on all items today.

## 2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

None to approve today.

## 3. Docketed from the Calendar

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

**1177 1073** Curriculum changes—Geography (regular order) (**Kidd/Bruess**)

**1178 1074** Curriculum changes—Math Education (regular order)  
(**Kidd/Bruess**)

**1179 1075** Curriculum changes—Physics (regular order) (**Kidd/Bruess**)

## 4. Consideration of Docketed Items

**1174 1070** EPC Recommendation regarding changes to the Attendance and Make-up Work policy, (tabled 2/11) (**Smith/East**)

\*\*Motion to take amendment off the table (**Smith/Neuhaus**). Passed.

\*\*Request to withdraw her motion (**Terlip**). Considered withdrawn due to no objection.

\*\*Motion for a new amendment to EPC proposal (**Terlip/DeBerg**).

\*\***DeBerg** friendly amendment to new amendment accepted by **Terlip**.

\*\***Gorton** friendly amendment to amended amendment accepted by **Terlip**.

\*\*Vote on final amendment to EPC proposal. Passed, with 2 nays.

\*\*Vote to approve EPC proposal as amended. Passed, with 2 nays, and 1 abstention.

**1175 1071** Academic calendars 2013-2020, regular order (**Swan/Strauss**)

**\*\***Motion to amend 2013-2018 Academic Calendars and to approve new Academic Calendars for 2019 and 2020 (**Dolgener/Neuhaus**).

**\*\***Vote on combined items. Passed.

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

**\*\***Motion to endorse Emeritus Status Request (**Walter/Neuhaus**). Passed.

**1163 1059** Report from Ad hoc Committee on Policy Process, regular order (**Swan/Strauss**) **1173**

**\*\***Motion to move to Quasi Committee of the Whole (**DeBerg/Terlip**).

Passed.

**\*\***Decision to refer recommendations back to Ad hoc Committee on Policy Process for reconsideration on March 11, 2013.

**\*\***Motion to rise from the Quasi Committee of the Whole (**Kidd/Walter**).

Passed.

5. Adjournment

**\*\***Motion to adjourn (**Terlip/everyone**). Passed.

Time: 4:52 p.m.

Next meeting:

02/25/13

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 53 pages, including 4 Addenda.

Special Meeting  
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE  
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
February 18, 2013  
Mtg. 1728**

**PRESENT:** Jeff **Funderburk** (alternate for Melinda **Boyd**), Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Tim **Kidd**, Michael **Licari**, Kim **MacLin**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Gary **Shontz**, Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter**, KaLeigh **White**

**Absent:** Syed **Kirmani**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Jesse **Swan**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Peters**: Ok. Let's come to order. We do have a quorum.

**COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

**Peters**: Do we have members of the press present? I see Emily Christensen from the *Courier*; Blake **Findley** from the *Northern lowan*, and any other members of press? [none seen] Ok.

**COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON**

**Peters**: Provost **Gibson**, welcome back from India.

**Gibson**: Thank you.

**Peters**: Do you have any comments for us?

**Gibson:** Just 2 brief comments. First, I'd just like to publicly thank all of the faculty Department Heads for the revised curricula restructuring. I've seen some of the packets that just have been informally sent to me, and they just look very, very good. I also appreciate Departments that have put together recruitment strategies, new brochures, DVD's—it's just very, very exciting what's coming out of the Departments in regard to curricula and recruitment of students.

I did spend 10 days in India with the other 2 Provosts, Regent Lang, other officials—State officials. It was a very good trip, long trip. We visited 4 institutions. I think that there are 2 of those institutions where we can really make some progress with exchanges for faculty and for students, so I will be putting together a small committee to sort of move forward in looking at what the possibilities might be. One of the universities is a private institution with lots of funding, and so they are very anxious to have our faculty and students visit their campus. So good possibilities there, and I'm glad to be back. I'm very glad to be back. Thank you.

**Peters:** Thank you.

#### **COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK**

**Peters:** Chair **Funderburk**?

**Funderburk:** I think most of you already saw that our—I don't know exactly what you call our President-to-be will be on campus next week on Thursday, the 28<sup>th</sup>. The reception is planned for 4:00 to 6:00 on Thursday, the 28<sup>th</sup> over in the lobby of the Gallagher-Bluedorn. So, I hope if you can attend, you will, so that we can kind of show our interest in working with our new President. He'll also be meeting with faculty leadership and quite a few others during his few days here on campus. So if there are particular items you wanted brought up, you might let us know prior to then at some point.

**Gibson:** Can I just add, I will not be here, and I could say more about that, but I won't, but I'll have a future meeting with the President at some point

in March. But I will not be here. Dwight **Watson** [Dean, College of Education] will not be present. And Farzad [**Moussavi**, Dean, College of Business Administration] will not be present.

**Peters:** Anything else, Chair **Funderburk**? [He shook his head.]

#### COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS

**Peters:** All right. My only announcement was along the lines of Jeff's [**Funderburk**]. Jeff, Dan **Power**, myself, and [Vice-Chair] Jerry **Smith** will be meeting with President-Select **Ruud**, I guess, while he is here. We will— among the things we'll be talking about is we'll be trying to get him up-to-speed on various issues and talking about how to address those issues with you, and so I'm hoping that one of the things we can do in that meeting is get a commitment from him to meet in some form with the [Faculty] Senate before the semester's out, because I know he'll be back to campus a couple more times, I think, before the Academic Year is over. Any questions about that?

One piece of recordkeeping for today, just I want Senators to know, and I'm not sure Sherry [**Nuss**, transcriptionist] knows, [Faculty] Chair **Funderburk** today is also serving as Senator **Boyd**'s alternate, and so he has a vote today.

#### BUSINESS

#### MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

**Peters:** There are no Minutes for approval.

## CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1177 for Docket #1073, Curriculum changes—Geography, regular order (Kidd/Bruess)

Calendar Item 1178 for Docket #1074, Curriculum changes—Math Education, regular order (Kidd/Bruess)

Calendar Item 1179 for Docket #1075, Curriculum changes—Physics, regular order (Kidd/Bruess)

**Peters:** And so we'll move on to docketing. A couple of quick notes about the items for docketing, the Geography Curriculum changes are attached to the petition online. These have been approved by the UCC already. The Math and Physics program changes will be taken up by the UCC this Fri

**Licari:** Thursday

**Peters:** —this Thursday. Assuming that the UCC asks for no changes, then I'm going to ask that we docket them in regular order so that we can deal with them on next Monday at our regular meeting. We will be able to post the curriculum packet from each of those two programs online on Friday.

I recognize that we are being a little aggressive here in terms of scheduling these, but we are trying to get them in line so that they can be discussed at the March meeting of the Council of Provosts and then approved at the April Board of Regents meeting. If something were to happen, the UCC were to demand changes, we'll just re-docket them, but I want to be ready to proceed if the stars align for us.

Does anyone want to pull any of these 3 items out for separate discussion for docketing? [nothing heard] If not, then I'll entertain a single motion to docket these 3 in regular order. Senator **Kidd**. [who indicated] Is there a second? Senator **Bruess**. [who indicated]. Any discussion? Seeing none, we'll proceed to a vote. All in favor of docketing Calendar Items 1177, 1178, and 1179 in regular order, please say "aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say, "no." [none heard] The motion carries.

## NEW BUSINESS

**Peters:** Any new business to bring to our attention today? [none heard]

## CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1070, EPC RECOMMENDATION REGARDING CHANGES TO THE ATTENDANCE AND MAKE-UP WORK POLICY, TABLED 02/11/13 (**Smith/East**)

**Peters:** Ok, that brings us to Consideration of Docketed Items. We should start by taking Calendar Item 1174, Docket #1070 off of the table. Could I get a motion to take that from the table?

**Smith:** I move to take it off the table.

**Peters:** Vice-Chair **Smith**. Is there a second? Senator **Neuhaus** [who indicated]. And....hmmm. We probably do need to vote on that. Is there any discussion about taking this off the table? All in favor of taking it from the table, please say "aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "no?" [none heard]

All right. Before we get to the substance of this, if you don't mind if I make just a couple brief remarks. I feel like it should be prefaced with the announcer coming on and saying, you know, "Previously on University Faculty Senate...." [loud laughter all around]. As you will recall, there was a motion to amend on the table. Let me put up the EPC's recommendation [see Addendum 1, projected for all present to see], so that it's there. There was a motion to amend on the table, but as our time wound down and we struggled to try to wrap up our discussion, you were struggling to try to figure out what kind of wording to adopt, and I, as the Chair, kind of did not adequately control that discussion, so we'll start today by asking Senator **Terlip** to withdraw the motion that was on the table. Assuming there are no objections to that, then I'll recognize her to introduce a new motion to amend. And that will begin our discussion.

