

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
03/28/11 (3:16 p.m. - 5:13 p.m.)

SUMMARY

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy announcements included no press present. Provost **Gibson** delayed her comments until the Executive Session. No comments from Faculty Chair **Jurgenson**. Chair **Wurtz's** commented on the Saturday, April 30, Diversity Session planned for Senate members and on the 5-senator volunteer Reorganization Task Force that will meet Friday, April 1.

2. Minutes approved for: 02/28/11 (**DeBerg/VanWormer**)

3. Docketed from the calendar:
 - 1074 972 Expedited Review of Program Changes for the Elementary Education and Middle Level Education Majors, for 04/11/11 (**East/Terlip**)
 - 1076 974 Report from the University Budget Committee for Discussion and Appropriate Action, returned to the Committee for specific recommendations for senate action (**Soneson/DeBerg**)

4. Consideration of docketed items:
 - 1072 970 New Undergraduate Academic Standing Policy (Academic Alert, Probation, and Suspension) for the 2011-2012 Academic Year, motion to approve passed
 - 1073 971 Resolution from NISG regarding Professional Development Assignment, motion to receive and reply passed
 - 1075 973 Resolution from NISG regarding proposed Dead Days, motion to endorse this new policy and send it along for consideration of others failed

5. New Business

Motion to send the NISG resolution proposing Dead Days (1075/973) instead to the Educational Policies Commission Senate Committee for review and input (**Terlip/Funderburk**), passed

6. Executive Session, 4:15 p.m.

7. Adjournment at 5:13 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
03/28/11
Mtg. #1694**

PRESENT: Megan Balong, Karen Breitbach, Gregory Bruess, Betty DeBerg, Forrest Dolgener, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Deborah Gallagher, Gloria Gibson, Doug Hotek, James Jurgenson, Michael Licari, Julie Lowell, Chris Neuhaus, Michael Roth, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Laura Terlip, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Absent: Marilyn Shaw

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Wurtz** called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Press were not in attendance.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Provost **Gibson** had no comments at this time.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Faculty Chair James **Jurgenson** had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR SUSAN WURTZ

Chair **Wurtz**'s comments included noting that on, Saturday, April 30th, Associate Provost Ginny **Arthur** and others are planning to present a diversity session for senators--something short but that would give senators, as campus leaders, an experience of what is going on across campus. Maucker Union would cost \$50/hour, if they met in the morning. Senators agreed they would prefer morning, so another location will be sought. Various rooms/buildings were suggested, including Baker 161. **Wurtz** suggested to those whose terms are ending that they encourage their Colleges to have their decisions made for their next year's senators so that they can be invited to this Saturday session as well. That overlap would be very useful, she noted.

Wurtz also reminded everyone that the 5-senator volunteer Reorganization Task Force for the Senate will be meeting this Friday. They will be working from the report put together by the University Governance Work Group. They will come up with recommendations for the Senate in terms of what/who makes up/constitutes the Senate. Senator **Terlip** wondered if the Committee on Committees put out a formal call for the University Ballot that needs to be going out and asked if they need to be requested to do that? **Wurtz** said she had a communication that showed they were working on it. Senator **Soneson** asked whether, with the merger of two Colleges, nominations could even be made. Senator **DeBerg** said that the College Merger Steering Committee Work Group has come up with a set of recommendations for the constitutions of the Senate, Senate committees, etc., and she will bring that information to the upcoming meeting. **Wurtz** noted that those on the Task Force have received it already and that all senators will be receiving the recommendations of the Task Force after it meets. Provost **Gibson** asked if this work is for implementation next year, because the Colleges are not merged until the Board of Regents says they are, noting that that will not happen until this June 2011. All agreed, yes,

next year. **Wurtz** noted that flexibility will be needed during this time of transition. Senator **East** said that it made sense to him to remain under current rules until they actually change and that that would give the slack time of at least the Fall to put into place any selection procedures that would need to change. **Wurtz** said there would be an interim period and that she hopes the Senate will revisit the issue of representation. Senators are elected from their Colleges, but they do not represent their Colleges. They represent all faculty. Senator **Neuhaus** wondered if, because they planned to move slowly, perhaps the College formerly known as CHAFA should have elections as they have in the past. **Wurtz** would recommend that, but she wants the Task Force this Friday who will meet in BAK 174 to offer recommendations as a group.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

