

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
04/14/2014 (3:30-5:06 pm)
MTG # 1753

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Smith** called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

No reporter from the Waterloo Cedar Falls *Courier* was present.

Provost Gibson commented on her recent meetings with representatives of the Deloitte study group and Academic Affairs, and her confidence in their expertise. Deloitte expressed the desire to have opportunities to meet with faculty when they return next fall. Provost **Gibson** encourages faculty to be engaged in the process.

Faculty Chair Funderburk expressed gratitude to Provost Gibson for her service to UNI and on behalf of the faculty, wishes success in future endeavors. He reported that his committee is continuing to explore issues related to faculty voting rights. As this committee will continue work next fall, he encourages any interested faculty interested in serving to contact him. He explained the need to move to Executive Session in the meeting to discuss names of nominees for the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence and to discuss the status of the Administrative Review.

Senate Chair Smith commented that he was surprised to find that the initial review from the Deloitte Study will be limited to undergraduate programs. He also mentioned that the Regent's Performance-Based Task Force has received proposals from the three university presidents which will be submitted to the Regents in June. UNI's proposal tilts heavily towards basing allocations on the number of Iowa undergraduate students served. The Iowa Legislature

is expected to finalize the budget in the next two weeks. Student enrollment, he said, looks good. He reminded faculty to be mindful of the identity theft issue that has affected 230 UNI employees, and urged them to sign up by May 31 for the free credit protection services. Thanking NISG Vice President Blake Findley for his service to the Senate and UNI students, he recognized incoming NISG Vice President Paul Anderson.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

The Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for March 10 was approved without changes (Walters/Nelson)

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1239/1135 Request for Emeritus Status for James C. Walters

1246 /1142 Request for Emeritus Status for Gene M. Lutz

1247/1143 Request for Emeritus Status for Dharendra K. Vajpeyi

****Motion to docket in regular order as one item (Edginton/Peters)**

1240/1136: Request from Department of Technology to Change the Title of their Doctoral Program.

****Motion to docket in regular order (Kirmani/Nelson)**

1241/1137 The Election of Vice Chair/ Chair-Elect

****Motion to docket at the head of the order on 4/28 (OKane/Gould)**

1242/1138 Recommendations Regarding Regents Award for Faculty Excellence

****Motion to docket at the end of the order on 4/14 (Hakes/Nelson)**

1243/1139 Proposed Policy Number 2.04 Curriculum Management and Change

****Motion to docket in regular order (Kirmani/Edginton)**

1244/1140 Consultative Session with the Senate Budget Committee

****Motion to docket in regular order (Nelson/Walter)**

1245/1141 Consultative Session with Library Dean Chris Cox.

****Motion to docket in regular order (Gould/Nelson)**

4. New Business - none
5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1232/1128 Proposed Policy 2.13 Faculty Participation in University Planning and Budgeting

- **Motion to amend language (Edginton/Walter)
- **Motion approved as amended (O’Kane/Nelson)

1235/1131 Request for Emeritus Status for David Else, College of Education (Edginton/Nelson)

- **Motion passes

1236/1132 Faculty Regent Relations (Nelson/Terlip)

- ** Motion passes

1237/1133 Curriculum Management (Kirmani/Nelson)

Guest: Ira Simet

- ** Motion to divide; consider provisions two and three separately (Peters/Nelson)
- ** Motion to accept provisions two and three passes; provisions one and four to be considered at Fall Faculty Senate Retreat (Edginton/Nelson)

1242/1135 Recommendations Regarding Regents Award for Faculty Excellence (Heston/Nelson)

- ** Motion to extend meeting by ten minutes (Peters/Terlip)
- ** Motion to move to Executive Session (Peters/Hakes)
- ** Motion to return to regular session (Heston/Nelson)
- ** Motion passes

6. Old Business- none

7. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn (Walter/Gould)

Time: 5:06 pm

Next meeting: Monday, April 28, 2014 Oak Room, Maucker Union, 3:30 pm

Full Transcript of 38 pages, including 0 Addendum

**Full Transcript of the
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
04/14/2014 (3:30-5:06 pm)
MTG # 1753**

Press Identification: none

Present: Senators Karen Breithbach, Jennifer Cooley, Barbara Cutter, Forrest Dolgener, Chris Edginton, Todd Evans, Jeff Funderburk, Gretchen Gould, David Hakes, Melissa Heston, Vice-Chair Tim Kidd, Syed Kirmani, Lauren Nelson, Steve O’Kane, Scott Peters, Chair Jerry Smith, Jesse Swan, Senate Secretary Laura Terlip, Michael Walter.

Also Present: NISG Vice-President Blake Findley, Provost Gloria Gibson, Associate Provost Michael Licari, Associate Provost Nancy Lippens

Absent: Senators Melinda Boyd, Kim MacLin, Mitchell Strauss

Smith: My watch says 3:30. I don’t know if that’s good or not, but let’s call the meeting to order. Begin with press identification. I think we’re clean on press so that means we’ll go to comments from Provost **Gibson**.

Provost Gibson: I just have one quick comment. As you know, DeLoitte was here last week and spent the entire week on campus. They met with Academic Affairs Council. I had two meetings with them and they had meetings with Mike and Nancy and others of constituent groups. In my exit meeting, one of the concerns that they expressed was the fact that they wanted opportunities to meet with faculty. And so, I was very happy to hear that. I think this first trip really gave them an opportunity to meet with administrators, but they do understand, and this is the important point, they do understand the importance of meeting with the faculty. They do want opportunities. And so I suggested that they have follow-up conversations with the Faculty Senate, and I also suggested that they have follow-up conversations with the College Senates and that they may want

to think about having open forums at each College. So, that would give them an opportunity to meet more faculty. Of course, this isn't anything they'll have time to do when they come back in May, but perhaps they will get all of this scheduled when they do come back in the fall. So, I was impressed with each of the groups that I met with. They have, and especially the consultants for the academic side, they have a wealth of experience. My sense is that they are here to listen—listen to everyone and right now again to reiterate what the President has said: Its only Phase I and Phase II that have been contracted, so the implementation phase has not been discussed at this point in time. I thought they were good meetings and I would just encourage everyone, when they come back to campus, to be engaged in the process.

Smith: Thank you Provost **Gibson**.

Faculty Chair Funderburk Comments: (written statement)

In light of the announcement, I'd like to thank Provost Gibson on behalf of the faculty, for her service to UNI and wish her the best in all your future endeavors. As usual, we have a very busy April. I'm still working to develop a committee to explore issues related to the voting rights of faculty as they apply across the university. There have been several incidents in the past few weeks that highlight the need for a thorough review of this topic. I want to see a broad representation on the committee that will also include voices from those currently designated as non-voting faculty. I have some names of individuals interested in serving. If you would like to participate or know someone who you believe would be good to do this, please let me know. This committee will not finish its work this semester, so it's not a 'hurry up' thing. But, we'll take time to fully examine many of the issues related to voting rights before making any recommendations. As you know, and as the Provost just mentioned, representatives of DeLoitte Consulting were on campus last week, meeting with many individuals in regard to the Regents-directed Efficiency Study. I have initial conversations to try to organize an additional meeting or conference call with a larger group of faculty yet this semester. In order to help structure the opportunities for faculty input in the process during the fall semester, I've had three conversations with the board office and half a dozen emails with them. I expect I'll hear back from them in the next day or so. If this is successful, I'd

plan to be able to report back at our next meeting, either what has happened, or what we can plan, so far. Later in the meeting today I expect we will be discussing nominees for the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence. This discussion will need to happen in an Executive Session due to the need for confidentiality. I would ask that in addition to the discussion of Regents nominees, we would take a few minutes to discuss the status of the Administrative Review process undertaken this semester. Since the Executive Session does not include members of the Provost's Office, I'd like to have the review discussion in the Executive Session as well. And I'll seek your support at that time. That's all I have.