I want to remind everyone that under Robert's Rules as we deal with amendments, discussion should center around the amendment. Discussion



always centers around the motion that is on the table. So, when we begin our discussion, we'll debate the merits of Senator **Terlip**'s motion to amend. I know that Parliamentary Procedure can be tedious, but I would ask that we try to use it to our advantage here, that we use it to focus our discussion as we move through the different issues that any amendments raise. I'm also going to be a little bit tighter on rules. Please be sure that I recognize you first, before you speak, and also given the fact that we have a lot of people here to speak [in the audience], I will prioritize those who haven't spoken yet, before I recognize somebody for a second or a third time. Ok?

Finally, just a couple quick things, I want to—I think we should keep in mind that while we certainly want to make the best policy decisions we can, and we want to be careful and very intentional about how we do it, we should also recognize that there's nothing that prevents us from coming back and looking at this again, if we don't quite get a 100% of the way there. If we get done what we can get done, and if it turns out that there are still problems with this, we can look at it again. And we'll count on our military and veteran students to stay as involved in this as they have been so far, and to let us know how it's working for them, and there's nothing that would stop the—Julia **Heuer** from giving us a report. In fact, maybe we can even ask for a report about how our Make-Up and Attendance Policy is doing.

And then I would—finally I would just ask speakers to keep in mind that I have been passing on communications that I've received either through in-person meetings or emails, so Senators are aware of the basic issues here and the basic issues that you're raising, so just keep that in mind as you speak.

Ok, that said, Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** I would like to withdraw my earlier motion, and

**Peters:** Is there any objection to withdrawing whatever motion it was that was on the table [light laughter] at the close of our meeting last time? Seeing none, we'll consider it withdrawn. Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** Ok. I would now like to move—and do you have the language?

**Peters:** I do [working to project it].

**Terlip:** I sent it to all of you [Senators] earlier, but I would like to amend the language on the EPC document [3.06-B-1, see Addendum 1] to read as follows: “Require university [related] absences (including but not limited to athletic games/matches/meetings or their equivalent),” this is where my amendment starts “absences due to military duty (including medical appointments where *failure to appear* might result in a loss of benefits), and legally mandated absences such as jury duty or court subpoena...” and you can read the rest of the document.

**Peters:** So the—sorry, I need a second. Is there a second?

**DeBerg:** Second.

**Peters:** Second from Senator **DeBerg**. So, just to be clear, the motion is to amend the EPC procedure by immediately after the word “equivalent” in the close of parentheses there, inserting the phrase “absences due to military duty (including medical appointments where *failure to appear* might result in a loss of benefits), and legally mandated absences such as”. Senator **Terlip**, your motion. You get to start off our discussion, and then we’ll go from there.

**Terlip:** I read a lot of opinions and documents over the weekend, and I guess being the old debater, they boil down into two or three different issues. I’d like to just share with you why this language ended up the way that it was. First, I think the EPC made a very good case for not extending it any further. The status quo had been working, and the grievance procedure works on some odd cases as Scott [**Peters**] and others have mentioned. So I tried to keep with their language and not broaden it, which some of you say results in perhaps two classes of students or privileges or those kinds of things. I think that ship sailed when we put in university-related absences a long time ago, where we created this sort of bipolar system. And so I think that this is probably the things we are trying to get in here are just as, if not more, important than athletic games. So,

the 2<sup>nd</sup> thing is, there was a question—we had been talking about mandatory appointments last time. That language doesn't work and appropriately represent the solution. These folks don't really have a choice in many cases. And then I guess the 3<sup>rd</sup> point I'd like to make is, even if we do favor the veterans, what's wrong with that? I mean, if nothing else, put it under the label of diversity where we all argue about the need for a more inclusive campus and policies that are welcoming to various groups. So, hopefully I captured what's needed. If not, I think we can work through with the grievance policy in the future.

**Peters:** Mr. Benson?

**Benson:** Is it ok if I speak now?

**Peters:** Yes. If you could stand up and state your name clearly enough so that our transcriptionist can hear you.

**Benson:** My name is Eric **Benson**. I'm an Electronic Media major and a History Education major. I'm supposed to speak to the [Faculty] Senate tonight as Director of Veterans and Non-traditional Students in order to help find a solution for the wording on the policy that was discussed last week. Since we have brought this subject up, there has been resistance for some of the reasons—following reasons: The term *mandatory*—which I know has been taken out, and I do appreciate and we do acknowledge that—use of the term *mandatory*, however mandatory is implied, is also a loophole against most vets. If a vet, for example—they asked for examples—if a vet wakes up with nightmares and suddenly is having issues with something that's happened and goes to see a therapist, an excused absence during a final or projects that would be detrimental against them, you know, it could be judged based on that. It's up to the faculty's discretion, and given this debate right here that we're having, it seemed that there are faculty members who feel different ways about different things. The second is the issue of legal ramifications, which I feel we have addressed, but vets, although not required by law in the acts to deal with their appointments were legally obligated to serve their country based on their volunteer experience. There was a legal obligation where we could be legally bound to perform our duty in harm's way or be subject to the

Universal Code of Military Justice. Grievance procedures, although this University has grievance procedures, and we do observe that, and it is a significant mark, we have been brought up \_\_\_\_\_ which is understandable but the fact is the policy's purpose is to be proactive in an effort to alleviate hardship on the vets. A good example of this would be Courtney **Greif**, who was here last week. She was currently going through an issue with one of the faculty members, and it is ironed out now, but for her to file that grievance and to find the people to fight her case, you could obviously see the emotional state she was in and how hardship it was on her. She could not make it today, but she has allowed me to use her name in this example. There has been mention of possibly having registered \_\_\_\_\_ email, and I have responded to the secretary, and it's about registering our information on file, which is a great idea, but it's more about applying the policy than it is the policy itself. Bottom line, the vets would like to see absences due to military duty and veterans appointments, including medical appointments where the failure to appear might result in the loss of benefits, and legally mandated absences such as jury duty.

**Peters:** I saw a hand up. Senator **MaLin**.

**MaLin:** And you started to half-answer my question. My question for Laura [**Terlip**]  
—I did miss the discussion last week, but I did read the minutes—or anyone over there [audience members], I'm curious about the way it's written right now, if *military duty* accurately captures the term *veteran*? Could a veteran—could military duty be construed as not being someone who happens to be a veteran?

**Terlip:** I don't know the answer to that. I think these folks probably have a better sense of that.

**Peters:** If—oh, sorry. Yep, Mr. **Tolliver**.

**Tolliver:** My name is Tim **Tolliver**. I'm an MSW student. Generally, the way that it works is that veterans are not in the military. It becomes a little bit murky when you talk about National Guard and Reserves. There are federal laws that define the word *veteran*, and I'm not completely up to

speed, but like I said, generally speaking there are two separate entities. Once you leave the military, you are a veteran, and obviously no longer a member of the military.

**MacLin:** Thank you.

**Peters:** Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** And my intent was to cover veterans, so I don't know what we do about that.

**Peters:** Well, we could have a secondary amendment to add in the word *veterans*, "loss of veterans benefits"—if someone wants to make that

**Hakes:** Would that then exclude someone in the Reserves who is not a *veteran*? [a few voices murmuring about this]

**Peters:** Yeah, Ron, then could you state your name?

**DeVoll:** Ron **DeVoll**, graduate student MSW program.

**Peters:** Can you give—I'm sorry, she didn't get your name.

**DeVoll:** Ron **DeVoll**, Jr. We're advocating for both military personnel, Guard and Reserve or not separating either one, and for those who are no longer in service, veterans. Both, if you're using services, examples would be the Department of Veterans Affairs services, Vet Center services, the list goes on. And then you have those who are mandated military duties. Some intertwine. Some military personnel use the Department of Veterans Affairs. So we're just adding to cover both military personnel and veterans; that way, it covers the population here on campus. So, if veterans could be added to that along with military personnel, that would cover everything.

**Peters:** Sorry, I saw

**Terlip:** Well, yeah, I was going to say, so would—I don't know where to put it, I guess. Is your suggestion before the parentheses or in the parentheses?

**Benson:** We both want parentheses right after *military duty*.

**Terlip:** Would comma *military duty or veterans affairs* cover it?

**DeVoll:** No.

**Benson:** Because if it's Veterans Affairs, like you say for instance, I have to see a Vet Center counselor because they are closer and given their case load. Vet Center is totally separate from the Veterans Affairs.

**Terlip:** No, I didn't mean capitalized, just *veterans' affairs*, like

**Benson:** *Veterans' appointments*?

**Terlip:** *Veterans' activity*? I don't know. I'm at a loss.

**Benson:** I would—as a veteran, I honestly think that *veterans' activity* would be way too broad, but *veterans appointments* where I do have to see somebody. There is something. And when I talked about the application, there would be somebody at this University similar to the Student Disability Office, which could be Julia [Heuer], who could be the representative that can tell you, “Yeah, that he does have an eye appointment this..... It's an eye appointment, but it's not to get glasses. It's because he's got a scar across his cornea.” That sort of thing.