The Minutes for 02/28/11 were distributed to senators electronically a week ago. Nuss received no additions or corrections prior to the meeting. Motion was made to approve the minutes as distributed (**DeBerg/VanWormer**). No senators today had additions or corrections or discussion. Passed.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1074 for Docket #972, Expedited Review of Program Changes for the Elementary Education and Middle Level Education Majors

East moved and **Terlip** seconded to docket this calendar item for consideration at the next meeting (04/11/11). Discussion included that this is not "regular order" but at the next meeting. Senator **Soneson** asked if there was a representative here today regarding this? He wanted it known that this is not a good time to increase the size of programs, and he hopes that there has been a reorganization without an increase in numbers of hours. Senator **Gallagher** asked if there would be a representative from Curriculum and Instruction or that area to attend when this is discussed?

Wurtz said that they would be invited, if necessary, and that in the past the Senate has just assumed that those who bring petitions will attend when those petitions are considered. Vote called. Motion passed and will be docketed for action at the next meeting.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1076 for Docket #974, Report from the University Budget Committee for Discussion and Appropriate Action

Wurtz called for a motion to docket this calendar item. **Soneson** moved to return this petition to the Committee because it lacks a motion for Senate action. **DeBerg** seconded this motion. Discussion on the merits included requesting this be done as soon as possible so that it can be docketed next meeting. **Gallagher** asked if the request was for information? **Wurtz** explained that the petition was information for Senate deliberation and to determine "appropriate action." **Soneson** wants them to be clear about what they feel is appropriate action for the Senate to consider. Senator **Smith** suggested that it be docketed and discussed and then returned, if the Senate could not determine appropriate action. **Neuhaus** suggested that it be docketed and "received" without being acted upon. **Soneson** said, however, that it seems the University Budget Committee wants the Senate to do more than just receive it. **DeBerg** agreed with **Soneson** that this report does not constitute a motion and that the Committee needs to provide some recommendations. Committees do this type of work so the "committee of the whole" does not have to sort things out, she said. **Smith** stated that he thought it might be helpful to take a look at it and then say to the Committee that, although they have considered the information, they do not see the direction and would like some Committee input. Would not this type of reading/debate/discussion be something the Senate would want to do in taking it up as an item, he asked? He noted that he was bothered by just sending it back without some consideration after docketing it. If the Senate needs the Committee's input, they can send it back and ask for it. **DeBerg** feared that the discussion would take too long. **Wurtz** outlined options of voting the motion or withdrawing it and having a new motion, etc. **DeBerg** moved the question on the motion made by **Soneson**. A vote passed on moving the question. **Wurtz** called for a vote on the motion to return the petition to the Committee asking for a more specific recommendation or recommendations for Senate action. Passed with 1 abstention.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #970, NEW UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC STANDING POLICY (ACADEMIC ALERT, PROBATION, AND SUSPENSION) FOR THE 2011-2012 ACADEMIC YEAR (**Neuhaus/DeBerg**)

Wurtz noted that Senator **Terlip** is on this Committee and invited her to offer her insight during the discussion. Also Mary **Bauman**, Associate Registrar of the Registrar's Office, and Phil **Patton**, University Registrar, moved to the table to speak. **Bauman** began by saying that throughout the last year they have had many discussions about rewriting the policy for probation/suspension/academic warning. There has been much confusion with the past/current policy. Some faculty members request explanation of deficiency points, and when a student is suspended often parents and students alike call to ask for explanation because of their confusion with the current policy. An effort has been made to simplify the policy.