Smith: Thank you Jeffrey (Funderburk)

Senate Chair Smith Comments:

I'll provide a bit of update from this morning's Cabinet meeting. Again with regard to the Regent's Efficiency and Transformation Review, I think Provost Gibson has summarized the main things there, and the real point is that while the initial round here did not include a lot of faculty-heavy meetings, meetings with faculty per se, it's anticipated that there will be such meetings down the road as we move more heavily into looking at academic programs. One thing that was surprising though from the meeting I had, and Scott (Peters) was in that meeting and Tim (Kidd) as well. We were surprised to find out that their initial review of academic programs is limited to undergraduate programs and I don't quite understand the rationale for that. Maybe there is one, but it seemed kind of odd to us. Perhaps down the road they will also look at graduate programs, but initially not. Some other updates from this morning: The Regent's Performance-Based Funding Task Force--this is the one that's looking at how the Regents allocate or assign money from the State to the different Regents universities. They've gotten proposals from the three university presidents. They're preparing the proposals to submit to the Regents, probably sometime in June. Our proposal tilts the heaviest towards basing these allocations on the number of Iowa undergraduate students that are being served, not surprisingly, but I think, appropriately. And the President talked about the rationale for that at this morning's meeting, and I think he's got a good argument. Budget is being negotiated by legislators in Des Moines right now (and) expected to be finalized within

the next two weeks. So we'll know how things look there. I think people are guardedly optimistic about UNI on that. We were updated on the IRS identify theft issue which thus far has affected 230 UNI employees. (Yeah, I hope it's not me. I haven't looked.) [Laughter] We were also reminded to sign up for the free credit protection service from Experian. There's a May 31 deadline on that. (Since I haven't looked, obviously I haven't done that, either)

Finally, an update on enrollment: It looks very good. We were trending a bit better than last year and then as a result of work with the Royal Consultants: big bump. They're not sure what the conversion rate will be on that: if the interest in the applications will convert into matriculations, but it is certainly positive. It's looking pretty good there. And finally, I want to recognize our new NISG representative, starting with Vice President Paul Anderson, who will be joining us next year in replacement for existing NISG Vice President Blake Findley, and I want to thank Blake for the outstanding service he's provided to the Senate, the students and the university during this year. And while I'm at it, I might also recognize Kevin Gartman who is the NISG President and presumably, some point in time, he'll be visiting with the Senate as well. [applause] And that completes my comments.

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL March 10, 2014 meeting

Motion/Second

Walters/Nelson

Vote: passed, all aye

CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS FOR DOCKETING:

Smith: Now we get to consideration of items for docketing. You'll see a long list there: it's the end of the Academic Year Rush.

1239/1135 Request for Emeritus Status for James C. Walters to be combined is one that I explained in the meeting preview, I would like to combine with two more emeritus requests that I received after the agenda had been published. And I'm hoping to do this on one motion that will put these all on our docket. The two additional requests are
1246 /1142 Request for Emeritus Status for Gene Lutz

1247/1143 Request for Emeritus Status for Dhirendra Vajpeyi

Motion/Second
Edginton/Peters
No discussion
All aye

1240/1136: Request from Department of Technology to change the title of their Doctoral Program.

Kirmani/Nelson
All aye

1241/1137 The Election of Vice Chair/ Chair-Elect

Smith: We are required by our by-laws to address this at head of the order at the last regular meeting of the academic year. This will be at the head of our order on April 28.

Motion/Second
OKane/Gould
No discussion
All aye

1242/1138 Recommendations Regarding Regents Award for Faculty Excellence

Smith: As Jeffrey (**Funderburk**) alluded to, it needs to be discussed in Executive Session. I'd like to do that at the end of today's meeting. So, I'm asking for a motion to docket this as the last item to be discussed during today's meeting, which I suppose means at the end of today's business.

Motion/Second
Hakes/Nelson
No discussion
All aye

1243/1139 Proposed Policy Number 2.04 Curriculum Management and Change

Smith: This is a proposed change to the existing policy number 2.04 which proposes a number of revisions, some of which relate to item 1237/1133, the Curriculum Management item on today's agenda. I drafted this policy in hopes that the Senate might be able to take it up this semester and for that to happen, I need a motion to docket this in regular order.

Motion/Second
Kirmani/Edginton

No discussion

All aye

Smith: The penultimate item will be:

1244/1140 Consultative Session with the Senate Budget Committee

Smith: This committee is being chaired by our Vice Chair Tim Kidd. Its been meeting all semester in response to our charge. I wanted them to have an opportunity to make a verbal report to the Senate, so I need a motion to docket this in regular order.

Motion/Second
Nelson/Walter

No discussion

All aye

Smith: And finally, I think its finally we come to

1245/1141 Consultative Session with Library Dean Chris Cox.

Smith: Chris had asked to meet with the Senate at the start of the semester to talk about various matters, primarily the proposed redesign of the Rod Library. I wasn't willing to commit the time early in the semester because I wanted to make sure we had the time we needed for Curriculum and other matters. I told Chris that the Senate probably won't be able to have this Consultative Session this semester. It depends how things go. But

its iffy, but I agreed to try to have it docketed so that he will be able to meet with you at the latest next fall.

Motion/Second

Gould/Nelson

No discussion

All aye

NEW BUSINESS

Smith: We've done our docketing lickety-split. Does anybody have any new business to bring before the Senate? (No response) That done, we will move on to consider the items on today's docket.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

1232/1128 Proposed Policy 2.13 Faculty Participation in University Planning and Budgeting

Smith: Now if you'll recall, we discussed the need for such a policy last semester. I subsequently drafted policy, incorporating input from Senators **Peters** and **Gould**. Before discussing this further, I'd like a motion to approve this proposal.

Motion/Second

O'Kane/Nelson

Smith: Now, we're open for discussion and I'll just lead this off a bit. The policy would assure that faculty have input to planning and budgeting decisions at all levels of the university, from Department through College and Academic Affairs, to the university as a whole. Its provisions are consistent with the engagement and transparency promise to the faculty by President **Ruud**, and at our last meeting of the Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Vice President **Hager**. So, that said, any discussion of this?

Edginton: I think I mentioned last time we had a meeting that the bulk of funding that goes into Academic Affairs is for hiring of faculty. Faculty are our most important asset at the university, other than the great students that we have here. I feel very strongly that at the Department level the statement needs to be strengthened, especially as it relates to the review process that goes on, and I would suggest this, if I could. The first sentence is fine by me, the second sentence is fine, the first half of that's fine, but I believe it ought to be altered to read as follows: 'Consequently departmental faculty should --I think it should say SHALL --be involved with all planning and budgetary decisions regarding additions, changes to, faculty positions, and the terminations of academic programs. So, what I want to see in this document is something that strengthens the reference to faculty positions in particular. It could be done very easily.