**Peters:** Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** I don't know if you all will consider this a friendly amendment or not, but if we did *military duty or veterans appointments* and then—just insert that and then leave the rest as it is? [voices agreeing]

**Peters:** It hasn't been seconded. Senator **Hakes**?

**Hakes:** Does that—the more we add words, then we focus on those, and we eliminate something by accident. By referring to *veterans*, do we somehow accidentally exclude people that are taking an appointment but are in the Reserves? So, it's not an active military duty thing. I just want to make sure that we haven't done something by unintended consequence, but the more we list, then as soon as we list, it's something that's left out of the list looks larger. Well, I'm just wondering—we haven't had—we have—if we did what we just suggested, that does not somehow accidentally eliminate someone who has an appointment but is in the reserves? It's not active duty. It's not military duty. But they are not a veteran. They're currently in the Reserves. So that's—we haven't done that? Is everyone comfortable that we haven't made that mistake?

**Peters:** Mr. DeVoll. You had a hand raised?

**DeVoll:** I would—I would say, “No.” That under military—if they have an appointment and it's due to military service, they need a physical or something, I'm good on to safely assume that's related to their—by being in the military service. Where, as it reads now, it doesn't necessarily include those that are no longer in the military. So, if we could have the word *veterans*—*veterans appointments*—it covers it.

**Peters:** Senator DeBerg, I think—I can say the look on her face is that she might be getting us out of this problem.

**DeBerg:** Well, I hesitate to wade into this—well, I hesitate to wade into it, but what about something like *absences due to military duty and veteran status*? [audience voices agreeing]

**Peters:** All right.

**DeBerg:** And I don't know if it should be an *and* there or an *or* there? *And/or*?

**Benson:** Well, I think if we add *or*, it can cover military duty or veteran status, because we talked about the Reserves, and sometimes they use

Veterans services sometimes. So put *military duty or veteran status*.  
[voices agreeing]

**DeBerg:** Whatever you think.

**Peters:** All right, let's take that as a motion.

**DeBerg:** Can someone buy me a drink for this? [laughter and some volunteering to do this]

**Peters:** The motion on the table is buy Senator **DeBerg** a drink. [more laughter] The motion—can I take that as a motion [serious once again], Senator **DeBerg**?

**Terlip:** Well, I will accept it as a friendly amendment.

**DeBerg:** It's an amendment to—are you accepting it as a

**Terlip:** I'm accepting it as a friendly amendment.

**Peters:** Ok. Let me just type that right here [on the projected screen]. So, can you repeat it for me, Betty [**DeBerg**]?

**DeBerg:** Yeah, *military duty or veteran status* [some working out of punctuation between the two and others helping] Oh, I—ok, *veteran space status*. Ok. Professor **Gorton**.

**Gorton:** Thank you. Joe **Gorton**. I'm the faculty advisor for the veterans. So certainly it seems like we are making progress here. That's always nice. Part of the problem here, I think, is that by saying *military duty* we might be leaving out the status with Guard and Reserve personnel, ok, who might have a call-up. Well, because they are not necessarily on duty--let me finish, they might have—and this is the word that the Hawkeye policy uses, they might have *a service-related medical appointment*. If you use those terms—so, if you keep some of the wording that you have and then a *service-related medical appointment*, you are going to cover anything that is a veteran's abs—an absence related to a veteran's service, an active duty



military or a National Guard call-up or Reservist. So that's—kind of would be, I think, really helpful.

**Peters:** Senator **Terlip**, do you have—Senator **Terlip**, go ahead.

**Terlip:** I see two possible solutions for that, which I would accept as a friendly amendment. You could take out *duty* and just have *military or veteran status*; that is one choice. Or the other choice is to leave it as it is and then do what was it? *Military status appointments*?

**Gorton:** Well, I—I

**Terlip:** Well, read the Hawkeye language again. [many voices]

**Gorton:** *Service-related medical appointment*

**Terlip:** Ok, so or the other option would be including *service-related medical appointments*. We could do it either way.

**Gorton:** Well, that's progress.

**Terlip:** Well, but which do you want?

**Gorton:** Well, I—I like what you just said—is it all right—is it ok to speak, Scott [**Peters**]?

**Peters:** Yeah, go ahead.

**Gorton:** All right. So, that sounds good. The only possible problem that I could see on this could be a problem for some professors, because as Tim [**Tolliver**] stated, that sometimes a problem for the rest of us that military duty is not necessarily going to be applicable to someone who is in the Guard or Reserves, and they have—they have a service-related problem. So I think that the *military duty* is kind of a problem. I mean, I think I might like it if you strike the word *duty* out of there, maybe, right?

**Terlip:** That's what I just said. [many voices, some saying it's hard to hear]

**Peters:** Is there any objection to striking the word *duty* from the amendment that's on the floor right now?

**Terlip:** Or I—if we take out *duty*

**Peters:** Ok, one moment [as he works on the projected screen].

**Terlip:** Yes. You guys [to the audience] have all been dealing with bureaucracy way too much. [laughter]

**Peters:** [many voices mumbling] Ok. I see Ms. **Heuer** standing.

**Heuer:** My name is Julia **Heuer**, the Veterans Coordinator. One of the issues is *military duty* does cover weekend appointments, so keeping that terminology in there so it doesn't seem like this is just directed at medical. I don't know if you could say *military duty and* [voices helping, back and forth ideas].

**Terlip:** Ok, the suggestion is now keep *duty* and take out *medical appointments* and substitute [voices disagreeing] No?

**Benson:** No, no, no. Just add *service-related medical appointments*.

**Heuer:** Because that covers the Guard and Reserves.

**Terlip:** Ok. [several giving **Peters** directions on how to change the projected amendment; others laughing]

**Peters:** Ok, I've got it. *Service-related medical appointments*, is there any objection to adding the word *service-related*? [none heard] Is there further discussions? [some joking about hyphenation and punctuation and much laughter] Ok. Any further discussion on the amendments? Seeing none, should we proceed to a vote on the amendment? All in favor of amending the EPC's proposal to include the words:

*absences due to military duty or veteran status (including service-related medical appointments where failure to appear might result in loss of benefit) and legally-mandated absences such as*

and striking the words:

*or legally-mandated absences due to military duty,*

please say “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say, “no.” [some heard] One opposed.

**East:** Two

**Peters:** Sorry. Two opposed, I’m sorry. The motion carries. Now, let me quickly paste that language into the proposal [on projected screen]. Ok, does everyone agree that that reflects the change that we just made in the proposal?

**East:** No.

**Peters:** It does not?

**East:** *Legally-mandated refers to jury duty or court subpoena.*

**Peters:** Oh.

**Terlip:** Yeah. It’s still there.

**East:** No, he crossed it out. [voices striving to explain]

**Peters:** *The legally-mandated absences such as jury duty, court subpoena*

**East:** Oh, ok. I’m sorry.

**Peters:** Ok, does everyone agree that reflects the....? Ok. So now we’re back to discussion on the proposal overall as amended—the EPC proposal

as amended. Is there any discussion about the EPC proposal as amended?  
Senator **Kidd**.

**Kidd:** Yeah, I don't quite understand why we've created—or why the proposal creates two classes of reasonable excuse? You have these and then those that the faculty would deem reasonable, and in the first case, you know, the military duty service whatever, you have this mandatory requirement to create an additional assignment for the student or an equivalent assignment, and I don't think that can always be done. So, I guess that's the language I'm concerned with. So, it says *to complete an equivalent assignment, or the professor and the student may mutually agree to waive the assignment without penalty*. And then it says *Faculty members have the discretion to determine what constitutes an appropriate make up work assignment*. So, to me, this is unenforceable. I don't know why you would have that in there, I guess.

**Peters:** Other comments? Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** I don't think the EPC changed anything. That was the language that's existed forever.

**Kidd:** No, that wasn't the language.

**Terlip:** So—what was it before? [voices attempting to clarify]

**Peters:** Existing language I have ready to go [on the projected screen].

**Terlip:** OK.

**Peters:** The existing language under Section B there is that—first of all Section [searching]—there we go. [<http://www.uni.edu/policies/306>] [see Addendum 2] Section 4 lays out:

*educationally appropriate, university-sponsored activities or sanctioned events—sorry Section 3—must be considered reasonable and [a student] must therefore not be unjustly penalized for these absences.*

And then Section 5:

*Other types of absences due to extenuating circumstances etcetera, etcetera may also be deemed “reasonable” by [a] faculty [member].*

That’s existing policy. Chair **Funderburk**.

**Funderburk:** A pertinent issue under B-2 does say that if it’s *deemed “reasonable,” the faculty member must provide the student an opportunity to make up missed work*, so [several voices speaking at once]

**Kidd:** If you keep reading, it’s cut off on the side.

**Peters:** Yeah. *“make up missed work, or have in place a make-up policy that does not unjustly penalize a student for the absence.”*

**Funderburk:** Ok. And, can I make a comment.

**Peters:** I’m sorry. Yes.

**Funderburk:** Actually, I do, in part, agree with Senator **Kidd**. I mean, I think probably because we come from these areas with labs and the different things that we do, that some things you just flat can’t make up. You can make up something and say it’s equivalent, but in the end, it’s not made up. So I understand the concern of a faculty being forced into a makeup of a piece of work, because currently the language does give the right. If you do not mutually agree to it, the faculty member is forced to make up something. In this case, not meaning to replace it, but to create an assignment that, in fact, is not equivalent to what was missed.