The current policy is weighted in that it is easier to become suspended as a junior/senior compared to a first-year or second-year student. A freshman student must have 14 deficiency points, but anyone over 60 hours needs only 10 deficiency points. She asked if everyone present understood the deficiency point system, and many admitted that they did not. This Committee looked at various policies with UNI sister institutions and also with Iowa State and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Iowa in order to develop the new, less-confusing policy. This new policy still has 3 parts: Academic Alert, Academic Probation, and Suspension. Basically, it allows for not suspending any first-semester student at UNI, including transfer students. (The proposal was then projected on screen for all the view.)

Bauman continued with her explanation with scenarios. A first-year freshman here from high school in their first semester making a 1.75 gpa would be put on Academic Alert, which is similar to Academic Warning. The Committee chose this new wording, Academic Alert, as more proactive. The student would be limited to 14 credit hours the subsequent semester,

and no record would be on their permanent transcript. To be removed from Academic Alert, they would need to make a 2.0 UNI cumulative gpa the following semester. The current policy includes transfer work; this new policy would only consider UNI credits. If the student fails to make the required 2.0 UNI cumulative gpa the semester when placed on Academic Alert, then they would move to Academic Probation for their 3rd semester at UNI. If they do not maintain a 2.0 semester gpa that 3rd semester, the student will be suspended.

When the Registrar's Office is asked the question of how many more students will be suspended under this new policy, that is hard to say because the criteria is now different--no longer looking at deficiency points; now looking at gpa. From first glance, it appears that fewer will be suspended early on, but there may be more suspensions in the 2nd year in December. That number depends on how many proactive measures are put in place to help those students to succeed; fewer proactive measures will mean more suspensions. She hopes that the student support system will increase to help the numbers go down and the students be successful.

If a new UNI student does average work and then has a really bad semester--perhaps a death in the family or break-up with a boyfriend/girlfriend--and their cumulative UNI gpa goes below a 2.0, they are automatically put on Academic Probation. The Academic Alert is reserved for that first semester at UNI. Currently, an upperclass student, junior/senior, can skirt around a 1.8/1.9 for a long time and not be suspended. It depends solely on the deficiency points. She has seen students at a 9.98 deficiency points and really close to that 2.0 gpa, and they are not automatically suspended. With the new policy, a student with a 1.98 will be suspended. That is what the policy states. They will, however, look at extraordinary circumstances. If the student feels it is not fair, they can go to the Committee for Readmission and ask for reconsideration. There may be more of those students under the new policy who are at the 1.8/1.9 range asking for another chance.

A student can come off Academic Probation once their cumulative UNI gpa reaches a 2.0. So they may be on probation a couple of semesters as long as their semester gpa is above a 2.0. That coincides with the current

readmission policy, where a readmitted student who does not receive a 2.0 is automatically suspended again. Students seem to understand that policy clearly. "I have to get a 2.0. If I do not, I am gone." Whereas with the current policy on probation, if a student comes to her and asks, "What do I have to have in order to avoid a second suspension?" It is hard with deficiency points to explain that to a student because it depends on how many credits they take in how many classes. The new policy will be clearer to students, and they will know what is expected of them. Everyone hopes that they will be able to plan better and know just what kind of grades they need to achieve.

A suspended student must remain away for 1 calendar year. Then they can apply for readmission. If they have above a 2.0 while attending a community college during that interim, they are automatically readmitted. If not, they must appear before the Committee who then makes the decision about readmission based on the student's circumstances. Upon readmission, they must maintain a 2.0 gpa; otherwise, they are suspended again, which is also the current policy. Usually a second suspension is permanent; however, the Committee has granted exceptions for extraordinary cases.

DeBerg sought clarification that the 2.0 is a C average. **Smith** asked if the major rationale for making this change is to have the policy made more clear for students to understand what they have to do and why they were suspended or whatever? He wondered if this would tighten things up or make things more lenient--its actual effect in terms of demand on students? **Bauman** replied that every December she receives calls from some 75 - 100 parents seeking to make deals for their children to be readmitted. Usually it is freshmen but also can be male transfer students. Therefore, new students will not know what the old policy was so will not know that they have been given a break to figure things out, but later on she feels it will be tighter because in the past a student could skirt around that 1.8/1.9 for a while and not be suspended. Now there is the distinct cutoff. Also, not just students and parents but also faculty and staff have had a hard time understanding deficiency points, which she also admitted gave her difficulty early on--not just how it works but the rationale behind

deficiency points. If an advisor cannot explain it to a student, how will the advisor be able to help that student succeed?