Smith: Anybody care to comment on that because if you want to do that, we'll have to do it as an amendment. Let's get some comments first to see how that looks for people. People comfortable with Senator **Edginton's** idea?

Cutte: I like that idea a lot. I would also suggest that related to that there is a statement on the very bottom of the first page that says 'finally while the policy encourages university administrator ... it recognizes that administrators are ultimately responsible for making related decisions. I think there might be a word missing there. But, my main comment is that what Senator Edginton is bringing up suggests that-- I don't think that ALL of these decisions would be ones that ...We might want to say that administrators are ultimately responsible, but faculty have a joint role in making these decisions about hiring and curriculum-related budget decisions, so maybe altering that language talking about joint effort, rather than just that that faculty role is advisory only. If faculty's role is advisory only, then you get back to the situation where in one of these hiring situations, one could say, 'Well, they listened to the faculty but then they decided to hire someone in a different field instead.'

Smith: Am I mistaken though? Is that NOT the prerogative of the administration? On hiring decisions?

Cutter: No, not hiring decisions. That's not what I was talking about. I mean a decision in the department about what kind of line to search for; something like that.

Edginton: That's my concern also. I understand: ultimately, Search Committees bring names forward, weighing pros and cons, and then administrators are going to make that final decision in terms of who gets hired. But, the conversation that goes on **before** that, about how those resources are to be allocated, and how they're to be framed, in terms of decision making-- ought to be a shared process between the faculty and the administration. And, I think if administrators operate unilaterally here, then this notion of shared governance is going to be viable.

Smith: I think what we're coming down to is the issue: do faculty **input** or is it do faculty **share** ultimate authority? (decision-making authority) And, I'm not sure how administrators feel, but my assumption was when I drafted the policy was a belief that, yeah, we need to make sure that faculty have input, but in doing so, I don't think we have the right to claim that faculty have the **authority** to make these decisions.

Peters: Chris (**Edginton**), I understand the goal you're after. So if we're looking at the first three sentences of that paragraph, bullet-point department. The second sentence is what you're thinking about changing -- that second sentence is about the role of faculty in programs. So, they're involved in planning academic programs, budgetary decisions in regard to additions to, and terminations of academic program. Then it's the next sentence that says, 'They should also participate in searches for faculty and other instructional staff.' So, I wonder if its that next sentence that should be strengthened in some way, if you're trying to get at the role in hiring?

Edginton: I think that we assume that faculty are involved in searches; that's the way the system is set up. It's that before the search occurs, it's the process of decision making about how resources are allocated with departments or colleges that need to be addressed. All I'm suggesting is that just a couple of words really strengthens that concern.

Peters: Could it be something more like, 'faculty should/shall be involved in all planning, budgetary and (I don't know) personnel decisions' would be too broad.

Edginton: Changes to faculty lines. How about something like that? I just think you have to have the term "faculty" in there.

Peters: How about 'additions, changes to, and terminations of academic programs, as well as 'additional faculty lines.' It's just the way it read. The subject there, all of those other terms there, operate on changes to academic programs, terminations of academic programs—and inserting something that has to do with personnel right in the middle of those two things, I thought made it actually more confusing, rather than clearer. That's my only point.

Edginton: Well, if something read this way, Jerry, if I could just say this. 'All planning and budgetary decisions regarding the faculty positions and the terminations of academic programs.' That simplifies it, in my mind; solves the problem.

Smith: Let me see. Are you talking about that second sentence then?

Edginton: Yes

Smith: Departmental Faculty should be involved in all...

Edginton: ...planning and budgetary decisions regarding faculty positions and termination of academic programs.

Terlip: That leaves out 'additions and changes.'

Peters: How about just inserting 'faculty positions'. How about inserting that between 'regarding faculty positions, and additions, changes to, or termination of academic programs?'

Edginton: That's very acceptable to me.

Cutter: And changing should to 'shall or will'?

Edginton: Yes, I would put 'shall.'

[Smith is editing proposal]

Terlip: Can I add another word? Could we say, "Shall be involved in **meaningful**? [Laughs] ...in a meaningful, or timely, or something like that?

Smith: 'Shall be involved in all planning and budgetary decisions' (help me out here Chris **(Edginton)**)

Terlip: 'regarding...'

Edginton: 'additions...'

Terlip: No. 'regarding faculty positions'

Edginton: 'regarding faculty positions AND additions, changes to, and terminations of academic programs.'

Smith: Are you comfortable with that?

Edginton: One other comment I would make is, I think the whole statement, that the word 'should' be removed and the word "shall" should be inserted.

Smith: I have never been a big "shall" guy. (Laughter) And personally, I don't understand the difference in force between them—those two. To me, they seem the same. But I guess I'm not the legal type.

Edginton: Well, I'm not going to press it if I get the other one.

Smith: Okay. Everybody is comfortable with this and so then; you're prepared to propose that as an amendment?

Edginton: Yes

Smith: So, you move that we amend the policy written originally to read as follows.

**Motion to amend/second:
Edginton/Walter**

Smith: Any discussion of the amendment?

Terlip: I just have a question about that. I threw this out, out of turn, I admit it. But 'shall be involved' can mean very little. It can be consultation five minutes before something is due, so, I'm wondering if we could also insert the words 'Should be meaningfully involved.' Or, is that muddying the waters too much?

Smith: Personally, yes.

Terlip: I was expecting this. [Laughter]

Edginton: If we take this back to where the process hasn't been transparent. Especially when you talk about faculty voting on allocation of resources there, you can say, 'Hey wait a minute, we need to back up a step here.' And, the faculty needs to be involved; the whole faculty.

Cutter: And that is where I came up with the idea of a joint effort in making decisions; to make this meaningful involvement.

Smith: Any more discussion of the amendment?

All aye

Smith: That amendment is approved and we're back to the motion of the policy as amended. [Proposal up on screen] Still any other discussion? Are we ready to vote on the policy as amended?

**Motion Approved as Amended
All aye**

Smith: The next item on today's docket is more straightforward.

Peters: Just a clarification in terms of what this means: assuming that we're operating under the not yet fully functional policy-policy. This means that we now put this out there for people to comment on, right?

Smith: We send it to the PRC and they will put it out and then it will come back and we'll get comments. You're not done with this. I am, but you're not. [Laughter]

1235/1131 Request for Emeritus Status for David Else, College of Education

Motion/Second Edginton/Nelson

Smith: To begin the discussion, while I did not receive a statement from Professor **Else's** Department, I want to invite any of you or anyone else in attendance, who is familiar with Professor Else's contribution to the university, to say a few words on behalf of this request. So, are there any comments to that effect?

Heston: I move to correct the pronunciation. It's David Else, just like its spelled.

Smith: There were Else's in my town where I grew up.

Heston: There may be "Elzees" in your town, but this is "Else".

Smith: Thank you very much.

Heston: Sorry.

Smith: No, I'm sorry. Goodness. I need to get my German right. Then, I believe we're ready to vote on this Emeritus request.

Motion Passes: All aye

1236/1132 Faculty Regent Relations

Smith: This concerns a request by the Regents ...a request **to** the Regents to provide for faculty participation in lunches when they meet at each of the three universities. Before discussing this in greater detail, I'd like a motion to approve this proposal.

Motion/Second Nelson/Terlip

Smith: And now the discussion. I don't know if I need to repeat the full backstory on this, but I will if you'd like me to. The idea came up in February when the Regents met here. Its been supported by everyone who's been asked about it and apparently there are parallel requests underway at ISU and also in Iowa City; something very similar. If the Senate approves this petition, it will be written up as a proposal for signatures by me, Provost Gibson, and President Ruud. [I can bring that up in a minute (on screen)] Signed copies of the proposal will then be transmitted to Board President Rastetter and Executive Director Donley. Assuming they receive similar proposals from Iowa and Iowa State, I suspect they're highly likely to go along with this. Then it will be up to future Senates, working with the Provost and Board Office to work out the details and implement the course of action. But, is there any other discussion of this?

[No discussion]

Smith: Basically, I don't know if you recall when I talked about this once upon a time, but what we're proposing is, when Regents meet on a campus, we would arrange to have faculty, not just faculty leaders, which is done currently, but faculty, often based on a theme. One of the Regents, Mulholland suggested just come back off PDA's. Having them, and they would be spread around and they would be able to meet with the Regents and by doing so, we can get better understanding; faculty would get better understanding of the Regents. That's the motivation here: to improve communication and understanding between the two constituencies. So, that's the thrust. This is the way we talked about doing it. Our counterparts

at Iowa and Iowa State are on board with it. They might have some slightly different wording and stuff but you put something out and it is likely we'll end up that effectively achieves that goal. So, is there any further discussion of this proposal?

All aye

Smith: We have now reached what might be termed the 'main course' of today's meeting:

1237/1133 Curriculum Management

Smith: This is a report and set of recommendations that have been prepared for the Senate by the committee that the Senate established in the Fall of 2012 for purposes of reviewing and potentially proposing changes to our current practices for managing the curriculum. Four Senators: Senator **Cutter, Evans, Terlip** and myself, all members of this committee are currently at the table and we also were joined by **Gale Pohl**, who is a member of this committee. I had thought we would be joined by Ira Simet, who is the Chair of our committee, and who was going to talk about it; he drafted the report. I assumed he would be here to talk about it, but he is not here. We've got plenty of people who can talk about it so for that talking to happen, I'd like to get a motion to approve this proposal.

**Motion/Second
Kirmani/Nelson**

Smith: We are now ready to discuss it. I was going to give the floor to Professor Simet, instead, (does) anybody from the committee care to start the talk or are you going to leave it on me? Thank you Barbara (**Cutter**)

Cutter: Its not, (I mean, other members of the committee chime in) it seems like one of the things that happened is there were a lot of discussions that we had within this committee and a lot of discussions that we had with meeting with UCC and other groups last spring. It seems like we have some general recommendations. Originally, they were more specific recommendations, but, basically they caused a lot of arguments.

So, we've got a recommendation to create a centralized committee to monitor the health of all academic programs. There was a debate over how often they should review them. But, as Ira (**Simet**) put it, the "faculty were most supportive of a mid-year review." Something like, since programs are reviewed every seven years, this would have a review in year three or four, in addition, because seven years seemed too long. A mid-year (cycle) review and to have this be...

[Simet arrives]

Cutter: We started without you, but you can pick up.

Smith: Sorry, Ira. The Senate's been just zipping right along. We got to where you're on the stage a lot quicker than I thought. [Senator] **Cutter** was filling in for you here.

Simet: Should she keep on going?

Cutter: I just had hardly started. I talked about how we had a lot of feedback and a lot of conversation about where there seemed to be more consensus and where there seemed to be less consensus on the frequency of review; that we thought of having a three or four-year review instead of the standard program review.

Simet: Okay. To pick up from there, when we originally formulated the proposal and we brought to you last year, one of the big concerns was that we didn't have a regular schedule for monitoring programs; a centralized way to do that; a faculty. We couldn't really agree on how long a timetable for that, so we started with the most extreme one, which would be to review all programs every year. And, that met with a lot of resistance when we took that around to various faculty groups for two reasons. First of all, there was great concern about how much work that was going to be. The other concern was: Do we really have to look at things every single year to be able to see indications of program health? We thought that seven years, the current cycle, is too long. So the question was, just how much to shorten it. The consensus was more like a default position was that about a mid-cycle review would be recommended because programs couldn't fall into such disrepair within three years. They couldn't go from something

that was very healthy to something that was very much in danger or at risk of being deemed vulnerable. So, three years seemed to be the interval that was settled on. Then the question was 'how deep a review' we should have. Again, we went for something that was I guess was a little bit shallower than the first, when we were just going to be reviewing programs every seven years. But, every year, there were probably a couple of key indicators that we could watch year by year and get an indication of if the programs were healthy or not. If we were going to go every three years, we'd have to go a little deeper than that. So, we started to modify the original proposal both for interval and depth. So from shallow reviews frequently, we leaned more toward moderate review at moderate intervals is what we came to, and that seemed to satisfy most of the faculty. Certainly, there was much less opposition to that model than the original model that we had. There's still some concern about faculty working to see the-- under number one in the revised proposal there, there were four concerns and the fourth one, faculty services, is the stickiest spot. Even a moderate level review every three years is going to be substantially more work than is currently done by the faculty in this area. We're not sure that we could go any lower on either of those things. A moderate level of review allows us to go beyond simple numerical criteria, to get a more thorough discussion going. But, it also is not so burdensome as to have to do that every year.

Still, nobody could come up with a good suggestion as to which existing group would take on this additional responsibility. The committee can correct me if I'm wrong, but I didn't sense any great enthusiasm for creating an entirely new committee. I think what we got was, 'let's figure out which group could add this to their current duties without being completely overwhelmed'. Of course, when we asked every one of those groups, they assured us that they would be. So, the University Curriculum Committee was one of the possibilities, since they do things like this, and there would be a corresponding work for the graduate college as well. Another group that was suggested was the current Academic Program Review committee, which does this sort of thing, except that their job up to this point has been more helping programs prepare their self-studies, as opposed to actually using the review criteria. So, this would represent a shift in the focus in that committee plus that committee could have a conflict of interest here, since I chair it. That committee works extremely

hard in the month of October. We get somewhere between ten and twenty of those self-studies every year and have just a month to review them, send back comments and then follow-up if there are any deemed unacceptable. So, they get them back and review them again. So, that committee works very hard, but most of their work is in the fall, so at least at one meeting it was suggested that this be some springtime follow-up, so that the workload would balance. Still, it's a lot of work for this committee. Didn't hear too many other suggestions for committees that could add on these responsibilities. So, it's something we decided to leave and see what kinds of ideas we could get out of discussion. Perhaps you'll have some ideas. So, this is pretty much where that first proposal has come to: that's the critical point of the proposal that we're making at this point --is to find a way to get the faculty voice or a faculty awareness of program health onto a regular basis, so that programs can be alerted that they're starting to exhibit some signs of wear and tear that might not be immediately obvious to the faculty.

OKane: I'm curious. Who carries out the seven-year review?

Simet: Its mostly a pair of external reviewers. Certainly the Program faculty, they write a self-study that reflects their point of view. That self-study is [a] fairly thorough document. It follows some guidelines for construction that we have used before, at least the 12 years I've instructed, they haven't changed much. Self-study is then shared with external reviewers who come in, talk with faculty, administrators, students very often, to get their perspective; to fill out their perspective. They write a report and then the Program faculty get a copy of that report, and they review it with the Dean and the Associate Provost and Provost and try to come up with a plan based on that report that will guide them for the next seven years. The Academic Review committee is only involved at the very front end of that while the self study is being done.

Peters: I'm trying to think of ways that we could almost (it might not be the best word) automate mid-point evaluation in a way that it wouldn't burden faculty very much. Could you require the program to report back to the Senate? Or report back to the UCC or something, say three years after their--a short report --I don't want to burden departments too much either,

don't get me wrong, but a short report back to the UCC , say, three years after a program review, that highlights what the department has done in response to that review. Or could we, the Senate and the Provost's Office work together to require the CIO's office to generate some certain data that would go to the UCC or the Senate or every three years after a program review that would facilitate that? I'm just trying to think of ways that the burden wouldn't be on faculty committees to gather a whole bunch of data.

Terlip: I was wondering as you were talking about a template for a program review: Has it been done? It sounds like maybe there could be a modification of that, which would include what Scott (**Peters**) is talking about as part of the process. And then maybe if there are other unwieldy features, like having them all due in October or something, we could look at how we do program reviews so that this could be thrown in to make it easier to accomplish the self-study.

Pohl: I'm sitting in for Marilyn, (Shaw) by the way. Much of this information is already gathered every year in the SOA plans. So, we have a lot of this data already. Especially if you do SOA like we do in our department, which is extremely expensive. We have a lot of this data, so it's not that we're gathering data, just out of the blue, we have this data if you're doing your SOA plans. So, I think it's going to be much more easily generated than what people are thinking.

Smith: I am a member of the committee, and I am of course opinionated, so let me throw my stuff on the table here. First off, I support the recommendations here because I think they are terribly generalized, and I believe that if the Senate approves them, then down the road, the Senate whatever device is established, can work out the details and make this work. I believe that there should be an ongoing monitoring. You can do that on the basis of data that's provided routinely now from various sources. Departments generate reports so we've never, in any of our deliberations, asked for the development of new reports by anybody, but the monitoring can be done to the point where every year you can simply look at numbers on enrollments and things like that. Course enrollments, program enrollments; its just right there, and its no big deal to look at that.

What you're looking for are programs that are having trouble so that you can let them know, 'you've got trouble.' I also think that the Senate, drawing on whatever body provides this, and I would suggest a new committee, needs to be in a position, when the Provost comes and says, 'Hey, I've got some money and we've got recommendations in different places to put it, where do you, the faculty, believe that we ought to invest new faculty resources? I think the Senate also should be in a position to say, on an on-going basis, 'Gee, these are the programs that we think are troubled and give that information to the Provost, to the Senate, to the Provost so that she can make decisions if necessary. I don't think we'll have to make those kinds of decisions in the near future, but we should be ready for them. I favor having a new committee do this. Nobody we talked to wanted to do it. They were very adamant about that. I think we should have a new committee that does this, and you can do it using existing information sources. Once you get it up and running, I don't think this will be an onerous burden. That's my three cents.

Cutter: Some of the indicators that we were looking at to get a broader view, like SOA, is one of those things that people will have on hand even that will help us with quality of the program. But, there's also some things that are going to require some work and thought, like centrality to UNI's mission, the uniqueness of the program, other quality indicators that you might want to talk about that don't come out in your SOA. Because one of the things that came up a lot is that if we just rely on numbers, then, we're going to get a very one-sided picture of the programs that don't take a lot of these things into consideration. So it will require some work, even if they're doing it every three or four years. I think it will sort of (cause) programs to think in those ways more often, and you can alter some of the things you collect. If we try to make this incredibly easy, we'll just come up with something that's about enrollment numbers which I don't think is what we want to go through--evaluating programs just on that. That's one of the reasons that (and I hate to even say this with Ira in the room), but that's one of the reasons that if the Academic Program Review Committee could be expanded, so it's not the same amount of people with all that work. That they're the ones that read program reviews, so even though they don't act on them, they would be the ones who would be reading the

program review and be most familiar with that kind of information, as opposed to a new committee, a curriculum committee. It seemed like it would be the easiest to expand their duties and maybe expand members.

Hakes: I have served on the Program Committee with Ira (**Simet**). Would it be possible to use our program review, even though we're only involved at the front end, we have always recognized that while we can't suggest what programs are exemplary, with our reading of the program reviews, we can tell which programs are in disarray. Now, it's possible that on the front end that we can accept a subset, possibly, of programs for a mid-term review, as opposed to this on-going, everybody (review) and shrink the job. We all know when we're reading these, we know when we see quality. And from having been on the committee for many reviews, then you have a reference point from which to gauge and maybe we could... So what happens when we see a program that has problems, and then come back later seven years later and then they say, so? We could have a subset, where we work with the Provost's office to highlight programs that we think have difficulty and then do further reviews on those programs. So that we see if they're making any progress over that seven year period. It would shrink the job and focus it where its needed, rather than having quality programs just constantly reporting more information, and make them angry, and then they don't like the process, and rightfully so.

Peters: I like that idea. Let me just ask a question. Let's say the Political Science department is reviewed and our external reviewers come back and say, 'You've had declining numbers for a few years, and this is a national problem in Political Science, and we found some programs for you that are bucking that trend and here's what they've been doing, and here's what we recommend, that you make these changes.' And we say, 'We hate those programs. They make no sense to us. That's not real Political Science. We don't care about the trends. We refuse to do it.'" So, what do Provost Gibson and Associate Provost Licari, and our dean-- what do they do to us when we say, 'Forget those external reviewers, we are not making changes.' What happens? And, our numbers continue to decline, by the way. We've got some centers of excellence, we've got some good faculty, we've got some good students, but some of the problems that the external

reviewers pointed out go unaddressed for seven years. What happens to us?

Provost Gibson: I'm not going to answer that question. [Laughter]

Peters: Just as a hypothetical! I want to make it clear, since my department head does read minutes. This is a hypothetical.

Gibson: Let me just say that it is important-- the metrics, because you're also going to have the Board of Regents and our performance funding metrics; you're also going to have other metrics that will be put in place. I'm not saying what the weight of those should be, versus some of the other things you're mentioning, but as you look at the health of programs, that data is going to be important because its important to the Board of Regents. So, enrollments are going to be important, matriculation through the programs are going to be important, what are retention rates there, and of course, completion rates are going to be important. So I think you can sort of come up with other criteria, but whenever -- but it's going to be May, June before that committee, David Miles' committee, is finished with their work. There's no way you can just sort of divorce what you're doing from the recommendations of that committee.

Dolgener: I just think it makes a lot of sense, what Senator **Hakes** said, that you key in on some of these key metrics that **Dr. Gibson** was talking about, and you identify some degree of deviance from what you think is appropriate, and then programs that falling below that level are the ones that get that mid-year [cycle] review. Ones that are able to maintain students and good graduation rates, etc...forget about for seven years.

Edginton: Where does faculty scholarship fit into the review process in productivity? We talk about benchmarking on the Board of Regents and we see that at Iowa State, they're benchmarking percent of a salary in terms of generating extra funds; percent of the entire unit in generating extramural funds. I'm just wondering if, given our historical mission focused on teaching, we haven't done enough in this document to address the issue of faculty productivity outside of the realm of student achievement.

Smith: I would respond to that. Our committee wasn't focused on identifying the criteria that would be used to evaluate programs. It was more concerned with identifying a process. I think that's an accurate statement.

Cutter: Yes. That's true but we also tried to do some open-ended language so that stuff could be put in. It could be put in Program Quality.

Heston: I'd like to follow up to some extent on Senator's Peter's hypothetical. I guess my concern is this: How do you ever close the loop, so there actually are consequences, and 'who gets to decide that?' We just approved a policy that will be reviewed, which gave faculty a lot more say, at least in principle in program closures et cetera, and yet we're looking at situation where we may have weak programs. And our faculty is going to have more say in this if the policy is approved. Is the faculty going to be willing to follow through and the loop be closed? Because that's what we're talking about. We're talking about faculty saying eventually, not the Board of Regents, not the... Are we going to let them close programs and then say we didn't want to take responsibility for it? We want to have major input. I agree, don't review anybody more than you absolutely need to. It makes no sense. Faculty have enough to do. But, the hard part of this is closing the loop and figuring out how to reconcile the realities of faculty exercising their academic freedom and believing what they're doing is really best, even though their numbers are going down; they have a level of expertise and knowledge that we would accord them, and their numbers are going down. How do we reconcile the fact that their vision of what their discipline is really, fundamentally about, isn't selling? It's not selling and should that be a marker of what we keep or don't keep? I think this is a very difficult thing to think about. I mean, its easy to think about in the short term. Its going to be difficult to implement, and I think we should think hard about really working out those implementation things and how we close the loop, rather than say 'lets put in another review process,' but not have it be any more... no more power to close the loop, and have consequences. Why aren't deans and department heads –why would any program not come back seven years later and still be in bad shape? Why has that been allowed to happen? That's somebody's responsibility.

Hakes: Well, maybe I'm still thinking of the review process, or a narrower sense of it. I'm imagining certain things Senator Peters is concerned about: not responding to exactly what the outside reviewers suggested. The next review always requires you to address it, and say 'why did you not..' If you disagree, fundamentally disagree, you just have to address it. You don't have to do everything the reviewers said. But, I'm imagining a process where we determine the true outliers. I mean, real outliers. We're not talking about half or a third of people below, but we have a few outlier qualities. Those programs should be aware that they're going to be scrutinized and it's amazing though how sometimes just putting the light of day on a program does get some response. And, sometimes the major problems are personnel and we can't fix that. You say, 'Why is a program still having problems seven years later?' Is it because the same people are there that were there seven years ago?

Heston: And they're choosing who gets hired to come in after them.

Hakes: Yes. Exactly.

Cutter: I don't think that we need to be sort of imagining that like we're going to be targeting a bunch of programs and shutting them down, I think. I really like Senator Hakes's idea of looking at outliers, and giving them advice, giving them resources, giving them opportunities to make some changes. There are all kinds of ways to put pressure on a program, short of shutting it down, like, 'Hey, if your enrollments keep going down, you're not going to get to replace any of your lines.' This should motivate. I think this would motivate people in general. I don't think we need to think of the worst-case scenario like a mythical department that refuses to anything ever and doesn't care that it's losing lines-- that sort of thing.

Kidd: I like the idea of using the seven-year review process to identify programs that are, you know, troublesome, but I also think that using an annual generated data set from IT would also be useful for doing the same kind of thing. I don't know if we would have to actually look at every department's class size, but I would hope that there's a data base that could be gained from examining classes with under a certain population or

a full enrollment classes, just to take a look and see if different majors, programs, whatever, need more resources for teaching. I'm not sure how to do that so much with quality issues, like research, to me is a very important thing, which I'm not sure how to address so easily. But, at least for simple graduation metrics that are important to, like Gloria (**Gibson**) says, the Board of Regents, I think we should keep track of that, because if we don't, they will, and that's not a good thing.

Terlip: I think I'm almost echoing what Tim (**Kidd**) just said, but I think part of our charge, initially, the reason for this committee, was not only to take responsibility for dealing with difficult people, but also to be able to promote what's good. So if we only flag what's bad, and the Board of Regents, or someone else comes up, we're still going to have to scramble to form an argument in response to an outside or external threat. So I think we can't lose that piece, whether its everybody turns in numbers, or institutional research method, or we get it from SOA, I think we need to agree on what we want to use as a selling point.

Cutter: And this data is all collected. I would want to issue a caution against scrutinizing that data every year because what you're going to end up doing is—you know, we can't all grow our programs all the time. We're going to have more students hopefully, but, we're not going to have an infinite number of students. I mean, President Ruud has said he does not want unlimited growth: This is going to be capped. And, what this is going to mean is that there's always going to be some people who will grow a little bit in enrollments and some people who will go down a little bit enrollments. It's actually mathematically impossible that we are all going to keep growing. So, I think the key is trends; longer term trends, significant dips, things like that. And I think if we're looking at these, scrutinizing these numbers **every** year, we're going to end up alienating certain departments that are doing a good job, but they're just having slightly lower enrollments for a year or two. I don't think we want to call people in at the drop of a hat. There's not going to be any support for this.

Smith: I'd like to comment on that. I support reviewing the numbers every year, but that doesn't mean I support meeting or even talking to departments every year. You'd only do that if you saw the trend year-to-

year. But, it on a year-to-year basis it seems to me to make sense to at least look at the numbers and the information, because its available. I come from a business background. Corporations, they're viewing this stuff every month, if not more often. Yeah, it takes time here, but nonetheless, year-to-year is not excessive for performance monitoring. But, I think we're next with Professor **Simet**.

Simet: I want to point out a number I threw in here that might have gotten in under your radar: It's the number of programs that have actually been eliminated. We're not talking about the fact that no programs are ever eliminated. So, sort of a jolt that this type of review process would reveal: 50 previously unnoticed declining programs. The faculty is already pretty good at finding those. The faculty are pretty good at finding what's outmoded or getting some decline in the track with students and eliminating them when they fall below a satisfactory level for the faculty. What we're worried about are the people who can find a rationale for what looks like subtle changes to them, but other people's experiences suggests that it's the beginning of a negative trend. You could clue them in at the beginning if they looked like outliers. I like David (**Hakes**) phraseology of outliers. You can let them know that what they're going through **is** atypical, then they can take some steps to think about it a little bit harder, as opposed to just waiting for it to recover on its own. They can actually be active about it. I think that was more what we had in mind in the original proposal. We suggested that programs that were deemed outliers, would be put in touch with those who had suffered through the same types of problems to see if they could come up with some ideas. And, that's exactly what external review does: It puts programs in contact with people who may have gone through these conditions before and have a new way to look at them.

Evans: To support what Ira (**Simet**) is saying, it doesn't necessarily have to be a punitive committee... So there's not a mass scramble if there's a budget crisis. The information is out there it's not necessarily the faculty's decision to close a program. But, we're just sort of collecting data and it also helps a program that may have numbers that are low, to build up a response ahead of time, or to do something to grow their program ahead of a crisis. If our overall goal is to increase enrollment, if we do that at the

program level by identifying a program that may have dipped, and helping that program grow, that is a good thing. It could be helpful rather than punitive, so to speak.

Heston: Don't programs already typically keep track of their enrollment levels year to year? So why would a program theoretically need a 'heads up' if they're seeing a trend?

Smith: In a way its a 'heads up' is a kind of boost...

Heston: It's kind of like a shove? A nudge? 'You're ignoring reality.'

Smith: In a way its a 'heads up' also to the administration, I would think, and to the Senate as a whole; to the faculty as a whole.

Peters: So back to the mechanism for doing this, for a moment. I'm going to channel Chris Neuhaus, and point out that it's very difficult for the Committee on Committees to get people to run for things. The ballot for university-wide groups has a couple of positions that maybe only one person is running for. I heard, you know that Ira (**Simet**) said that they talked a lot about who would do this and what kind of committee it would be. Could an existing committee do it? So along those lines, I guess I really like Senator Hakes idea of ... Is there some way to take existing committees and maybe build this into their responsibility? Ask the Academic Program Review Committee to follow up with some programs, you know, whether there could be some other information made available to the UCC about the health of particular programs so they could know to ask more questions, when/if those programs came along and proposed new courses. You know, are there ways to add relatively small responsibilities, or just get more information to existing committees rather than create an additional committee?

Heston: I actually think that's sort of interesting. We've always treated these Academic Program Reviews as highly confidential. They don't get shared widely, yet we do have a University Curriculum Committee that is making decisions about curriculum In the absence of what might be necessary to really understand the viability of a program, making particular

curricular changes. So it seems to me that there might be some, not the whole report perhaps, some abbreviated portion of that report that we all get to see before we say 'Yes, you can add these courses' or 'No, you can't add these courses because you haven't addressed these issues.' We seem to operate in terms of little vacuums and we make decisions in ignorance a lot of times, not because we intend to, but because we don't have access to information that might be really useful in making a good and reasonable decision.

Terlip: To go along with that, maybe the UCC in terms of curricular changes can revise their questions and ask for that kind of information on curricular changes from the Program Review and make sure that whether the department or the committee submits it, its included.

Smith: Let me ..

Simet: I'm not exactly sure, but I think that in referring to documents that have to be submitted when you're proposing a new major or even a new course, that there's a place that asks, pretty much, 'Where did you get that idea?' My sense is that if it comes out of SOA initiatives that that carries a little bit of weight. And perhaps if you're creating this new major in response to an urgent request from your external reviewers. I've seen lines like that before on proposals. So, there's a little place in there, it's just not very complete. I don't know exactly how much weight that carries.

Terlip: And if it's not there, the committee doesn't know to ask. You can choose as Scott (**Peters**) said, to ignore everything the reviewers had to say, and still build new curriculum in line with what you've been doing. It would be helpful I think, if they knew it went against the program reviewers.

Simet: To answer that question, the meeting where the Program faculty get together with the Dean, and the Associate Provost and sometimes the Provost, is the place where some of that gets worked out. Because if you want to go completely against what the external reviewers are suggesting, you better have a pretty good case, or you're going to get counter arguments, and then there's a negotiation that takes place there. Its possible to do that, I think. I know, because my own department has turned

down some suggestions from outside, but we have not thrown anybody's report out completely and said, 'You guys didn't know what you're talking about.' These are things we think we can do, and the Dean says I think you can also, I'm supportive of those. Then you have at least some direction about what you're doing. I think that's built in. Again, its not complete.

Smith: Not to curtail or truncate this discussion, I just wanted to point out that this proposal has really four proposals here. Hopefully, the rest aren't as controversial as the first. The second was to amend the curricular process to allow proposals each year, rather than alternate years. The idea here was to get the Senate stating, 'Yeah, we're on board with speeding up the curriculum process rather than having a two-year cycle, you can offer, you can generate curriculum proposals every year. We want the Senate to basically endorse that. The third proposal was to divide the curricular process with distinct and different tracks with more substantive changes and less substantive changes. The idea there was to go to, I'm thinking, UCC and GCCC or whatever has to be changed in the curriculum process, perhaps with the curriculum handbook, but try to find ways to triage between the stuff that requires an intensive review at all stages, and the stuff that could be done with a much faster review, and by doing that, make the overall process more efficient. Then, the final proposal: it says, 'consider the Faculty Senate the curricular implications of expansions, divisions and mergers of colleges, departments and programs.' I'm not sure what the thrust of that was. Ira? What?

Simet: I think that just was spawned by some concerns about mergers of departments or shifting things around. Not, perhaps, having a lot of faculty voice as that was going on. So, the gist of all these proposals was to enlarge the faculty voice in a lot of procedures that are programmatic-type procedures. I think that one just kind of got swept in there. We couldn't put expansions and divisions and mergers under this first [part about] monitoring existing programs so we expanded it a little to include other changes that affect programs.

Smith: Going back, unless people have concerns about the other three, I'm going back to the first recommendation: 'create a centralized faculty committee to monitor the health of all academic programs.' A lot of stuff

we've talked about, you know, could be encompassed under that, but the main issue that we seem to have right now is, should we have a new committee to do this OR should we try to have this done through an existing committee? What I'm hearing is maybe academic program review committee could do it. So, that's, I think where we're at right now. Any further discussion?

Cutter: I would like to say that I like Senator Hakes idea of just doing the outlier review, not doing all programs, and that that could also help with making it more manageable for people. If they want more people, maybe...

Smith: See, the question I have with that is what do we do when the Provost comes to us and says, 'Where should we put additional academic resources? Which program should I grow?' And shouldn't faculty have been put into that?

Cutter: That's a really good point, but that would require having reviewed them. You'd be looking at their seven-year review and deciding, 'Are they outliers?' But, I guess in that process you could note exemplary programs or something.

Nelson: I think there can be outliers in more than one direction, so a program that has incredible growth or some quality that [has provided] new opportunities in emerging areas where people want to take courses—those are outliers as well in a positive way.

Smith: Okay

Nelson: The concern I would have about only relying on information about outliers that are struggling in some ways, [is that] there may be changes that need to occur in terms of the traditional offerings. You don't always want to say, 'We'll put resources into programs that struggle.' I think sometimes, changing where you allocate resources would make sense. I think there's a quality level of review that we need to be very careful about.

Cooley: I think that if you want to ensure that this is not a punitive process, we have to at least conceptualize the possibility of giving the outliers- the

negative outliers, more resources. This has to be stated as one of the possible solutions to the problem.

Nelson: I'm not against it being a possible solution, just saying that whether you decide on that depends on a qualitative review of a situation. Not that just that they are numerically an outlier, but looking at, 'Is this an opportunity for this university that we are missing out on?' And if it is, certainly then I could see putting resources into a program. But, at the same time, those outliers that are on the other side of the equation, those that have undergone growth, there's a penalty there. There's almost a sense within programs that grow that they would be better of not growing because your workload goes up phenomenally to deal with large numbers of students. If you don't have additional resources to deal with them, so what is the benefit of having all those students in your program? You'd be better off doing things to discourage them.

Funderburk: A procedural thing to note is that it makes a lot of sense to have this in the Academic Program Review Committee, but if I understand, that's the committee of the Provost, and so therefore, the Senate can't act to change or assign a request because the Provost would decide such a thing. Its something else to consider in all this. Don't have the authority, and if you want to mandate any kind of reporting, to this body, it would not be the committee to do it through.

[Aside comments about Ira owing a six-pack. Laughter]

Smith: Any other discussion of this?

Nelson: There is almost too much in this document to act on because we have four very different provisions. So what is the way forward here? Do we have something specific in them for the Senate to say 'yes' to?

Smith: We might pare down and approve certain of the recommendations and hold off on the others.

Peters: The committee, which has been meeting for two years now and has done a ton of work and has met with people all over campus—and I thank

you all for it very much, because I'm the one who got you into it—so I probably you owe you a six-pack as well. [Laughter] Recommendations two and three here were originally made a year ago, haven't changed. I've heard literally no opposition from anybody about these recommendations in the past year, and they're things the faculty can do entirely on our own. We do not need administrative approval to do them. All we need to do is rewrite the curriculum handbook. We can do that ourselves. The curriculum handbook gets approved by us, and that's it. So, I think that we should do that. I think that we should—the Senate—should endorse those two recommendations immediately, and I'd be willing to make it a motion to that effect. If we should, I don't know, instruct some kind of ...Ira (**Simet**) exactly what kind of process we need to go about changing the curriculum handbook, but get an ad hoc committee and Senators together to write up provisions to the curriculum handbook so that handbook could be formally approved in the fall.

Smith: So, with regard to the motion on the floor that consists of four recommendations, I'm hearing a willingness to support two and three, and perhaps four, but I'm hearing a lot of mixed emotions about number one.

Peters: I think four is covered by the policy. I would, if there's enough support, to make it worth the time to do it, I would say we should divide the question to consider parts two and three separately, and then endorse later.

Smith: Should I take that as a motion to divide the question?

Peters: Sure.

Smith: What we're dividing is two and three as a separate issue. One and four remain behind? Second for that?

Motion/Second

Peters/Nelson

All aye

Smith: Discussion? All in favor of dividing the question?

All aye

Smith: Its divided and I assume now (that) you would like to act on two and three which are now the questions on the floor? Motion to approve the second and third of these motions?

**Motion/Second
Peters/Kirmani**

Smith: Discussion of that? All in favor, please say aye

All aye

Smith: So we've approved the second and third of these recommendations, the first and fourth now stand unapproved. It's a separate issue. Do we want to take that up? Do we want to table it? Where do we want to go with it? Could we get some resolution?

Nelson: I do not want to advocate not having us do something on this. There's real merit in the work that the committee brought forward. The faculty would desire a process like that in number four. So I was not advocating dropping it. It just seems like we don't have something specific yet to endorse.

Edginton: Therefore, I think we should table it until we can we get more specific guidelines back from the subcommittee.

Smith: Don't count on the committee.

Cutter: I would say that we realize that the recommendation is up in the air, and I think we needed Faculty Senate input. So I think faculty is going to have to play a role further.

Funderburk: Could it be tabled specifically to be brought up by the Senate at its fall retreat?

Smith: That sounds good. Vote all in favor of tabling the rest of this, which is basically one and 4 to be brought up at the fall Senate Retreat, assuming there is such.

Motion/Second
Edginton/Nelson
Vote all aye

Smith: Motion carries. We've completed that item—those items. Next item on our docket, and we're running out of time.

Peters: So just one point, number four. I think the policy that you drafted that we docketed earlier sort of covers the fourth proposal here, but I just want to remind you that in that policy you drafted there is a specific paragraph on the Curriculum Management Committee which we just refused to pass.

Smith: Right. With the one that was docketed. That will have to, when it comes up for discussion, I will either revise it before then or I will make changes.

Terlip: I also think that we need to follow up on Scott's (**Peters**) motion that we need to get a group together to review the curriculum policy and procedures that will go into place early next year, because if we wait, we're not going to have time to do that, so we can get this triage process going. I don't know if you need a motion or...

Smith: I had planned to write up the petition that would be docketed at our next meeting that was going to address some of the curriculum issues that we encountered two months ago. Make sure you've got those front and center for the Senate to address. Presumably, the stuff you're talking about would be part of that. The addressing issues of curriculum policy and procedures in general. I'm open to whatever you want to put in there. You folks can decide what you put in there, but if we get it on our agenda, then at some point it keeps in front and the Senate will act on it. You can address it in their retreat as well. Are you comfortable doing it that way?

Terlip: But we've already passed the triage policy. We'll have to have...We need to do some work to get that in place.

Smith: So, you're talking about implementing that and, I don't know. Do we need another motion on that kind of stuff?

Licari: Thanks. I guess I do have a couple of comments to make on the curricular cycle issue. That is, that Secretary **Terlip** is exactly correct, that these procedural issues need to be decided relatively quickly. If we move to an annual catalog of curricular development, we'll have to start at the program level, at the departmental level in January of 2015. So the sooner in the fall that the Senate is able to get all of this done, the sooner the faculty will understand what the new cycle is, and they will begin to be able to act within the new process. Regarding the changes to the curricular handbook, I think a subcommittee of faculty, Senate members to revise that document is a good idea. I only ask that I be added as an ex officio member, so that there are Iowa Code mandates and Board of Regents mandates that we need to follow then. We can't just throw out the existing handbook.

Terlip: We would want people from the Registrar's Office.

Licari: Yes

Smith: Do we want a motion then, to form a subcommittee that would undertake these tasks, or can we just do that?

Peters: The Chair can do that.

Smith: Do I have the authority from you to put together a subcommittee to do that? (Except that I retire in a month.) I think that we're done with this item and we are running out of time. We still have on our agenda what we have to do today is **1242/1135 Recommendations Regarding Regents Award for Faculty Excellence** and that's a discussion that requires that we go into Executive Session. At which I'll also discuss another matter that Chair Funderburk brought up, so at this point I need a motion to go into Executive Session.

Peters: You'll probably need a motion to extend the meeting, first.

Smith: Okay. Give me the motion to extend by ten minutes.

Motion/Second

Peters/Terlip

All aye

Smith: We're extended for ten minutes. Let's go into Executive Session

Motion/Second

Peters/Hakes

Peters: You should state for the minutes the true purpose of going into Executive Session.

Smith: The purpose of going into Executive Session is to discuss the recommendations regarding Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence as well as the Provost Review Process that has been undertaken and the disposition of that process. So those are the intents. We need a two thirds vote to go into Executive Session.

All aye

Smith: Sounds like two thirds to me, and that means we get to clear the room. Stop recording. Let us know. Ready?

[Room is cleared and recording stopped]

[Session Resumed six minutes later]

Smith: We need to complete our work on Calendar item 1242 /1138. I need a motion to approve those recommendations.

Motion/Second

Heston/Nelson

Smith: Any discussion we would have would not breach our commitment to confidentiality. Is there any such discussion? Then we are ready to vote.

All aye

Smith: That gets us to our last, our final item of business is the motion to adjourn. Do you really want to vote on that?

Kidd: I think the Senate really does need to weigh in. The provisions do not allow a committee to...

Smith: Motion to stop the review of the Provost?

**Motion/Second
Edginton/Hakes**

Smith: Any discussion? All in favor of stopping that review?

All aye

Smith: That passes, which gets us to our final item, motion to adjourn

**Motion/Second
Walter/Gould
Passes by acclamation.**

Smith: We will meet for our final session in two weeks. I hope to see you then.

Adjourn: 5:06 pm
Kathy Sundstedt
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:
Monday, April 28, 2014 Oak Room, Maucker Union 3:30 p.m.

Follows are 0 addenda to these Minutes.