**Peters:** Are there other comments? Senator **Strauss**.

**Strauss:** Yes, we don’t live in a perfect world, and if you have to make up something that comes close, I think we’re bright enough to do it. I don’t think it’s that high a bar to get over.

**Peters:** Senator **Hakes**, did you have something?

**Hakes:** Doesn't the grievance procedure accommodate that so that if, for example, the student thinks that they are not being accommodated and then a group hears this, I believe that we're responsible enough to make the judgment. It shouldn't come to that very often, but as it stands, it doesn't bother me. [?]

**Peters:** I'll recognize Mr. [Jaime] **Yowler**, because he hasn't spoken yet, and then Professor **Gorton** after that.

**Yowler:** As a student and member of the EPC, I think what we were trying to emphasize is the importance of the student not being unjustly penalized for missing that assignment. I definitely understand the difficulties, as Dr. **Funderburk** realizes, that making up like a Biology or a Chemistry lab, some of those, the equipment, the materials that are necessary, you just can't come up with every other day. So, whether there needs to be added language with what we've re-established of making sure that a student isn't unjustly penalized for missing that work that that would be fine.

**Peters:** Professor **Gorton**.

**Gorton:** Well, I just wondered if Senator **Kidd** has some--because I also appreciate your point, Tim [**Kidd**], and I wonder if you have alternative language in mind? With something....

**Kidd:** Yeah.

**Peters:** Senator **Kidd**.

**Kidd:** Go back to the original policy.

**Gorton:** And I don't know what that was, so

**Kidd:** Yeah. No. No. The EPC revised policy is very complicated to me. Their paragraphs—it's a lot of words. The original policy was simple, direct, straightforward. It seems like you just should add in the language for jury

duty, veterans benefits, etcetera, into the original policy and be done. I don't see why this big revision had to be done.

**Peters:** And this is what you had sent out in the email earlier.

**Kidd:** Yeah.

**Peters:** Are there any other comments? Professor **Gorton**?

**Gorton:** I think the recent history of it was, if I'm not mistaken, Tim, and I find my hearing is not what it used to be, but that the controversy that took place last semester related to a student not being able to take, presumably, or not being able to take a makeup exam or something, so my sense of it is that that's kind of what motivated this language to avoid those problems in the future. Is that not correct? Or is that correct?

**Peters:** I have not—I wasn't privy to the details of the EPC's deliberations, but that's certainly the circumstances under which it was referred back to them.

**Gorton:** Which is a little unusual because the words "make up exam" are not even in the policy, by the way, so—"make up work" is in there but "make up exam" is not. But that's all. That's all I have.

**Peters:** [NISG] Vice-President **White**.

**White:** I just found out from our discussions in the EPC we were worrying about between—originally, we just had *exam* in there, and then we were worried that that would exclude other work that may be made up. We really thought that "work" included exam, but maybe it doesn't.

**Gorton:** I don't know. That's a good question. For some professors it might, and others it might not.

**Peters:** Are there any other comments? If I see no more comments, I'm going to assume we should proceed to a vote on the amended proposal from the EPC. Let's proceed to a vote then. All in favor of—let me get it

back up on the screen here—all in favor of the proposal from the EPC as amended, please say “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say, “no.” [two heard] Two opposed. And 1 abstention. The motion carries. Thank you very much, and I want to especially thank members of the EPC. I thank members of the [Faculty] Senate for the work you put in on this, but especially want to thank UNIVA, NISG, all the student leaders and their faculty and staff sponsors who got involved in this. I think it’s fair to say that we had more participation on this policy issue than any other policy issue that’s come before the [Faculty] Senate in recent history, and I think that regardless of how one might feel about whether we got all the way there on the changes we just passed or not or whether some people think we might have done it a little bit differently, I think everyone would agree probably that the involvement of so many students, faculty, and staff who were interested in this really helped us to understand more fully the challenges that this population of students face. And I think it was very helpful to all of us. So, thanks again for your involvement. I hope that we can continue to work together on other issues that affect military and veteran students on campus. All right. So with that, if those of you who came for this [EPC policy discussion], if you don’t want to stick around to watch us do other stuff, you are certainly welcome to leave [light laughter around], and we can pause for a moment.

DOCKET #1071, ACADEMIC CALENDARS 2013-2020, REGULAR ORDER  
(**Swan/Strauss**)

**Peters:** Ok. So we’re back. Registrar **Patton** is joining us. He has submitted a petition. Before we can begin discussion, we need a motion to approve, or rather to amend, the Academic Calendars from 2013-2018 and to approve new Academic Calendars for 2019 and 2020. So we need a motion to do that, please. Motion by Senator **Dolgener** [who indicated]. Seconded by Senator **Neuhaus** [who indicated]. Registrar **Patton**, the floor is yours.

**Patton:** Nate has just asked if I’m going to be here in 2020. The answer is, “No.” [laughter all around] Basically, just 2 minor things. Basically, a year or so ago you approved a motion to make the first half of Fall and Spring



semester to be the same. You may not remember, but in the past, because it is a 15-week semester, you had 8 and 7, and they were—when the 8-week part was different in the Fall and the Spring. You passed a motion a year ago to make sure that the 8-week portion was always in the first half. So that’s all the changes that are occurring between the Calendar that’s previously been approved from 2013 to 2018, and then 2019 and 2020 just takes out to a little extended period of time. We like to keep them out several years in advance because of people scheduling conferences, events, etcetera. And that calendar does take into effect the first half that you mentioned and otherwise follows the standards you see currently. So I’d simply to be open for any questions that anybody has.

**Peters:** Does anyone have any questions? No one wants to probe the details of the 2020 Academic Calendar, planning your Spring Break vacation or anything? [light laughter all around] No?

**Patton:** Actually, you may not remember, and I’m not sure if I’ve sent it before, but the Calendar—the creation of the Calendar follows guidelines created by the [Faculty] Senate. I’d hate to tell you how many years ago, but it dictates when the Calendars begin and end, and it follows a standard pattern.

**Peters:** No questions? Seeing none, let’s proceed to a vote then. All in favor of amending the Academic Calendars from 2013–2018 and approving new Academic Calendars for 2019 and 2020, please say “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say, “no.” [none heard] The motion carries. Thank you.

**Patton:** Thank you.

DOCKET #1072, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, ED **BROWN**, REGULAR ORDER (**Swan/Strauss**)

**Peters:** All right. We’re just knocking them out now. [light laughter] Emeritus Status Request for Ed **Brown**. Unfortunately, I did not receive any testimonials from his colleagues or anything. I don’t know if anybody

here..... I guess we need—sorry, we need a motion. We need a motion to endorse his emeritus petition.

**Walter:** So moved.

**Peters:** Motion by Senator **Walter**. Seconded by Senator **Neuhaus**. Discussion about emeritus status for Ed **Brown**? Senator **Walter**.

**Walter:** I didn't bother sending a comment, but I came here in 1997. Ed is also an Environmental Microbiologist, and it sounds corny, but he took me under his wing and was tremendously helpful, and I have several Microbiology colleagues, but he was far and away the most helpful, most constructive, most generous with his protocols, with various gear that we both happen to share, ideas, and always there in a way that helps a new guy learn how to teach properly. That's all I have to say.

**Peters:** Senator **Neuhaus**.

**Neuhaus:** I'd like to chip in a few words. I work with the science folks, and when I came on early in the '90's, Ed was real active with the science teacher program and really put together some really fine workshops. I had the privilege of being part of a couple of those, but the esprit de corps among the educators—of course, they were out of school; that helps a little—but I think he had a lot to do with that and lot to do with the success of that teacher education program in the sciences through that stretch.

**Peters:** Other comments? Seeing none. Let's proceed to a vote. . All in favor of endorsing the emeritus status for Ed **Brown**, please say "aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say, "no." [none heard] The motion carries.

DOCKET #1059, REPORT FROM AD HOC COMMITTEE ON POLICY PROCESS, REGULAR ORDER (**Swan/Strauss**)

**Peters:** And that brings us to everybody's favorite topic, *process*. You know, everybody is a political scientist like me, and likes to talk about

process. I think probably the best way to do this, because we've got this [Ad hoc] Committee we formed at the beginning of the year with Senator **East**, Senator **Neuhaus**, and Senator **DeBerg**, and they have come up with this proposal. They ran it by people across campus once. They got comments once from President **Allen** and Associate Provost **Licari** and University Counsel Tim **McKenna**. Made some revisions, and we've now got more comments based on the revisions from President **Allen** and University Counsel **McKenna**, and I think the best way to proceed at this point is probably to move into a Committee of the Whole and have a committee-style discussion of the whole about the proposal. Whatever—however that discussion goes, we'll kick it back to the small Committee in hopes that they can get back to us in pretty short order, because I think we are very, very, very close on finishing this. Does that sound ok to everyone? So let's get a motion then to move into Committee of the Whole, or Quasi Committee of the Whole to be technical, to consider the changes to the policy process.

**DeBerg:** I so move.

**Peters:** Senator **DeBerg**, thank you. Is there a second?

**Terlip:** Second.

**Peters:** Seconded by Senator **Terlip**. . All in favor of moving into the Quasi Committee of the Whole to consider these changes to the policy process, please say "aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "no?" [none heard] Ok. So I'll stay in the Chair, and I guess I'll start out our discussion by saying that I think that—well, actually, let's do this. Let's—can I ask you, Phil [**East**], if you could explain—walk us through the basic structure, or the basic process, and then at that point I'll identify at least what I saw as a couple things that it sounds like we need to talk about.

**East:** The proposal in its current form?

**Peters:** In its current form, yeah.

**East:** OK.

**Funderburk:** Before we move, can I get clarified, which document will we want to look at of those two?

**Peters:** The most recent proposal from the Committee is dated January 28<sup>th</sup> of 2013.

**Funderburk:** Is this the one below it?

**DeBerg:** Are we going to look at the marked-up one or the non-marked?

**Peters:** Let's start with the non-marked-up one. Yeah. [see Addendum 3 or go to: [policy-approval-policy draft 1-28-13.docx](#) ] [projected on screen for all to see]

**Funderburk:** It would be the one that uses Roman Numerals as opposed to

**DeBerg:** And it has no "Draft" on it.

**Funderburk:** Ok. That's it. Ok. Good.

**East:** To start with, and it's my understanding that policies can be proposed at various places or by various bodies on campus. Additionally, all—I believe there's a policy somewhere that says, "All policies are to be reviewed every 5 years"? Or 10 years? Or at some time frame, so the idea here is that a new policy is proposed or a—there's a proposal to revise a partic—an existing policy or a proposal to review an existing policy. Anytime that happens, the notions would be that the University community is informed of that, asked to provide input, or allowed to provide input. It's our understanding that policies—all policies have a VP who will oversee the policy, so that's what Part B talked about, making sure that that is expressed, in particular if it's a new policy or if it's a change. And that people would—not only do you announce the intention to revise a policy, but you include information about what that revision or new policy would deal—would say. It's posted. There's a period of input, at least 2 weeks. The originating body, whoever started this process, would then take that—take the input, formalize a proposal, and submit it to the Policy Review

Committee, and the Policy Review Committee would then kind of say, “All right, this is what we’re going to be reviewing. This is the policy that’s under consideration and would accept a review”—and—what? Time out [as he searches for the section in his notes]. Original input, [Section III] then the policy proposal is posted and submitted to the Policy Review Committee.

**Peters:** And then the Policy Review Committee has several choices. Either

**East:** Wait a minute.

**Peters:** Oh, sorry.

**East:** So there—yeah, so there’s not another round of input until the Policy Review Committee has done its work. So the Policy Review Committee then can either agree with the recommendation, or it can suggest revisions which would [go] back to the originating body. If those revisions are accepted, again it moves on to approval. If the revisions are not accepted, then the originating body and the Policy Review Committee would provide rationales for their views on the contested elements, and those things would come under review. If there were no objections, then it moves on to initial approval, and the approval comes from—currently, the Cabinet is the approval body. When we met with the President, the President was—the thing that we got most out of that meeting was the President is a bottleneck in this process. The President and the Cabinet are a bottleneck. They shouldn’t have to approve everything. So this initial approval, there was going to be somebody identified as an approval agent, which would either be the President or the Cabinet or a Vice President, and so that person or that agent would approve or disapprove the policy in one of the following ways [Section V]: If it’s an uncontested policy that’s approved, great. If it’s a contested policy, they could agree with one of the two bodies, or they could refer it back to those people and say, “Fight this out.” Or they could say—they could do whatever they wanted. They could do something entirely different. Or they could say, “Aww, heck with it. We’re not going to have a policy on this.” All sorts of—all manner of possibilities exist there, and after that person or that body or that indiv—that whatever, the approval agent approves it, there is a—they have to supply a rationale

for their decision. If it involved—if it wasn't an uncontested policy—and provide an opportunity for the University community to say, "Boy, you really screwed that up, and don't you want to reconsider?" Or, "Wouldn't you rather do something else, before it went to the Board of Regents for their approval?" The primary idea here is to try to make sure that there's—that the process is transparent and that there is an obvious and, I think, minimal, opportunity for input from the University community.

**Peters:** So, Senator **Neuhaus** and I met with President **Allen** and Tim **McKenna**, and Associate Provost **Licari** was there for a little bit as well, late last week. The President has since reconsidered his view on Cabinet approval not being necessary. He—I guess one thing that's worth mentioning is that, for any policy decision really, it's the President who makes the decision. The Cabinet is advisory. The President makes the decision. But after more discussion with Mr. **McKenna** and with members of the Cabinet, there was a feeling that if they kind of—if they sort of allowed policy to be promulgated from different parts of the University, what's supposed to be University-wide policy would no longer really be University-wide policy. There was a feeling that everything should come before the Cabinet. It should be discussed by the Cabinet. So, that idea that seems like a good idea to him, after further discussion we decided it wasn't such a good idea. So I think he would prefer if the process gets—at the end everything gets submitted to the Cabinet. And then one other thing, in terms of basic stuff, I would say is that there aren't very many University policies, we are told, that actually have to go to the Board of Regents. There might be stuff mandated by the Board of Regents, but it usually gets done on campus. It doesn't then need to be submitted again to the Board of Regents. So pretty much once the President signs off on a policy, it's policy. But there certainly could still be like a week-long period where, you know, this policy does not become effective until such-and-such a date, just to give people one more chance to weigh in. Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** Well, this subcommittee worked quite a while on bringing together a poli—this is Point E on the very end on the guidelines—we worked quite hard to think of a representative Policy Review Committee that might have different views of the campus and how it's done—how

things are done from a variety of perspectives. Can you tell us—I mean, so my marked up copy has all that crossed out. What—can you

**Peters:** Well, there was a comment—I added a comment in there, too, so I don't know if you printed enough so you can see the comment.

**DeBerg:** Right. I can see that.

**Peters:** They actually liked, and Chris [**Neuhaus**], jump in here anytime. But they actually liked involving governance groups in it. What they're concerned about is that at the moment—the poli—at the mom—who's on the Policy Review Committee right now? Mike [**Licari**]?

**East:** Half a dozen administrators.

**Licari:** Pretty much.

**Peters:** And there's a guarantee, but—but there's a guarantee that they're from—that all Divisions of the University are represented on it. What they're—what President **Allen**—I can't remember if Tim [**McKenna**] was also concerned with this or not, but he was concerned that while he likes the idea of including the governance groups, you could end up with almost everybody on there being from Academic Affairs. So you could have a merit representative, P&S person who worked for Academic Affairs, with the other Divisions not represented. So they're in favor of somehow incorporating governance groups as long as we can also try to still make sure that Divisions of the University are represented there.

**DeBerg:** Well, I guess I'd like to see a list before, you know, we acted on this. I think who's on that group is really important.

**Neuhaus:** And Tim [**McKenna**] had said he would supply something. We might just want to remind him of that while it's still fresh in his mind, because I think he wasn't really opposed to that. He was really just trying to figure out how to blend the two. So maybe we can see about this. We might give that a try.

**Peters:** I would say in terms of some things that we should discuss and give some feedback to the Committee on—President **Allen** and Tim **McKenna** wanted to know whether there should be time limits built into the policy so that the Policy Review Committee or the Cabinet were required to act within a certain amount of time after receiving a proposal from the immediate step below. They believed there should be, so they suggested that we add something like that in.

**East:** They believed there should be?

**Peters:** There should be some kind of time limit, yeah, because otherwise you could just sit on it; yeah, like the pocket veto. You could just sit on it and not act. So I don't know what a reasonable amount of time would be. How often does the Cabinet meet, Provost **Gibson**?

**Gibson:** Every week.

**Peters:** Weekly?

**Gibson:** Uh huh, yeah.

**Peters:** Weekly.

**East:** My guess is, if I were—if I were guessing, I would think that you might want as long as a month [now talking about the Policy Review Committee]. I don't know how long—I mean, I don't know how contentious the policies could be that you—you might not be able to consider it the first week. If you meet weekly, you might not be able to get it the first week. The second week you might find something that you—that was kind of a problematic and you wanted to investigate further. It seems to me that—that a month is perhaps the minimum you would want for that—to allow before you'd want to force something out of them? I don't know. That's perhaps something they should talk to us about.

**Peters:** Senator **DeBerg**.



**DeBerg:** Well, the Cabinet meets weekly. They can schedule this real easily. It's how often the poor Policy Review Committee and all those groups meet? So I think those are the ones we have to worry about. They can't do—they can't

**East:** That's the one I was talking about.

**DeBerg:** Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you were talking about the Cabinet.

**East:** No.

**Peters:** Senator **Dolgener**.

**Dolgener:** If you have a time limit, wouldn't you also need what happens if that time limit is not—you know, doesn't go? You know, would it just go back somewhere? Does it sit there?

**Peters:** You—we—could say that it—you could say that it goes up to the next level, if they don't act on it. [a few voices commenting quietly] Chair **Funderburk**.

**Funderburk:** I think also you'd want to define what you're counting as a month. Are you counting a month on a calendar or a month of school days? Having given up my last 2 Holiday Breaks for doing such work, I think you don't want to limit. That way, if you suddenly force some of those committees, and even though we meet every two weeks, when things get busy, it's hard to get things before the [Faculty] Senate sometimes. And, you know, you can't slide things (?). Like 30 days, 30 class days may be the minimum.

**East:** Yeah, I was thinking 4 class weeks. [back and forth with **Funderburk**, both overlapping]

**Funderburk:** Yeah, 60 might be safer as a general policy.

**Peters:** Other thoughts on time limits? Another question that came up during our discussion last week was the role of the Policy Review

Committee. One of the main purposes of the Policy Review Committee is to make sure that the policy is in some kind of shape so that it can actually be inserted. It's actually written as a policy. It can actually be inserted into the Policies and Procedures. Make it play nice with other policies and procedures. Use consistent terms across policies and procedures. So, I guess, something that Tim [McKenna] has experienced recently is what about something—changes that really amount to copyediting but don't substantively change the policy? Should those have to go back to the originating body for approval? Senator **Neuhaus**.

**Neuhaus:** I'll point out that Tim [McKenna] was pretty uncertain where to draw that line.

**Peters:** Yeah.

**Neuhaus:** I mean, he thought that, "Boy, it would be silly to send it back on that." But I don't think he was quite sure where he drew the line on that. And so it'd be difficult, you know.

**DeBerg:** Well, if it's simple editing, that could—the originating body could quickly look at that, if it's not substantive.

**Neuhaus:** Sure.

**Peters:** So we would want to err on the side of caution and say, "Any changes should be sent back to the originating body." Is that what I'm hearing?

**DeBerg:** Well, I think so. Wording in policies is really important.

**Neuhaus:** Sometimes change in wording is—one person thinks it's not terribly important and others do.

**DeBerg:** Yeah. Sometimes people don't see ambiguity, and another person does or something like that.

**Peters:** Another item that we already talked about a little, the makeup of the Policy Review Committee. Does anyone have any further thoughts on making up that Committee, or should we just wait to hear what we get from Tim [McKenna] on that one? Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** I think it's important that United Faculty be represented, because they seem—they seem to be the experts on campus about what constitutes a mandatory subject of bargaining, and if it's on a mandatory subject, the University is illegal in passing policies that have to do with those subjects. They have to be bargained. And we have had new policies passed in the last several years that have been on mandatory topics, so I really appreciate the inclusion of someone from United Faculty in the Policy Review Committee. [Section E-3 in Addendum 3]

**Peters:** Other thoughts on

**Heston:** That's not quite what that says.

**East:** That's not quite what the recommendation says.

**DeBerg:** Oh, I thought it said "Faculty Bargaining Unit."

**Peters:** Selected jointly.

**Heston:** Selected jointly by.

**DeBerg:** Oh, I get it. I get it. But at least they're in there.

**Heston:** They would have input on who was representing them.

**DeBerg:** Well, "selected jointly by," that's cumbersome.

**East:** The faculty representative would be selected by [voices attempting to clarify]

**DeBerg:** Ok.

**Peters:** Other thoughts on the makeup of the PRC?

**East:** I think it matters.

**Peters:** Oh, it definitely matters. I agree. And right now—you know, right now there—the faculty—is there a student representative on there?

**East:** There is no faculty.

**Peters:** There is a student representative on the Policy Review Committee right now, but no faculty representative.

**East:** And no P&S.

**Peters:** And no P&S.

**East:** And no merit?

**Peters:** [NISG] Vice-President **White**.

**White:** Well, I looked—I searched in the policies, and I’m not sure if this is the most updated, but it says [see Addendum 4 or go to: <http://www.uni.edu/policies/000>] [reading from Procedure 2.] “The University shall maintain a Policy Review Committee consisting of seven representatives to review new and revised drafts of University policies prior to consideration” blah blah blah blah. “The [Committee] shall include a student and a representative from each of the three divisions (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Administration and Financial Services), Development and Alumni Relations, Human Resource Services, and the Office of University Counsel.”

**East:** Yes.

**White:** And the current student representative—NISG defaults to have it be the Governmental Relations Director, so that would be Jaime [**Yowler**] currently.

**Peters:** Other thoughts on the makeup of the Committee? Two other issues I thought warranted at least a little bit of discussion. 1. On the policy as it currently exists, the Initiation phase, item C there [see Addendum 3, 1-C.]. The originating body “posts the proposed policy [or revision] or a general statement of anticipated provisions of the policy [or revision].” One thing that President **Allen** and Mr. **McKenna** were concerned about was that if you do something that’s sort of a general statement of anticipated provisions and you get comments on that, and then you make it into a fully formed proposal, has that changed so much that you almost need to get input again or not? So they were wondering if maybe it should just be, “You should be doing your best to get a fully formed proposal before you get comments on it.”? Other thoughts? Oh, yeah [recognizing Senator **Neuhaus**].

**Neuhaus:** I just have one. I think we are going to want to touch base with whoever is running that policy website, because I don’t know if they were included in there. But we’ll need to set up some mechanism. It’s not stated explicitly in there. Tim would say, “Well, that makes sense for it to be there.” (?) Right now, there’s just that really bare bones, vanilla, here’s policy 1, 2, 3, 4. So something needs to be somewhere, and everybody needs to be aware of it. Because that’s where that input or new process will take place, and then some lucky person will be in charge of making that all happen and run through it. And nobody wants to identify any time frame. [?]

**Peters:** Right. And my suggestion in our meeting on Friday was that you could have on this page, on the University’s Policies website, you could have a marginal section that says—you know, over on the right-hand margin, it would say, “Policies currently being considered,” or “Policies open to public comment,” or something like that. It would provide links. If we were considering a policy, maybe it would just be a link to the petition that’s on our website. And that way it’s right there at one central place. Everyone around campus, with NISG proposing a policy, P&S Council, whatever. They would all be right there, and people would be able to know. And then presumably they would be announced in Inside UNI as well. Senator **East**.

**East:** Not just presumably. I mean, it's very important, I think, that policies be announced and everybody receive the announcement. Not that they'd just be posted someplace, and you have to go find them.

**Peters:** Correct. Poor choice of words on my part.

**DeBerg:** And during the Academic Year. None of this during the Summer.

**Peters:** Yes. We also had a brief discussion about whether you should need approval from the relevant Vice President before it goes higher in the process. I guess Tim [McKenna] has had experiences before where a policy proposal gets up to the Cabinet level. The Policy Review Committee proposes it. It gets up to the Cabinet level, and the Vice President has never even heard of it. The relevant Vice President has never even heard of it. So there was some discussion about that. President **Allen**, though, thought that while it's certainly smart to keep the relevant Vice President informed—obviously the Provost comes to our meetings, so she knows what we're doing, and we have opportunities to talk to her, and it's important to keep the Vice President informed—that he can imagine situations where University-wide policy might be passed against the advice of a Vice President charged with overseeing it. That is to say that University—you know, University-wide interests may trump whatever opinions that one Vice President had. So he was not in favor of a Vice President having to give permission before it went forward in the process. But some notion of keeping the Vice President apprised, in the loop, something like that.

**East:** Well, I think that was the reason why we suggested that the overseeing Vice President would be on the—that that person be a member of the Policy Review Committee when their policy was reviewed. The idea for the Policy Review Committee wasn't necessarily that there be a *policy review committee*. And that's kind of weird. Our thinking was that you needed to have a set of people on the Policy Review Committee, and they would—you might have several sets of people. So, you might have a specialist—a faculty member who was particularly interested in the Finance and Administration stuff might serve on the review committee when those policies were reviewed. The difficulty there that we hadn't thought of was

the necessity to have sort of that knowledge of what's going on University-wide in all policies. So perhaps we need to do some—we actually do need to do some more careful thinking about this. But a policy committee that meets every week is quite a chore, I would think. So, I think we do need to do some fairly hard thinking about what's going to go on here with who's on the Committee. But if the Vice President or a person is there, I think they should always be represented on that Committee, when a policy under them is considered. So that might be an extra person on the Committee.

**DeBerg:** An ex officio member.

**Peters:** Or it could—another option could be that the Committee has the power or ability to invite other people to give them advice on

**East:** Or as Betty [**DeBerg**] said, an ex officio

**Peters:** Right.

**DeBerg:** Slot.

**East:** position, slot, for that person.

**Peters:** Well, those were the things that I had identified as—well, not really as concerns, as issues to talk about. I don't know if others are seeing things? Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** I do have a question—do any of you know or does the University regularly review policies every 5 years? Is there a process?

**Peters:** I'm not sure they have in the past, but they are right now.

**DeBerg:** OK.

**Peters:** Yeah.

**East:** They are attempting to get caught up, is what we were told. [voices agreeing]

**Gibson:** There are policies that are 20 and 25, 30 years old.

**DeBerg:** Yeah, I know.

**East:** Yeah. They are attempting to get caught up, is what we were told. I was a little nervous or bothered by the—in Section VI about the Final Approval where that—the final policy has to be kind of put up before it becomes finalized. They didn't—in addition to striking out submitting it to the Board of Regents, they struck out, or somebody struck out the time period.

**Peters:** That was just between me and Chris [**Neuhaus**] trying to represent what we talked about at the meeting. But the key there is the Board of Regents. So we could still say, "...is available for 1 week before it's finalized."

**East:** Well, I mean—I think our thinking there was that we hadn't—we really don't have any power to say—over the policymakers, the President. That we don't have any real power over whether or not the President should approve this. So, what we want to do is to, you know—when—if the President is going to be insistent on going her or his own way, then they have to say—at least say it and say why and put it out there for a little while to allow the University community to raise hell, if you want, you know.

**Neuhaus:** Phil [**East**], do you think—do you know—I think you're right in one sense. I mean, if we're going to have that section on the page where you can give input when you're looking at this policy in its making, but it would be real easy to lose track of that thing later on, and you know, there's a lot of policies out there, so maybe a sort of other section on the page that says the approved policies or policies that have just recently taken effect, just to draw

**Peters:** And will take effect this date or something like that.



**Neuhaus:** Yeah, just to draw people's attention. Because you're right, I mean, we're not going to be able to change that, but we need to be able in some cases to react or adjust with what's

**East:** Well, even Presidents can make mistakes. [voices mumbling] And this would give them a chance to not make the mistake absolutely final. That was my thinking—our thinking, I think. And that they can be accountable in that they—if they don't agree with the process that produced the policy, and that's perfectly reasonable that they might not. They might have a \_\_\_\_\_ or have an opinion that says, you know, "You've got your priorities wrong for the institution, in my view. I think it needs to be this." And go totally against what has happened in the process. I think that's not unreasonable to allow that to happen. But just have them explain why they think that and give us a chance to yell, and, ok, we followed the process.

**Peters:** Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** I mean, I think that is a strong part of this proposed process is that in a couple of different places where there's disagreement, rationales have to be offered. And I think that's really healthy. You have competing reasons why that are articulated and are part of the process.

**Peters:** Senator **Neuhaus**.

**Neuhaus:** I wonder, too, if that final posting of rationale or even finished policy, whatever it is—finished policy and rationale, I wonder if that shouldn't also be up there for a little bit longer than a week. You know, we all have weeks where, "Wow, where did that week go? And I didn't get to things." I don't see any harm in having it up there. It allows people ample time to—so if we are going to go with 4 weeks on the input time, why not have 4 weeks on the these-are-new-policies-that-have-come-forth and in some cases rationale, cause we tweaked them a little bit on there. It allows everybody throughout the campus that opportunity, despite a really busy week, to go and look at what's coming down the line.

**Peters:** Any other questions or comments? Well, our triumvirate of policy process, what do you think? How much time do you think you will—you might need to respond to some of these things and resubmit something to us?

**Neuhaus:** Well, we would want Tim [**McKenna**] to kind of weigh in a little bit, but that's—so if he can do that quick or not?

**DeBerg:** March?

**Peters:** Let's see, we've got one more meeting in February, and then we've got the March 11<sup>th</sup> meeting, right? Do we want to pencil this in for March 11<sup>th</sup> to discuss it?

**Neuhaus:** Phil [**East**], are you nodding over there? [voices discussing possibilities quietly]

**East:** I mean, that's the week before Spring Break, right? It would make sense to me, if—again, if we get something back from Tim [**McKenna**] about the makeup of the Committee.

**Peters:** That seems like it's probably the most nebulous thing left out there, unless a uncertain thing is left out there when all is said

**East:** No, I really—I like pretty much the revision. The things that were added to it, I thought, enhanced it, with the exception of crossing out our suggested committee members. But it seems clear that some thought needs—that we hadn't maybe considered enough about the historical mem—the institutional memory, necessity for that. So, yeah, something probably needs to be done there, but we've got time for it.

**Peters:** Well—go ahead, Chair **Funderburk**.

**Funderburk:** I don't know exactly how it would work in, but since the faculty representative currently is supposed to be jointly selected, I almost wonder if there shouldn't be a set of possible faculty representative, because on certain policies, they are primarily related to the Master

Agreement, and it would be most important UF-related that way. Others are really academic, and we'd need somebody more purely academ—I don't know if we can suggest to Tim [McKenna] that he consider it that way, and that would potentially give the group the flexibility to make sure it's not all one Division or another.

**East:** Well, that's actually what we thought. I mean, with respect to the faculty members and student representatives—I mean, there are—somebody said there were lots of policies being revised (?). \_\_\_\_\_ is the number I heard that had to be reviewed, and so for a while this is a big, huge job, and having several people kind of rotating in and out, depending on the policies being discussed made sense. But there are other places where it doesn't make sense, it seems to me, and so I don't know how to deal with that yet. But that's something we need to consider.

**Peters:** Senator DeBerg.

**DeBerg:** One thing to pass along is that the—I have not been able to print out the Policies and Procedures Manual. So I would like it online in a way that it can be printed out, because some of us like to work from a hard copy. And that has just changed in recent years. And it used to be that a hard copy was always available somewhere, but that's not the case anymore.

**Peters:** Ok. Any other comments? Well, if there are no objections, let's just refer this back to the committee for further work. We'll assume that they will get something back to us for action on March 11<sup>th</sup>.

**Funderburk:** Great work so far, too.

**Peters:** Yeah, and I know it's not the sexiest topic we'll talk about all year, but I think it's something that is [voices stating how important it is] And for all the comments that we got from the President and from Tim [McKenna], I think it's useful to point out that they were very supportive of the overall endeavor and stressed that the Cabinet has been supportive of it and thinks it's necessary, especially with all the policies that are being revised. It's really important to have opportunity for public comment and some ability

for people to know what's actually going on and what's being considered. So—well, that's it for today. We got through our business. So thank you everybody, and if there's no objection [voices rising about procedure]  
Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** Usually we have to go back in session.

**Peters:** Ok. So what do we rise from? Rise from the Committee of the Whole? Can I get a motion to rise from the Committee of the Whole?

**Kidd:** So moved.

**Peters:** Motion by Senator **Kidd**. Seconded by Senator **Walter**. [who indicated] All in favor, please say "aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say, "no." [none heard]

ADJOURNMENT

**Peters:** Motion to adjourn?

**Terlip:** So moved.

**Peters:** Senator **Terlip**. Seconded by everybody in the room. [light laughter] And we'll see you again next week for a curriculum-heavy meeting. [5:52 p.m.]

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss  
Transcriptionist  
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting: 02/25/13 Oak Room, Maucker Union 3:30 p.m.

Follows are 4 addenda to these Minutes.

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

## UNI CLASS ATTENDANCE AND MAKE-UP WORK POLICY, 3.06 (revised)

Policies Home » Chapter 3: Student Policies

### 3.06 Class Attendance and Make-Up Work

#### Purpose:

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

#### Definition:

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

#### Policy:

##### A. General Provisions

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

##### B. Absences

Occasionally, students will have reasonable cause to miss class. In order for both faculty members and students to plan effectively for these absences, the following procedures have been developed. Faculty members are encouraged to take into account the reason for

an absence and make appropriate accommodations. Students are still responsible for demonstrating achievement of course learning goals, even when absences are necessary or reasonable. In situations with many absences, it may be most appropriate for the student to withdraw and retake the course in a future semester.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### C. Make-up Work Grievances Arising from Absences

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

Faculty Senate, approved April 16, 2012

President’s Cabinet, approved July 30, 2012

ADDITIONAL EPC REVISIONS SUBMITTED TO FACULTY SENATE IN  
JANUARY 2013

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

Addendum 2 of 4 [from <http://www.uni.edu/policies/306> ]

Current Student Policy 3.06, approved April/July 2012

### **3.06 Class Attendance and Make-Up Work**

#### ***Purpose:***

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

#### ***Definition:***

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

#### ***Policy:***

##### **A. General Provisions**

Faculty members who choose to have policies related to attendance and make-up work must distribute those policies on the first day of class. While it is strongly recommended that all faculty members have written policies regarding attendance and make-up work, these policies are not required. However, when such policies are not provided in writing at the start of the class, it is understood that there will be no grade-related penalties due to absences, missed exams, missed assignments or other activities or assignments which would otherwise have an impact on a student's grade, regardless of the cause of those events.

Students must adhere to each faculty member's policies regarding attendance and make-up work.

Faculty members who require attendance at activities or events that may conflict with a student's otherwise regularly scheduled classes are expected to be reasonable in setting these requirements. If a faculty member will require student attendance at an activity or event outside of the regularly schedule class period, the affected students must be provided written notice at least 10 University class days in advance of the event during the fall or spring semester and by the third day of the course for any summer term class. The faculty member must provide each student with a notice that can be given to the faculty member who instructs another course affected by the required attendance of the student. It is then the student's obligation to notify the other faculty member. In the case of extracurricular activities, a semester-long schedule should be prepared and distributed

to the participating students at the beginning of the semester. It is the student's obligation to provide the schedule to his/her other faculty members.

## **B. Absences**

Occasionally, students will have reasonable cause to miss class. In order for both faculty members and students to plan effectively for these absences, the following procedures have been developed. Faculty members are encouraged to take into account the reason for an absence and make appropriate accommodations.

1. Faculty members have the discretion to determine the reasonableness of an absence.
2. When an absence is deemed "reasonable", the faculty member must provide the student an opportunity to make up missed work, or have in place a make-up policy that does not unjustly penalize a student for the absence.
3. All absences due to participation in educationally appropriate, university sponsored activities or sanctioned events must be considered reasonable, and a student must therefore not be unjustly penalized for these absences.
4. Students participating in educationally appropriate, university sponsored activities or sanctioned events must inform each faculty member of their known and anticipated absences as far in advance as possible.
5. Other types of absences due to extenuating circumstances, either predetermined or unexpected, may also be deemed "reasonable" by the faculty member. Such absences include, though are not limited to, the following: non-university sanctioned educationally appropriate events and activities (e.g., attendance at a professional conference); illness; significant personal emergency; bereavement; jury duty; military service; mandatory religious observances, etc.
6. If a faculty member assigns a mandatory activity or event that encompasses time outside of class or requires students to miss another class, that faculty member assigning the mandatory activity or event must either provide the student an opportunity to make up the missed activity or event, or have in place a make-up policy that does not unjustly penalize a student for the missed activity or event.

### **Make-up Work Grievances Arising from Absences**

Should a faculty member refuse to allow a student to make up missed work, and should this refusal constitute an unjust penalty upon the student, the faculty member's decision can be appealed by the student using the grievance process outlined in Section G of 12.01 Student Academic Grievance Policy.

Faculty Senate, approved April 16, 2012

President's Cabinet, approved July 30, 2012



### **Procedures for Establishing, Reviewing, and Revising University Policies**

The following six-step process is to be followed when a new University policy is proposed or an existing policy is reviewed.

I. Initiation

An originating body identifies the need to propose or revise/review a policy and:

- A. Notifies the University community of the intention to do so and to seek input concerning the policy.
- B. Identifies or suggests the VP who will oversee the policy and be responsible for its enforcement, maintenance, and review/revision.
- C. Includes or posts the proposed policy (or revision) or a general statement of anticipated provisions of the policy (or revision).

II. Original Input

The originating body accepts input concerning the policy (or revision). A period of at least two weeks must be provided for input.

III. Policy Proposal

The originating body generates, announces, and posts its formal proposed statement of the policy and:

- A. Submits the proposal to the Policy Review Committee with a recommendation as to the person, office, or body that will be responsible for final approval of the policy (e.g., President, Cabinet, VP, Policy Committee).
- B. Makes available to the University Community a copy of the received input and (if reasonable) provides a synopsis of that input.

IV. Policy Review

The Policy Review Committee examines the policy statement, input, and recommendation for approval body and **either**:

- A. Agrees with the recommendation (and it moves to policy approval)
- B. Suggests revisions to the originating body which **either**:
  1. Accepts the revisions (and it moves to policy approval).
  2. Rejects the revisions. In this case the proposal moves to policy approval with the notation that the originating body disagrees with the Policy Review Committee. Each body includes a rationale for their view on the contested elements of the proposal.

V. Initial Approval

The Policy Review Committee and, in cases of disagreement, the originating body submit appropriate material to the identified approval agency which will, after appropriate examination, either:

- A. Announce and post agreement with an uncontested policy.
  - B. Announce and post agreement with one of the bodies in cases of a contested policy.
  - C. Refer the policy back to the originating body and Policy Review Committee for additional work (in which case the process begins anew).
  - D. Announce and post a revised policy statement.
  - E. Announce/post the decision that there is to be no policy on this topic.
- In all cases other than agreement between all parties, a rationale for the decision is to be posted with the decision.

#### VI. Final Approval

The final policy decision, policy statement (when appropriate), and any attendant rationales will be made available to the University Community for at least one week before the policy can be finalized and submitted to the Board of Regents for approval. An opportunity for members of the Community to voice objections to the approval agency shall be provided.

The following guidelines will be followed when implementing the above process.

- A. All policies will be reviewed at least every five years. Review is initiated by appropriate VP's office.
- B. A specified University office will maintain the communication and posting mechanism that is to be identified and available to all the University Community. Announcements in the approval process will be sent directly to all members of the University Community (administration, faculty, staff, and student government representatives). Postings will be made to the UNI web site.
- C. All time periods for University Community review for input or objections must occur during Fall or Spring academic semesters.
- D. When a policy must be put in place in a manner inconsistent with the identified time frame, it will be considered an interim policy that must be reviewed according to the standard review process in the next academic semester.
- E. The Policy Review Committee consists of:
  1. University Counsel (or designee)
  2. Overseeing VP (or designee)
  3. Faculty representative(s)\* (selected jointly by Chairs of the Faculty, Faculty Senate, and Faculty Bargaining Unit)
  4. P & S representative(s)\*
  5. Merit representative(s)\*
  6. NISG representative(s)\*
- F. In cases where the approval agency is **not** agreed upon (by the originating body, the Policy Review Committee and the identified VP), the President will be or will determine the approval agency.

---

\* It may be reasonable to have a small cadre of representatives from the various University groups, perhaps with each focusing on a particular subset of policy topics (e.g., 1 per VP)

Addendum 4 of 4 [from <http://www.uni.edu/policies/000> ]

Policies

[Home](#) » [Chapter 0: Policies and Procedures Manual](#)

**0.00: Policy**

***Purpose:***

To designate operational Policies and Procedures for the University of Northern Iowa; to define policy and procedure initiating authorities; and to establish the framework and standard format for the development, review, approval, and dissemination for University policies and procedures.

***Policy Statement:***

The University of Northern Iowa Policies and Procedures shall include and document the policies and procedures applicable to the entire University. The University Policies and Procedures shall be on the University website.

***Procedure:***

1. University policy recommendations may arise from several sources within the University but the most usual are: the University Faculty Senate, the UNI President, the President's Cabinet, the Northern Iowa Student Government, nonacademic committees, and a wide range of additional committees, most of which report to one of the bodies listed above. Policy also may be imposed on the University as a consequence of actions by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa, legislature, courts, or other governmental agencies to which the University is legally subject.
2. The University shall maintain a Policy Review Committee consisting of seven representatives to review new and revised drafts of University policies prior to consideration by the President and Cabinet. The Policy Review Committee shall include a student and a representative from each of the three divisions (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Administration and Financial Services), Development and Alumni Relations, Human Resource Services, and the Office of University Counsel. The student member shall be appointed by the NISG Senate for a two-year term. Before a policy is given to the Committee for review, the policy must be approved by a Vice President who has or would have some applicable oversight or, if the policy is from within the President's division, the applicable administrative head. The Committee should be given a reasonable amount of time to review and discuss each proposed policy before the policy needs to be passed on to the President and Cabinet. The Committee may meet with the appropriate drafting person or body before passing a policy on to the President and Cabinet for approval. The Committee may send back drafted policies to the appropriate person or body for revision until a final draft is approved by the Committee and passed on to the President and Cabinet. Except

for the student member, Committee members will be appointed to three year terms by their respective administrative heads.

3. The standard policy format is:
  - o Policy Number and Title
  - o Purpose
  - o Policy Statement
  - o Procedure (if necessary)
4. Each University policy shall state at the end of the policy:
  1. the administrative source and date of approval by the administrative source, and
  2. the date of approval by the President and Cabinet (and by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa if required).
5. All University policies shall be subject to review by and approval of the UNI President and Cabinet.
6. Upon receiving notice a new or revised policy has been approved by the President and Cabinet, the University Counsel will forward the new or revised policy to the Office of University Relations. The Office of University Relations shall be responsible for notifying the campus community regarding new or revised policies. Each University policy shall be broadcast in summary via e-mail through UNI Online to University students and faculty and staff members. The e-mail message shall contain the effective date of the new or revised policy, as well as where the full text of the policy may be accessed (i.e., on the UNI Policies and Procedures web page).
7. The Office of University Relations shall maintain, update and edit the University policy and procedure records. Each policy shall be published in the Policies and Procedures of the University on the UNI website. A policy may also be published in other University publications.
8. The Office of University Counsel shall have the authority to make non-substantive changes to University policies without Cabinet or Policy Review Committee approval as long as the University Counsel discusses the changes with the appropriate persons.
9. Colleges and departments of the University are encouraged to formulate and to publish official policy statements and/or procedures for their jurisdictions. Such policy and procedure statements shall not be inconsistent with official University policy statements.

10. Policies and procedures maintained in the UNI Policies and Procedures shall be reviewed at least every five years by the Vice President who has applicable oversight or the Vice President's designee, or the applicable administrative head if the policy is from within the President's division.

Office of University Counsel, approved June 13, 2011  
President's Cabinet, approved August 15, 2011