Terlip, who has been on the Committee a while, noted that the members on the Committee have had to use manuals and math to learn how to calculate deficiency points. She said that she feels this new policy seems more fair. In the past a really poor first semester would cause a student to be suspended, whereas here they receive an Alert and are given another chance to become serious. This group has been working with the Retention Council also, so hopefully they will all do a better job of working with the First Year Experience and other initiatives to help students deal with the transition to college. She also agreed with **Bauman** and likes about the policy the fact that first-semester transfer students are allowed to acclimate but after that if they do not receive a UNI gpa of 2.0 in a semester, they are suspended.

East wanted clarification on "first semester." Do they mean after a first semester? **Bauman** replied that a first-semester student means that this is the first semester when a student has matriculated to UNI. **East** noted that this means then at the end of that first semester, because that is when grades are posted and gpa's figured, so this discussion is at the beginning of the second semester at UNI, and therefore only those students beginning their second semester at UNI can be put on Alert. If the gpa falls to below 2.0 at the end of that second semester, then the student goes directly to Probation, he wondered. **Bauman** agreed, because they are looking at situations as students get closer to graduation. She reminds students and parents frequently that as a junior they do not have much time to improve a gpa and perhaps wasting their money on schooling that will not lead to a finalized degree. They often just dig themselves into a hole toward the end.

Soneson wondered just where the new policy was in the materials provided, and discussion revealed that different print versions were available. The version with "boxes" was the most current version. (It was projected at the meeting for those present to review.) He asked, then, if the new policy meant all reference to deficiency points had been eliminated and all policy would simply talk about gpa? **Bauman** agreed for

undergraduates but noted that the Graduate College has just gone to that system. **Soneson** said that he was hearing that the elimination of deficiency points would make life much easier for many. **Bauman** agreed--parents, students, faculty, staff. Registrar **Patton** said that in terms of explaining the policy, this new policy would make things more simple to understand. Referring back to **Smith's** question as to whether this would mean more suspensions or fewer, **Patton** noted that until they used the new policy for a time, they just would not know, but based on historical scholastic summaries, they think it will not greatly increase the number of those suspended but that there will be no fewer.

Senator **Funderburk** asked if this new policy brings UNI more in line with the other schools in the State? **Patton** agreed. Senator **Hotek** asked if it is clear to the transfer student that he/she can be a "first-semester student" when reading that policy? It says "any first-semester student," and he wondered if that is clear enough to a transfer student? He personally would not know that that included transfer students in their first-semester at UNI. **Bauman** noted that if this seems to be unclear, they can make that language clear so that everyone--students, parents, faculty, staff--knows that they mean students who are attending UNI for their first semester. **East** agreed that it seems unclear. Additionally, he feels it is not stressed or made obvious in any way that only those first-semester students can get Academic Alert. He noted that it briefly comes out in the second sentence under Academic Probation that reads "continuing students" and suggested perhaps definitions to clarify, such as "A first-semester student is any student who has finished attending UNI for their first semester, either freshman or transfer." And "Continuing students are those who are in their second semester or have completed their second semester" or something along those lines. This might be very useful, he added.

From the audience, Jean **Neibauer** from Academic Advising wanted to reiterate what **Bauman** said about the fact that new students in their first semester often have many things that they are trying to acclimate to, whether they are freshman or transfers, and sometimes all of this gets ahead of them, and they do not do well. This new policy and its second chance seems more lenient, but actually she believes the policy is more rigorous for students because the unclear deficiency points have been

removed, and now it is very clear to students and very clear for advisors to be able to tell students just what is expected of them from now on. Even when they come for advice in the middle of the semester when having difficulties, it helps advisors to be able to articulate to them the expectations. The idea that a student can move through to being a senior and then not be able to graduate because of deficiency points--being so close and yet so far away--will no longer happen with the new policy which outlines very clearly all along how the student is doing. She added that it is much more rigorous, at the same time, as the student will be suspended earlier when the specific expectation has not been met.

Bauman offered an example that just today she talked with a student who wants to graduate this summer and who has a 1.99 gpa. She has never been suspended, and she wants to take 9 credits in the May Term--an overload. **Bauman** did not allow the student to do this. This new policy will help prevent that from happening.

Soneson called the question, after **Wurtz** moved through debate on the merits and pro/con points anyone wished to make prior to voting with no one speaking up. Nods all around approved calling the question. The motion up for vote was for approval of the new policy on Academic Standing for the 2011-2012 academic year. Passed with no opposition nor abstentions. Thanks were offered all around.

DOCKET #971 RESOLUTION FROM NISG REGARDING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSIGNMENTS (**DeBerg/East**)

DeBerg thanked the Northern Iowa Student Government for solidarity with faculty in what they think is a really important issue in regard to the quality of education here at the University. It is really great, she noted, when students recognize how important research is to teaching excellence and how important professional development leaves can be for a research agenda, and she thanked them again very much.

East also offered his thanks and extended that idea beyond research to the term "professional development" which should not necessarily be limited to research.

Soneson also offered his gratitude to the student present representing NISG, Kevin **Shannon**, and to the student government for offering this resolution. He thinks what it is really important to understand, and that the constituents of Iowa might not understand, is that higher education is really quite different than high school education and does require an advanced degree. But the advanced degree does not stop the day of graduation. It needs to continue on if professors are to be effective in introducing students to the latest knowledge and research. Professional development leaves make it possible for professors to do this.

Soneson also asked what NISG wants the Faculty Senate to do with this resolution presented? **Shannon**--who described himself as the Speaker of the Senate of the Northern Iowa Student Government, who is the chief executive of the legislative branch of NISG--directed faculty senators to the end of the resolution where the NISG senators asked him to send a copy of the resolution to the Faculty Senate. So he used the electronic application on the Faculty Senate website to forward that copy, mostly so that they would be aware that the students stand with them in support of these assignments but also in case they need to use this to show the student government's stand on these issues if they need to lobby or speak with legislators. He does not believe that any formal action is required back to NISG. **Soneson** clarified that the Senate would simply receive this then? **Shannon** agreed. **Wurtz** noted that the petition did say that the Senate could reply, if necessary.

Senator **Bruess** thanked the student senate and especially the representative from CSBS, **Parker**, in that they were also quite diligent in trying to clarify the deliberate obscuring of the State Legislature saying they are receiving "sabbaticals," which is a private school concept that does not apply to public institutions, at least in the State of Iowa. Their clarification that it is "professional development assignments" and not ranked as "sabbaticals" he feels is a really important clarification by the student senators.

The motion to receive their report, with thanks, was voted on and passed with no further discussion and no opposition nor abstentions.

DOCKET #973 RESOLUTION FROM NISG REGARDING PROPOSED DEAD DAYS
(**Soneson/Bruess**)

Soneson asked **Shannon** if the petition is asking the Faculty Senate to endorse their resolution, which is that a Dead Day be declared as the last day of the semester? **Shannon** agreed, noting that he is not sure what actions are available to the Faculty Senate in this instance, whether they can set a policy for all professors or make a recommendation to other bodies at the University. But he asked them to consider the idea of a Dead Day, and whether that would affect students, and then endorse the idea or whatever is appropriate. **Soneson** wished to clarify what the Senate would need to do. He is unsure if the Senate can just say that next semester this will begin.

Wurtz stated that the Faculty Senate is the voice for academic policy, so that is well within their jurisdiction. However, they do not simply pass policy. The Senate sends the policy forward to the particular university policy committee, which does include lawyers for any legal issues perhaps missed. If it does receive approval from the university-level policy committee, it then goes to the UNI Cabinet, and then has to be approved by the Board of Regents, at which point it would then become official policy.

Soneson expressed surprise that only one day was requested rather than perhaps the last week of classes, if not the last 2 weeks. He feels this is a discussion-worthy proposal because having that time at the end for students to write papers and to prepare for exams is an excellent idea. He personally has been under many types of academic schedules, and the one he liked the best, the one in which he most clearly flourished, included a 16-week semester (as UNI now has) with 12 weeks of class, 2 weeks of reading period, and then 2 weeks of finals. This has been proposed in the past at UNI with 2 groups resisting: one, the science area who want to have labs, and the other, the musicians who want to continue with practices/lessons and such. He feels that those things could still be arranged for but also have a week or two-week reading period for students. He noted that he would not change the proposal at this point, but he

suggested that if **Shannon** thought it was a good idea, then he might want to change it himself.

Wurtz asked speakers for efficiency as the Executive Session will begin in 15 minutes. **Funderburk** stated that he is supportive of the resolution but that it is slightly too broad. In his experience, when he has asked classes how to handle that day, they have asked to use that day for other than prep, particularly classes that involved presentation-based things. He asked for flexibility in accommodating such a policy depending on what the actual class may be. He personally does think that they should shut down rehearsals and such the last week of classes and allow students to have the time back, but not always are they, as professors, allowed to do that.

Bruess said this issue was addressed 2-3 years ago, and the decision became not to have any final exams given during the week prior to Finals Week but that unit exams were allowed or a quiz. He wondered if this resolution was asking to exclude all of that for the entire week. No, just the last day of class, many replied. The clarification was made that this meant the last day the particular class was to meet the week prior to Finals Week, which might not be a Friday. **Shannon** admitted that they were only asking for one day per class and was not sure that a full week was appropriate.

Smith voiced trouble in getting excited about this idea because students should be studying and doing work throughout the semester rather than cramming at the end. Current findings show that students are not learning as much from college as all would hope, so he is bothered by saying that they might take part of the semester that is dedicated to teaching and doing things and now call it catch-up time. He would have trouble supporting this resolution.

DeBerg disagreed with **Smith**, saying that this proposal does not say to not have class. This proposal does not say that class will be cancelled. This proposal said that the last unit exam, the last paper due, and the last set of truly new material should be given before the last day of class in any given semester. She wholeheartedly embraces this proposal. The class would still be meeting. They could do review and other things. Just the kind of summative things would not happen on the last day because the students

are gearing up for final exams. **Smith** noted that he would have thought that faculty in designing their courses would do that anyway. He had trouble thinking of what someone would do on the last day of class that the Senate would want to keep them from doing. **DeBerg** noted several things that some professors actually require that last day of classes.

Neuhaus expressed concern with calling it "dead," which conjures up the idea that everyone is just taking the day off. It might be therapeutic in one sense but not necessarily educational. Perhaps "Review Day" or "Study Day" or "Prep Day," something other than "Dead Day" would excite him more. He suspects that off-campus people looking at this might wonder why there is a day off that is called this. It might raise an eyebrow or two.

Funderburk noted that he can remember a number of classes he took that were going flat out on the last day, and that it would have been great to have had a day to actually try to talk about bringing everything together, a summation day he might call it. He knows that some of their colleagues today do push it to the wire in getting the last bit of information shoved in. Heads nodded all around.

Gallagher said that she thinks the students are simply asking in a nutshell for professors to be mindful of them. She does get a sense that for even the best students that she teaches things get pushed into that last minute, and these are things that they truly cannot prepare for, such as presentations, things that they really have to gear up for. For many students, it gets fairly impossible, even for students who are thoughtful about apportioning their workload. They are simply asking them to be mindful of that, and perhaps very often professors are not.

Lowell agreed with some of this. She used to think there was a rule or a procedure here that papers were not to be assigned that last week. She asked if she was mistaken about that? She began that way here and has never done it. She really cannot see having papers due and exams that last week. It does not make sense to her, not just the last day but the last week. She, however, may be one who might shove new material in on the last day, especially if there has been an illness or a snow day and there remains basic material that really needs to be gotten through. She does

not propose going overboard on it. Reviewing and pulling things together, she feels, should be done all along in classes, and students should be studying all along. Class presentation of some new material the students have read should be okay. She fears that 1-2 weeks of time off for some students would turn into party-time. **Wurtz** stated that it seems that in the past as long as an announcement was made early enough that those types of things could be done in that last week.

Soneson questioned **Shannon** whether if when the item came up for a vote did he want the Senate to vote on the current resolution or did he perhaps want to take it back to the student government for reconsideration?

Shannon said that the student government would be willing to look at this policy again based on comments made today; however, he does believe it could be simply voted on today.

East noted that in the past this type of thing has been submitted to the Educational Policies Committee (EPC) rather than coming directly to the Faculty Senate, and they have recommended something along the lines of going against the wording the students have submitted because the wording typically says "nothing new" or "nothing can be turned in," and that seems to breach academic freedom where faculty are told how they may not teach, which is the same thing as telling them how they must teach. So this is a problem for the Senate to pass something using this language, specifying to faculty how they must or must not behave in their own individual teaching. He thinks the wording that faculty have been willing to go along with is "nothing new be assigned" for that last week. He gave the example of giving students the entire semester to complete a paper which is due no later than the last day of classes, asking "What's the problem?" Whereas, if he were to tell students the week before the last week of classes, "Oh, you've got a paper due next week," and they only learn about it then, then that certainly is a problem. He thinks generally speaking that faculty will do what is reasonable, but if a rule is to be crafted that they must follow in their teaching, then it must be very carefully written and needs to be considered by a group who is looking out for academic freedom.

DeBerg stated that the Schedule of Classes tells faculty when they have to offer their classes. The Schedules tells when the semester starts and when it ends, and no one cries academic freedom about that. She sees this as just another basic rule of the road rather than having to do with academic freedom. She hopes that the Senate will pass it as it stands. She encouraged that the resolution name be changed to say "Review Day on Campus" or "Last Thoughts" or "Day for Summaries" or "Integration Day" or such. She said that she is ready to vote for this resolution now although the wording is not attractive.

Balong asked if the Senate could send this to the Educational Policy Commission which has a member from NISG on it, and maybe between them they could work on the wording issue or other concerns, and then bring it back to the Senate. That body would have faculty and students both working to craft something workable. She offered this as a suggestion.

Wurtz summarized the time remaining and the possible Senate actions.

Smith stated that he would be more comfortable with this if it were advising faculty, letting them know, recommending, but mandating does not strike him as a good thing. He is not concerned about academic freedom, but he is concerned about cutting out part of the semester. He fears that that last day, with nothing new lectured on or discussed, then it will turn into basically a free day. Thanksgiving Week was expanded recently, and more free days are not needed. More work days are. He has problems with the mandatory nature of it.

Funderburk remembers that this has come up once or twice in recent times and wondered if there is an issue with no enforcement or follow-through. He senses that most faculty do this anyway, but since it keeps coming up, obviously somebody is not doing it the way they keep talking about. But the Senate has no authority to enforce anything like this, no matter what they pass.

Wurtz summarized the motion as an endorsement of the policy which they would send through the pipeline to the policy committee, cabinet, regents. Vote failed. Chair **Wurtz** thanked **Shannon**, offering appreciation for the

work NISG has done on this and noting that the Senate shares their concern for this issue.

NEW BUSINESS

Terlip moved that they instead send this petition (1075/973) to the Educational Policies Commission Senate Committee. **Funderburk** seconded. No one offered discussion on the merits. **DeBerg** called the question. Vote passed with 3 in opposition.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate then moved into Executive Session for discussion of the ratification of nominees for Regents awards and a consultation with Provost **Gibson** on the current University Budget information.

The Senate unanimously endorsed the nominees for the Regents' Faculty Awards for Faculty Excellence. And Provost **Gibson** offered information about the current budget situation and recent changes and responded to questions.

ADJOURNMENT

The Senate arose from Executive Session, and the business for the day being accomplished, the chair declared the meeting adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss,
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate