

Regular Meeting  
**UNI Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**04/28/2014 (3:30-5:04)**  
**MTG #1754**

**SUMMARY MINUTES**

**Summary of Main Points**

1. Courtesy Announcements

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

Mackenzie **Elmer** of the *Waterloo Courier* and Amber **Rouse** of the *Northern Iowan* were present.

**Provost Gibson** thanked Faculty Senate leadership and Senate members, the faculty and staff, for their work through both difficult and good times, adding that she apologizes for any faculty who may have been offended or hurt by her in any way. She expressed the desire that the legislature and citizens of Iowa value the importance and uniqueness of the University of Northern Iowa as they move forward.

**Faculty Chair Funderburk Comments** explained that a review of faculty voting rights has found that rights as described in the constitution are not uniformly used on campus. He included a list of voting and non-voting members willing to serve on a committee to explore and suggest possible amendments. As he leaves his post as Faculty Chair, he extends gratitude to those who have offered advice and support and best wishes to Scott Peters, Faculty Chair Elect.

**Senate Chair Smith Comments** recognized and thanked departing Provost Gloria **Gibson**, Faculty Chair Jeff **Funderburk**, Senate Members Siyed **Kirmani** and Scott **Peters**, Senate Assistant & Transcriptionist Sherry **Nuss**. He also solicited for additional members to serve on the ad hoc Senate Curriculum Committee. He introduced VP Terry **Hogan**, to speak on the fall 2014 new students welcome.

**Hogan** explained that planning is underway for new events to welcome new students to UNI next fall. There will be more time allotted and expanded content,

which will include contact points between faculty and students. Hogan invited faculty involvement, stressing that student-faculty-program connections are critical to student retention.

## 2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

Minutes for March 24, 2014 were approved without changes **Edginton/Nelson**

Minutes for April 14, 2014 were approved without changes **Dolgener/Kirmani**

## 3. Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

**1248/1144** University Writing Committee Report and Recommendations.  
Motion to docket in regular order (**Nelson/Gould**).

## 4. New Business

\*\* Motion to ask the Administration to suspend the approval process for this policy until the fall semester Proposed Policy on Background Checks (**Heston/O’Kane**). Passed.

## 5. Consideration of Docketed Items

**1241 1137** Election of Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect (head of the order) (**O’Kane/Gould**)

\*\* Motion to move into Executive Session to consider candidates Edginton & Nelson (**Walters/Peters**).

\*\*Rose from Executive Session.

\*\*Senator Nelson elected as vice-chair/chair elect.

**1238 1134** Resolution to Encourage Contribution to the UNI Institutional Repository and to Initiate Discussions about Open Access (**Marshall/Peters**).

\*\*Motion to approve (**Gould/Cooley**). Passed.

**1239 1135** Request for Emeritus Status, James C. Walters (**Edginton/Peters**)

\*\*Motion to endorse emeritus request (**Walter/Edginton**). Passed.

**1246 1142** Request for Emeritus Status, Gene M. Lutz (**Edginton/Peters**)

\*\*Motion to endorse emeritus request (**Nelson/O’Kane**). Passed.

**1247 1143** Request for Emeritus Status, Dhirendra K. Vajpeyi (**Edginton/Peters**)  
\*\*Motion to endorse emeritus request (**Peters/Edginton**). Passed.

**1240 1136** Curriculum Change, Department of Technology (**Kirmani/Edginton**)  
\*\* Motion to approve the name change from Doctor of Technology to Doctor of Industrial Technology (**Kirmani/Peters**). Passed.

**1243 1139** Proposed Policy #2.04: Curriculum Management and Change  
(**Nelson/Kirmani**)

\*\*Motion to amend (**Cutter/O’Kane**). Passed.

\*\*Motion to amend (**Cutter/O’Kane**). Passed.

\*\*Motion to table pending further discussion in the fall (**Peters/Swan**). Passed.

## 6. Adjournment

\*\*Motion to adjourn (**Gould/no second**) Passed by acclamation; meeting adjourned at 5:04 PM.

Next Meeting:

Date: August 25, 2014

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

**Full transcript follows of 33 pages, including 3 Addenda.**

Regular Meeting  
**Faculty Senate Meeting**

**04/28/2014 (3:30-5:04)**

**MTG #1754**

**Present:** Senators Melinda Boyd, Karen Breitbach, Jennifer Cooley, Barbara Cutter, Forrest Dolgener, Chris Edginton, Gretchen Gould, Melissa Heston, Vice-Chair Tim Kidd, Syed Kirmani, Lauren Nelson, Steve O’Kane, Scott Peters, Marilyn Shaw, Chair Jerry Smith, Jesse Swan, Senate Secretary Laura Terlip, Michael Walter.

**Also Present:** Faculty Chair Jeff Funderburk, Provost Gloria Gibson, Associate Provost Michael Licari, Associate Provost Nancy Lippens

**Absent:** Senators Todd Evans, David Hakes, Kim Maclin, Gary Shontz

**Guests:** VP Terry Hogan, Kristin Woods, Jordan Bancroft Smith, Ellen Neuhaus, Katherine Martin, Thomas Kessler, Mohammed Fahmy,

## **1. Courtesy Announcements**

**Smith:** I’m going to call the meeting to order. We will begin as usual with our Courtesy Announcements and Press Identification. Apparently not, and then comments from Provost **Gibson**.

**Gibson:** I was going to write a long speech, but I didn’t [laughter]. I just want to give out some appreciations. I want to say thank you to Jerry and to Tim. I think they’ve done an extraordinary job this year. I want to give a shout out to Jeff. He’s done an extraordinary job this year. I also appreciate the work last year of Scott and I appreciate the work of the Faculty Senate. We’ve been through some rough times. We’ve been through some good times. I think when you look back, we’ve had budgetary challenges and if we could have done it differently, we certainly would have done it differently. What I would hope is for the future, that the legislature and the citizens of Iowa understand the importance of the University of Northern Iowa and the uniqueness of this institution, and how very important this institution is. And so I do appreciate your work. I appreciate the work of the faculty and staff. I have enjoyed working with faculty, staff and students for the five years that I have been here. There are probably not a lot, but there a few people, who –I don’t know a tactful way to say this—I guess for people who for

the faculty and staff who I have offended; who I have hurt in any way, I offer my apologies, and I hope that UNI can move forward, because that's what's most important—that the institution would move forward. And, I would hope that in some small way, that what I'm saying and offering can help individuals and the institution to do that. And I think that's all I need to say, but thank you.

**Heston:** I know I'm out of order. But, I feel compelled to acknowledge three things that I particularly appreciate about what has happened in the past several years with the Provost's leadership. Cornerstone as a foundational course, the Multi-Cultural Awareness efforts that have taken place out of her office, and the support that she gave to teacher education, because we were facing a no-go kind of review because of our governance structure and we could not get traction with either of the previous provosts. Neither one would listen. And in the first month, I went to **this** provost and said, 'We need help from the upper administration,' and we got it, and it made a huge difference. So all else aside, I **very** much appreciate those particular actions that have, from my perspective, strengthened the university and particularly strengthened Teacher Education, given other things that have happened.

**Gibson:** Thank you.

**Smith:** Thank you Senator Heston. Before proceeding with comments from Faculty Chair Funderburk, I do want to acknowledge for the minutes that we have been joined by Mackenzie Elmer from the *Waterloo Courier*, as our press representative for today. [Amber Rouse from *The Northern lowan* was also present] And now we will hear comments from faculty chair Funderburk.

**Funderburk:** Good afternoon! I want to bring you up to speed on the review of faculty voting rights I announced at an earlier Senate meeting. After a number of issues and discussions this year, I have begun to form a committee to explore issues related to faculty voting rights. It has become clear that voting rights as described in the Faculty Constitution are not being used uniformly across the campus. It also appears that our current definition of voting rights is not aligned with the AAUP's current guidelines regarding the inclusion in governance of faculty members holding contingent appointments. The committee is made up of voting faculty members as well as representatives from the 'non-voting ranks.' I wanted at least two from the 'non-voting' ranks who will vote on this committee.

Of course, any changes recommended by the committee that would require a change to the faculty governing documents and that will have to pass a vote of the full 'voting' faculty.

I am asking the committee to consider the following:

- \* Are faculty voting rights as described in the Faculty Constitution adequately defined for the institution as it currently exists?
- \* Are the voting rights defined in the faculty constitution meant to govern all votes in all departments and committees across the campus?
- \* Should voting rights be extended to additional faculty members who hold contingent appointments?

So, should the committee feel it needs additional information or resources to fulfill its charge, it is free to reach out to other groups on campus as needed, such as the local AAUP chapter for example. In the event this committee determines that changes or clarifications are needed, it should draft language to amend the Faculty Constitution, which can then be considered and ultimately voted on by the full faculty. After our discussion today, I plan to circulate a list of current committee members and the charge to the College Senate Chairs to gain any additional suggestions in the event that a particular perspective is being overlooked that should be represented.

At this point, the following have agreed to serve: Scott **Peters**/Jeff Funderburk (as **Peters** becomes Chair, I have agreed to serve in his place), Chris **Edginton**, Chris **Neuhaus**, **Jesse Swan**, and then two representatives from the non-voting faculty: Marilyn **Shaw** and Michael **Prahl** have agreed to serve. In addition, I have asked Associate Provost **Lippens** to serve as a non-voting member of the committee since her position is involved with the collecting of information for the faculty roster, and also fields many questions related to this issue. If you have any particular questions or suggestions, please let me know. I don't know that we have time today, but fire me an email if you like, unless somebody has something quick that I can clarify. [pause] Nothing? Good.

On another unrelated issue, today will be my last regular meeting of the Faculty Senate as Chair of the Faculty. This completes my eighth straight year of involvement on the Faculty Senate, which I think is sufficient. [laughter] I want to thank you for the opportunity to serve for the past three years as Senate Chair

and then the last two terms as Chair of the Faculty. We've had more than our fair share of challenges during that time. I want to extend a special thanks in particular to all of the senators during this period who were always willing to lend a hand, give advice and offer more than enough corrections when necessary. Your support and assistance have been greatly appreciated.

I also want to congratulate our Faculty Chair-Elect, Scott **Peters**, who will begin his term in the Fall Semester. I look forward to working with Scott this summer as he transitions into a large number of new and exciting committee assignments!

**Smith:** Thank you, Faculty Chair Funderburk. I will begin my comments by turning the floor over to Jordan Bancroft Smith. To Terry **Hogan**, instead, who is going to speak with us about the planning being done for the arrival of new students in the fall, if I'm not mistaken.

**VP Hogan:** Yes. Thank you Mr. Chair and Jordan. We just wanted to take a moment before this academic year came to a close to brief the Senate on plans that are evolving for this next fall and in fact for the following fall, relative to how the campus welcomes the entering new student body. And we've had a good deal of enthusiastic planning so that this fall, we will be, among other things, we will be reaching out to departments of all types across the entire campus to become involved in this process of welcoming the new student body. It will be generally fun stuff, but we wanted you to know it was coming and to ask if you in your various department levels or you could act as a Senate, how you might want to be involved in that process. The goal that the committee's been working on is going to be to break it down into small chunks so folks might make a two-hour commitment to being involved in the process, but when added up to all the two-hour commitments, it presents to new students and their families, a really positive representation of the university. A second piece for this coming year is in consultation with the President's Office, and this is where Jordan and his role will be involved. I neglected to introduce Kristin Woods, who's our Assistant Dean of Students who leads our retention and orientation efforts. Is the creation of a new Student Convocation. Some of you may recall that there was a period of time where there was one of those held on this campus. It's a common feature in campuses across the country. Folks are paying particular attention to learning from our last experience about what worked well and what didn't, in terms of the nature of the event and the timing and so on. But we're anticipating that this fall

we will have a convocation-- a gathering of all new first year students--symbolically and practically indicating the start of the new year. I'll leave it at that, as it is yet to be fully defined.

**Hogan:** The other piece I would share with you is that for the following fall, the committee that's been working on this is looking --it looks as though the key pieces are in place to have the opening weekend be expanded so that its more than just a weekend, and starts on a Wednesday. And a key reason for that is to be able to develop ideas about how students, new students, find points of connection with their academic programs early in the process. So historically, what's happened is that it's been all about residence halls and dining halls and co-curricular, and what we know is that the degree to which students find a point of connection that's meaningful to them in the institution is critical to their retention, their success, how they feel about the place. So, the expansion, the time and hours that are created are going to be largely devoted to how students connect to their programs or if they're deciding students, we obviously will accommodate them, but how do they connect to their programs, their colleges, their faculty, their future faculty and so on. I wanted to alert you to that and let you know that planning is in the early stages-- they're being planned now. Kristin and her colleagues on the Retention Council, which Mike (**Licari**) chairs, has been a starting point of this, but then there's been a committee put together to work in particular. If you have any thoughts about that question, 'How do we connect new students to their academic programs?' as part of a welcome activity, you might reach out to myself or Kristin. And relative to the Convocation, Jordan is involved in helping to lead the planning of that Convocation this fall, and may present another opportunity where we invite faculty, or perhaps it's faculty who teach first-year classes or it's Cornerstone faculty--yet to be determined, but there'd be opportunity there as well. So, that was all. I just wanted to alert you to those things that were in the works.

**Smith:** Thank you Vice President Hogan. Any questions?

**Heston:** Who are the faculty participating in all this planning?

**Kristin Woods:** The expanded committee for the early move-in program for Fall '15 has not been fully formed yet. But informally we've talked with Advising Council and so April **Chatham-Carpenter** has been up until now has been the



Chair of that, and then we've talked with our First-Year Only Faculty and the Cornerstone Faculty, so we don't have—we haven't locked in the committee for Fall '15, but we would take recommendations.

**Heston:** I'm not going to recommend any particular faculty, but I do strongly encourage you to make sure that faculty have a very active voice in this.

**Smith:** Yeah, one comment that I'd like to be made is that there are a number of faculty-type events in that first week, so you want to make sure you coordinate schedule in conjunction with the faculty events in the fall—faculty workshop, things like that. Any other comments or questions? Thank you.

**Hogan:** Thank you very much Jerry (**Smith**)

**Smith:** Next thing I want to do is repeat my solicitation for volunteers to serve on an ad hoc Senate Curriculum Committee, which will among other things, make arrangements for implementing the changes to the curriculum process that were approved at our last meeting, April 14. As well as addressing curriculum policy matters that surfaced when we approved curriculum packages earlier this year. As of now, Melissa **Heston**, Scott **Peters** and Tim **Kidd** have agreed to serve on this committee. I wouldn't mind having a few more, and they don't necessarily have to be people on the Senate. We have other people who are interested in curriculum I know, Melissa (**Heston**) is going to be on the UCC so probably it would be nice to have someone from the GCCC as well, I know we're going to have Assistant Provost **Licari** involved in that effort but, let me know if you're interested and we'll take it from there.

One other point of information, just so you know, I arranged for flowers to be delivered to Sherry **Nuss** on behalf of the Senate, as a token of our appreciation for her years of outstanding service as Transcriptionist and Administrative Assistant. Then, this being the Senate's last meeting of the academic year, in addition to holding an election, we will also be expressing our appreciation for the service of senators who are completing their terms in office. There are three such people. I'm going to ask our incoming Chair Tim **Kidd** to present certificates of appreciation to two of them: Syed **Kirmani** and Scott **Peters**, both of whom are completing a three-year term on the Senate, and on behalf of the Senate, I want to thank you both for your outstanding service to the faculty and to the Senate.

[applause]. At the risk of being redundant, I have some other departures to acknowledge: that of Chair of the Faculty, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, who before serving two years in that position, served on the Senate, with his final year being the Senate Chair. On behalf of the Senate and the faculty, I want to thank you, Jeffrey for your years of outstanding service. [applause]

And this also marks, I believe, the final Senate meeting for Provost **Gibson**. On behalf of the Senate I want to express our appreciation for her years of service to UNI and the faculty. Yes, there were some rough spots, but no one who knows her could ever doubt Provost Gibson's concern for this university, its students, staff and faculty. We appreciate your taking the time to attend and participate in Senate meetings during the past five years, and we wish you the best in all your future endeavors. [applause]

**Gibson:** Thank you.

#### **MINUTES FOR APPROVAL:**

**Smith:** Now, as reported on the agenda, the minutes of our March 24 meeting have been reviewed and are ready for approval by the Senate and subsequent posting and distribution to the faculty.

**Motion/Second : Edginton/Nelson**

**Motion passes, no nos**

**Smith:** Before moving on to our next item of business, I'd like to ask the Senate's permission to also approve the minutes of our April 14 meeting. It wasn't listed on the agenda, but the minutes have, I believe, completed our usual review process and are ready for approval.

**Motion/Second: Dolgener/Kirmani**

**Smith:** Discussion of this. If we don't approve them today, we'll probably want to do so, presumably by email during the next several weeks, which is going to be true for today's minutes as well. We're not going to want to wait til the fall before these things get distributed, so I'd like to get them approved and these can get

out. We will have to do an email solicitation, presumably early in May to address these minutes, if you're comfortable with that. Again in doing that solicitation, I would hope it would be okay with you (that) after they've gone through our review process, first through the officers, and then being circulated to you all, if I can take non-responses as approval, because I'm suspecting a lot of you aren't going to respond to the emails. But if you're comfortable with that, then once I had enough actual responses, unless I have negative responses, those minutes would be approved, if you're okay with that. Right now the question on the floor is approval of the April 14 minutes. I've had a motion and a second. Any further discussion of this? [no response]

**Vote: Motion passed, one 'no'**

### **Consideration of ITEMS FOR DOCKETING:**

#### **1248/1144 University Writing Committee Report and Recommendations**

**Motion/Second: Nelson/Gould** to docket in regular order

**Smith:** To start off this discussion, this item relates to a charge we made to the University Writing Committee earlier this year to develop a proposal for improving student writing. Senator **Nelson** has been our representative on that committee. They've completed a draft report, which is posted with the petition. They've secured the endorsement of the Liberal Arts Core Committee for the report and their recommendations. We wanted to get this on the Senate's docket so that it could be taken up early in the fall. Any more discussion of this matter?

**All aye to docket in regular order**

### **NEW BUSINESS**

**Smith:** Indeed we do have an item of New Business. It was suggested both by myself and Senator **Heston** almost simultaneously. This is the proposed new policy that I circulated to you all on background checks. We were notified of this last week. It's generated some discussion, initiated primarily by Senator **Heston** and so I was hoping that Melissa (**Heston**), that you could start us off, discussing your concerns on this.

**Heston:** I have a variety of concerns. There are specific concerns as the policy is written and I'll address those specifically through the mechanism. My bigger concern at the moment is the timing. It's coming out at the very end of the academic year. I'm not sure and clear on the policy approval process: when people give feedback, if there's another round of revisions and it comes back. So, my concern is that the Faculty Senate as a body is facing a situation where there may be a policy put into place that we've not really had a chance to review, get information about, ask questions of. That may not be an issue for most of the faculty, or others on the Senate, but it's an issue for me. I would like to make the motion. I'm not sure the correct procedure, Jesse (**Swan**) will correct me, I'd like to make the motion that this policy, any further administrative action on this policy, be held. That the Senate recommend that any further action on this policy be held until the beginning of the fall academic semester, so that faculty, Senate, and other bodies have a full and complete opportunity to participate in the vetting of the policy.

**Motion/Second: Heston/O'Kane**

**Swan:** By beginning, does that mean that the beginning of the semester we agree to begin to consider to start gathering information, not that action can be taken at the beginning of the semester.

**Heston:** Right. What I'd like to see is that the review process is halted and really initiated in the fall at the beginning of the semester. I may have worded that poorly, but that's my intent. I'd really rather us start with this policy in the fall and the review process rather than try and either squeeze it in or make rapid responses that may not be particularly useful.

**Smith:** As I see the issue on the floor is for the Senate to ask that the review process on this policy proposal be halted, stopped-- until the start of the fall semester. And at that point, the Senate and other relevant parties can weigh in on it. Is there any further discussion of that?

**Peters:** I support Senator **Heston's** motion. As a point of information, just remind people that the changes that we put forward to the policy making process, that still have not been finalized but maybe will soon. I believe they allow for the

administration to put temporary policies into place during the summer that they would then revisit and make permanent at a later date. Just so people are aware it could very well happen they say, 'We'll respect the Senate's wishes here and we won't put it firmly into policy, but we'll enact it on a temporary basis to be reviewed later.'

**Smith:** Yes, I would second Senator **Peters'** point.

**Peters:** It's just speculation, but I'm saying that allowance was made in the policy-making process that we put forward.

**Smith:** If there is resistance to what we're doing, and saying, 'We've got to get this done' we could, I suspect, get them to agree to follow the proposed new policy, which the administration has been pretty on-board with, which would make this; the approval process would continue, but the policy itself if approved would be done on a temporary, contingent basis, and subject to review in the fall. It may not be necessary to do that, but it's a plausible fall-back position. Okay? Having said that, is there any more discussion on this matter? [pause] Then we are ready to vote. All in favor of this motion to call for a halt and ask the administration to stop or delay further development or review of this policy.

**All aye; motion carries**

## **CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

**Smith:** The first item on our docket, **1241/1137 Election of Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect**. I'd like to begin our work on this item by asking Scott **Peters**, a member of the nominating committee to inform the Senate of the results of the committee's efforts.

**Peters:** The nominating committee met. We had reached out to a number of people on the Senate and the committee which was comprised of myself and Chair Smith and Senator Kirmani, agreed to put forward two nominees to be Vice-Chair and Chair-Elect and they are Lauren **Nelson** and Chris **Edginton**.

**Smith:** Thank you, Scott (Peters) We have two nominees for this position. We can also entertain nominations from the floor, which I am hereby soliciting. [Pause] Hearing none, then at this point, nominations are closed and I'm going to ask each of our nominees to make a short statement in regards to their nomination. After which, the Senate will go into closed session with our nominees also absenting themselves. And in that closed session we'll discuss the matter and vote and then come back and [report]. So, we'll do this alphabetically. Senator Edginton...

**Swan:** We can't vote in Executive Session. So we can decide how we want to vote.

**Smith:** That's what I'm intending. We'd report and then we'd have another vote.

**Swan:** An actual vote?

**Smith:** That's right. In Executive Session, we can find the substance of the matter.

**Edginton:** It's been an honor to have been a member of the Senate for the past three years. There have been some challenging issues, but I take great solace in the fact that we worked through these issues in, I think, a rather logical and rational fashion to bring our faculty's views to the administration of the university. I think it's very important that the Senate remain a strong voice on behalf of the faculty, and I think that indeed we have over the last several years, expressing the viewpoint. I have not sought this position. I don't lust after the Chair's position, but when called to serve, I indicated I would serve. So, I hope that the Senate consider my candidacy a worthwhile and viable one, and consider electing me to the Chair's position.

**Smith:** Thank you Senator **Edginton**, and now Senator **Nelson**.

**Nelson:** I also agreed to serve. I did not put my own name forward. I think my view on serving is that someone has to step forward and take on the position, and I would be happy to do so if I were elected. I do not bring my own personal agenda to the Chair's position. But I bring a commitment from many years of service and faculty government in a variety of roles, to make sure that the faculty voice is brought forward and that issues that come to us get full discussion in the Senate, and an opportunity for us to act on them. I think the Senate is an essential voice for the faculty. It's been very obvious over the past couple of years, how

important that voice has been. I commend those who have been in leadership positions over the past few years, because it has been a difficult time.

**Smith:** Thank you Senator Nelson. I need a motion to move into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing the nominees and among ourselves, voting on our new Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect.

**Motion/Second: Walter/Peters**

**Vote: all aye**

**Smith:** Then we are moving into Executive Session and that allows you all to leave. I'm thinking ten to fifteen minutes-- enough to refresh your coffee or Mt. Dew.

**Move to Executive Session 4:03-4:07**

**Smith:** We are now back in regular session, and we are prepared to conduct our election and senators should have voted. The ballots have been distributed. They are being collected by Faculty Chair Funderburk. Secretary Terlip, are you ready to announce?

**Secretary Terlip:** The winner is Senator **Nelson**. [applause] Congratulations.

**Smith:** Thank you. Congratulations Senator **Nelson**. Thank you to Senator **Edginton** for his willingness. [applause]

**1238/1134 Resolution to Encourage Contribution to the UNI Institutional Repository and to Initiate Discussions about Open Access**

**Motion/Second: Gould/Cooley**

**Smith:** To open this discussion, this petition was submitted by Dr. Ellen Neuhaus of the Rod Library who is with us today and well as a big chunk of her library compatriots. So I'd like as many of you as you can to come up here [motions to open seats in the circle] I know Ellen (**Neuhaus**) has some material she wanted to distribute. Ellen will start off the discussion by talking about this and then of

course after that we'll have opportunity for senators to ask questions and contribute their impressions.

**Neuhaus:** The Scholarly Communication Committee, within the Rod Library. There are several people, Tom Kessler, Kate Martin, Barb Allen are all part of the committee. Why are we here today? To ask you to endorse the resolution. And, why should the Faculty Senate care about this resolution? To ask you to consider retaining author rights to your publications in order to allow more use of your own work, including work you're using within the classroom as well as in future publications. We also think that having the Faculty Senate's endorsement, that will heighten campus awareness and help spread knowledge of these different related issues around scholarly communication.

The whole Open Access movement is complex and rapidly evolving and is very different than it was even a couple years ago. We also hope we can use the endorsement of the resolution as a platform in the fall to build on when we begin development of the Institutional Repository. The resolution has no mandates or requirements. And the resolution was developed by the Scholarly Communication Committee at Rod Library, on behalf of the Library faculty, who endorsed the resolution, on February 11.

We have a teaching faculty member a part of our committee, Elana **Joram**, of the College of Education, and she participated in developing the resolution. The UNI Copyright Committee has reviewed the resolution and has no concerns at this point. We have discovered that many faculty don't realize, or don't know about the May 2002 Iowa Board of Regents approval or endorsement that the Board strongly encourages faculty, students, and employees of the Regents institutions to seek to retain intellectual property rights to articles and reports that they publish in scholarly publications and equivalent types of publications where feasible and appropriate without detriment to publishing agreements.

UNI is developing an Institutional Repository that's being coordinated by Rod Library and we hope to be ready to accept deposits or materials sometime next year, 2014-2015. An IR (Institutional Repository) is a place to preserve as well as to make accessible, the scholarly output of the university. Many types of things can be put in to an IR. At this time, nothing has been decided. A lot of things still



need to be decided. We will be hiring a Digital Scholarship librarian in the summer, who will manage the new IR.

**Neuhaus:** We have developed a UNI author addendum to be used as a tool to help retain some author rights and it's based on the author addendum at the University of Iowa as well as the CIC. The resolution deals with overlapping but distinctive issues of the institutional repositories, author rights and Open Access, which is all rapidly evolving. Many mainstream publishers now actually publish Open Access Journals but they also, many of them offer Open Access options for individual articles. There are websites like SHERPA/RoMEO that will inform faculty as to what types of things the publishers, as well as different journals will allow. There is the Directory of Open Access Journals that I think now has close to 10,000 Open Access journals listed. The whole landscape with the Open Access is rapidly evolving and very different than it was even a few years ago. We will keep the campus informed as the Institutional Repository develops and the Library hopes to serve as a campus resource for your departments or colleges as conversations continue about Open Access.

**Smith:** Any questions or discussion?

**O'Kane:** I'm unclear to me about the form that's in there. [refers to packet] Is that something that you request that we fill out?

**Neuhaus:** No. That's author addendum. It's often used to attach to a publisher agreement to retain some of the copyright or rights of your individual item.

**O'Kane:** The reason I ask is I can think of any number of scientific journals that would rather just say, 'You can't publish.'

**Neuhaus:** There's also at the Sherpa Romeo site, a place that you can look at, and many mainstream publishers-- you don't even need to attach like an author addendum, but they will allow archiving in Institutional Repositories. Even like Elsevier and some of the mainstream publishers.

**Smith:** Other questions, discussion? If I get the substance of this, I see the three points that you have right in front of you; the three points are the substance of

the resolution. Unless there's additional discussion, I guess we're ready to vote on this.

**Kidd:** Just for clarification, I agree with Senator **O'Kane**. There are some journals that (refers to Resolution item 2) you say can basically post it where you like, I'm not sure that's gonna fly, unless you pay them \$2,000. Again, this is not mandatory, correct?

**Neuhaus:** That's correct. It's intended to be a model, too. Some journals and some publishers offer their own addenda to authors to complete.

**Kidd:** Sure

**Martin:** But in the case where there isn't one, then this could be a document that could be used. And we realize that there are variations, hence Ellen's reference to this particular website, where it says what you can do both prepublication and post-publication, and whether you can put in an Institutional IR in final published form, or in essence the content, but not the final polished appearance. The pre-print I know is more common in the Sciences. We wanted to create a model for people to work forward from, if they weren't familiar with the process; maybe to tweak it with their particular publisher or editor or to have something that just we thought would help people better understand the process involves.

**O'Kane:** I note that at least in Biology, and perhaps Physics and most of the Sciences as well, the most prestigious journals are never going to buy that—I can't say never-- but at this time, would not buy this. So, Molecular Biology, Evolution Science, Nature- they're not going to buy that. So I worry, I wonder, I worry that there is a subtle pressure for us to NOT publish in **the** most prestigious journals.

**Kessler:** I don't think that was at all the intent. I think at least one intent was to provide a tool to those individuals when they're in a situation where they're would like to try to retain rights or to seek to do that, that we would provide a tool that they would have that they could use. Again, it's not mandatory. We hope that people will, you know, think about, as they publish and when we have the IR up and running, that they'll want to if possible contribute to it, but it's not mandatory or not intended to do that.

**Neuhaus:** There is also, I don't know, journals that will allow you to publish the article as Open Access, but there's usually an author fee. At this point, UNI doesn't have a central fund, but many institutions have developed a central fund to help support faculty. The University of Iowa developed a central fund I think last year, so, even though we don't have one at this point, doesn't mean we won't have something in the future.

**Smith:** Other comments?

**Peters:** Do you have plans to go to academic departments and talk directly to faculty members about this. Is this something you'll be looking to do in the next couple of years? To educate people about how they would actually go about doing this? For many of us, we might have the kind of fear that Senator **O'Kane** has, that is, 'Gee if I were to send this in, would they say forget about you—go publish this somewhere else.' So that kind of guidance would be helpful I think.

**Neuhaus:** I think one of the main points of the resolution is to continue discussions and to have campus discussions. Our committee has talked about being a resource, and we've talked about maybe what are the possible next steps to take to support and educate the campus.

**Kessler:** And that's actually the point of the third part of this resolution, is 'to initiate a conversation on campus' and just that--try to have people learn more about the concept of Open Access. There are certainly issues. Some of them have been alluded to here. So having the opportunity to look at those and identify those, that conversation...

**Kirmani:** A couple of things. In science, what generally happens is that if the research is funded by NIH, NIH requires that it be Open Access. So, those are automatically Open Access. So far as the Open Access periodicals that are in my own discipline, they are considered inferior periodicals; you don't go to them. These are the situation.

**Nelson:** I certainly respect the comments from those in the Sciences who have reservations, but the resolution in no way requires someone to choose to publish in a lesser journal, just to have an open access to the article. I feel that we can still support this without in any way compromising the quality of someone's scholarly

publications. At the same time, and this wouldn't be true in every field, but there may be opportunities for us through our professional societies to support the Open Access movement, by pushing for more Open Access or policies under certain circumstances that were allowed. And the idea that we might be able to have financial support if there are options for Open Access that faculty could take advantage of, if they had financial support to do that. That seems rather intriguing and a benefit of continuing this conversation.

**Swan:** I'm familiar to some extent with what Harvard College, Harvard Arts & Sciences does. This looks very much like that. Do you know what they're doing or how this compares with that?

**Neuhaus:** Many institutions have Institutional Repositories and many colleges and universities at different levels and their Faculty Senates have passed different resolutions addressing different parts of Open Access. A lot of them have passed something that says that they support when possible, for faculty to publish in Open Access venues. Other institutions, it has become more mandated.

**Martin:** You've seen some institutions where they start with something like this, then eventually their faculty or their governing bodies have chosen to come close to making it mandatory, but we're not advocating that at all. No. We think that's an institutional choice. We want people to know that the option exists for them.

**Neuhaus:** We're certainly happy too, should people have questions about particular journals, should this resolution go forward or we continue to work with faculty in another way, to research what's possible with certain journals with which people may be familiar, to share the information to which we have access on various websites, and say, well, this journal will allow you to do this, or this journal will allow you to do that. There's certainly a list of long established reference journals that are now moving in the direction of some form of Open Access, if not full allowance of rights back to the original author or authors.

**Swan:** That may be because some very high prestige universities are moving towards mandatory engagement of this.

**Neuhaus:** It may well be.

**Terlip:** I think as you take this forward and discuss this with departments its going to probably be important to make sure that whoever is on PACs in those departments understand that because that's where we get confusion going for new people. It can be really problematic, so that clarification [has to be].

**Smith:** Other comments or questions? [no response] Then we are ready to vote on this petition.

**Vote: All aye; Motion Passes**

**Smith:** Thank you Ellen, and your colleagues, the library people. The next three items on our agenda are all Emeritus Requests.

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

**Motion/Second: Walter/Edginton**

**Smith:** Earlier today I received a letter of support from Siobahn Morgan, Professor Walter's Department Head. She asked that I read her statement into the record, which I will now do:

"Dear Dr. Smith,

I would strongly recommend Dr. James C. Walters be awarded Faculty Emeritus Status at the University of Northern Iowa. Normally I would be present at the Senate meeting for the discussion of this proposal, but at this time I am attending the Earth Science seminar where Dr. Walters is providing an update on his research concerning northeast Iowa's periglacial environment. This seminar is the last that Jim will be presenting as a regular faculty member in the Earth Science Department, a position he has held since 1975. Jim Walters was one of the three founders of the Geology Program at the University of Northern Iowa, along with Emeritus Professors Wayne I. Anderson, and Kenneth J. DeNault, a program which was evaluated by external reviewers for the 2012 Academic Program Review as "...the ideal model of teacher-scholars by their dedication to teaching, research, and involving their students in collaborative research." Dr. Walters was a key component of this quality program which was erroneously terminated in spring 2012.

“As mentioned above, Dr. Walter’s UNI career began in 1975 following doctoral studies at Rutgers University. For 39 years he taught students in a variety of courses including the General Education/Liberal Arts Core course, *Physical Geology*, and advanced geology courses including *Geomorphology*, *Iowa Landforms*, *Oceanography*, *Glaciers and Glaciation*, *Environmental Science Seminar*, *Geological Field Methods*, *Geotectonics*, *Spring Field Trip*, *Spaceship Earth* (an early LAC course which was basically *Environmental Geology*), *Studies in Field Geology* (a 4-week summer course in Colorado), *Natural Environments of Alaska and Western Canada* (a 6-week summer course), summer workshops for teachers which varied in length from one to eight weeks, *DataStreme Oceans*, (online course) *Readings in Earth Science*, *Independent Studies in Earth Science*, *Internship in Earth Science* and *Undergraduate Research in Earth Science*.

“Jim Walter’s concern and attention that he has provided to students in his geology courses throughout the years is clearly seen in the quality of the geology graduates, many of whom have gone on to careers in industry, the public sector and academia. His attention to students’ needs naturally extends beyond the majors in our department to all groups including LAC students in his Introduction to Geology/Physical Geology course throughout the years. I can personally attest to the quality of his instruction in this course since for one semester I sat in on the entire course and significantly increased my own geology knowledge. He spends a great deal of time providing meaningful experiences in classroom and lab experiences, experiences that can last well beyond the end of the semester. Often students would attest to his personal attention that he provided to help students understand difficult concepts, or as an advisor provided helpful information about careers and graduate schools. Jim’s research has continued throughout his academic career, generally with an emphasis on Alaska.”

**Smith:** I’m going to skip over some of this because it is quite extensive, with your approval. The whole thing will be appended to the Senate Minutes. I appreciate Professor **Morgan’s** stuff. I’m going to close with the last paragraph:

**Smith** (for Professor **Morgan**): “I could probably fill several more pages with information about all that James Walters has done over the years that highlight the quality of his work as a faculty member in the Earth Science Department and as a geologist. The closure of the geology programs in 2012 has resulted in the premature retirement of a generous man, who worked tirelessly to provide all

(students, colleagues and the public) with an exceptional educational experience. While some were more concerned about the quantity of students impacted by faculty in programs across campus, it is the case that James Walters has provided a meaningful and positive influence on the education and lives of his students throughout the years. He is a worthy recipient of Emeritus Faculty status.”

**Smith:** Are there any other comments regarding this?

**Strauss:** I’ve gotten to know Jim he worked in the same building as I do. He was a beloved department head for many years, also a beloved faculty member and just one of the nicest and most generous man I’ve ever known.

**Smith:** Thank you Senator Strauss

**O’Kane:** I’d say the same thing. One of the nicest people that I’ve ever known in my life; an absolute delight to work with.

**Smith:** Thank you very much.

**Edginton:** On a personal note, my son David is married to Jim’s daughter, Jennifer [laughter] so we share grandsons. He is a wonderful grandfather; he’s been very attentive and supportive to their development.

**Smith:** Thank you. Then I believe we are ready to vote on this request.

Vote: all aye

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

**Motion/Second: Nelson/O’Kane**

**Smith:** Our discussion of this request will be led by Professor **Phyllis Baker**, Head of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology. Professor Baker you are welcome to come up to the table here [gestures]

**Baker:** I’m fine here.

**Smith:** You have the floor.

**Baker:** What I'm going to do is to read a letter that will go in your minutes.

**Dear Chair Smith and Faculty Senate Members:**

"This letter is from the faculty and staff of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology and myself as Head of that department and is in support of emeritus status for Dr. Gene **Lutz**, Professor of Sociology and Director of the Center for Social and Behavioral Research. Dr. **Lutz** has been a member of our department for 38 years and I have known him professionally and personally for 23 of those years. He is both a model citizen and a friend. His contributions to the department, college, university, the community, and his profession are clearly worthy of emeritus status. Though for more than the last two decades he has had a 100% appointment at the Center and has not been involved in the day to day activities of the department, his influence early on helped direct the course of our department and is still influential today.

"Dr. **Lutz** received his PhD from Iowa State University and was hired at UNI in 1973 as an assistant professor and worked his way through the ranks to full professor in 1986. During that time he taught a range of courses, which I will not list, but made the strongest impact in the area of social science research methodology. Dr. Lutz has been the Principal Investigator for over 70 studies of public health and other topics, and administrator for scores of additional studies. He is also an Adjunct Clinical Professor at the University of Iowa Department of Community and Behavioral Health.

"He's been Director of the Center for Social and Behavioral Research (CSBR) since 1988. The Center for Social and Behavioral Research (CSBR) is a freestanding unit within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Since its beginning in 1967, CSBR has conducted close to 700 funded research studies on a wide variety of topics. Among these are public health, crime and safety, environmental/health, education, housing/planning, and public opinion and policy priorities. However, public health is the primary and predominant area of research and most activities for his Center are applied in nature. The CSBR has collected data from over 400,000 Iowans by telephone interviewing, face-to-face interviewing, mailed questionnaires, focus groups, and web surveys. Every year the CSBR provides direct research training and experience for many UNI students. This kind of



research embodies the mission of a regional comprehensive university, such as UNI.

“However, in addition to students, the CSBR also supports research efforts of faculty. For example, Anne **Woodrick** states that, “Gene took an interest in a number of my research projects and facilitated my hiring a Spanish language transcriptionist. He’s contributed financially to my research as well. His support for faculty research extends beyond the research projects affiliated with the center.”

“Similarly, Michele **Devlin** explains that, “I credit Dr. **Lutz** with introducing me to what it means to be a community engagement scholar. He was the first faculty member I met here that was doing grant work 20 years ago when I came to UNI. Within my first semester, he had already invited me to work with him and the Black Hawk County Health Department. His enthusiasm for serving the public, his ability to develop community-campus partnerships, and his emphasis on applied scholarship that improves the lives of people around us is truly inspirational, and has left an important legacy for us all to follow.”

“Finally, this quote from Joe **Gorton** exemplifies why we all support his emeritus status in sociology. ‘Professor **Lutz** is a gifted researcher, a great colleague and one of the finest administrators I have ever known. Over the years, I have had the opportunity to work with him on a variety of grant projects. In every instance, those collaborations were characterized by his complete dedication to collegiality and the highest standard of scholarship. In my opinion, he exemplifies all that is good about our university.’

“Dr. **Lutz** will continue to contribute to UNI, the community, and his profession. He will maintain an office and presence on campus and all the resultant benefits of emeritus status, if so granted. It is with great honor that I and the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology support the awarding of emeritus status to Dr. **Lutz**. Thank you for your consideration.”

**Smith:** Thank you Professor **Baker**. Any other comments on this proposal?

**Nelson:** I had the pleasure of working with Dr. **Lutz**. He has lent his expertise in research to several faculty research-types of projects on behalf of the Faculty

Senate and the faculty. He was very generous with his time; a very thoughtful individual and very enjoyable to work with.

**Smith:** Thank you.

**Funderburk:** And specific to that, Gene has been the person who has been at the center of over most of our five-year administrative reviews the last 20 years. He has been the memory of how this works. He should be thanked for that as well.

**OKane:** I would add how much esteem he's held in by people outside the university. My wife works for Blackhawk County Health Department as Program Director. They interact with Gene a lot and absolutely love him.

**Smith:** Other comments? Then we are ready to vote on this proposal.

**All Aye**

**1247/1143 Request for Emeritus Status, Dhirendra K. Vajpeyi**

**Motion/Second: Peters/Edginton**

**Smith:** I believe Senator **Peters** will be making a statement on behalf of the Department of Political Science.

**Peters:** I have a letter from our Department Head. I won't read the whole thing, but Jerry (Smith) also has a copy and I assume it will be in the minutes. Vajpeyi has been here since, as everyone calls him "Vaj" and probably most of you around the table have met him at one point or another. He's been here since 1969. Vaj has among his other accomplishments, he was Head of the Political Science Department for 10 years, during which time he grew the department significantly by getting us involved in teaching non-western courses, which were new at that time, so he greatly expanded the department into having expertise in all areas of the world and Vaj's involvement in various issues on campus was extensive. His research continues. Even now I think he's editing a couple of books as we speak. The institutional memory he has is not going to be easily replaced, but I'll just read the final paragraph of the letter, which I think nicely sums up. I'll say one more thing before I read that paragraph. If you talk to a graduate of the Political Science Department, probably the first question they ask is 'How's Vaj? How's Vaj

doing?’ He’s been constant for so long in our department. This is just the final paragraph of Professor Hoffman’s letter:

‘After forty-five years of service to the University of Northern Iowa, its students and the community, Professor **Vajpeyi** will be retiring at the conclusion of the 2013-14 academic year. His retirement will leave a void impossible to fill in the Department. His colleagues will miss his contributions to departmental governance, as well as his wit and good humor. His students will miss his passion in the classroom, where he sometimes wove stories of elephants and tigers from his native India into his discussions. On behalf of the Department of Political Science, we recognize and thank Professor **Vajpeyi** for his commitment and dedication to the University of Northern Iowa, its students, and the Department of Political Science. It is fitting that he be given the title of Professor Emeritus.’

**Smith:** Any other comments?

**Kirmani:** I am not in Political Science but I have heard that Vaj is a very highly respected international researcher. He’s extremely active and I thought that I would just add that.

**Heston:** Vaj served on the Senate during one of the more controversial periods many years ago, about 2000-2001 when they made an attempt to close PLS and it was an interesting ...He was a very interesting and forceful speaker on behalf of faculty when he was a member of the Senate, and I really appreciated much of what he has to say, and I like seeing him, which I do periodically.

**Smith:** Any other comments?

**Vote: All aye. Motion passes.**

### **1240/1136: Curriculum Change, Department of Technology**

**Smith:** The motion to approve this item which would change the name of the program from Doctor of Technology to Doctor of Industrial Technology

**Motion/Second: Kirmani/Peters**

**Smith:** Discussion will be led by Professor Mohammed Fahmy, Head of the Department of Technology and I believe he also has another colleague here.

**Fahmy:** This is Julie **Zhang**, the coordinator of the Graduate Programs at the Department of Industrial Technology.

**Smith:** And so Professor **Fahmy**, the floor is yours to talk through the rationale for this proposal.

**Fahmy:** The Doctorate of Technology, when it was proposed in 1977 was a degree that was the only degree of its kind. Not only in Iowa, but in the United States. The main goal of that degree, as it was listed at the time, was to prepare leaders of...within the Industrial Technology field to be in the top management leadership in industry, government and education, and it has stayed like this for years. And the Doctor of Industrial Technology actually is a degree that is not only one of its kind in the United States, but was also recognized by the Department of Education and the National Science Foundation in pursuit of two other degrees that were on the Engineering side from California, Berkeley and the MIT.

Recently there was a change to Doctor of Technology in the last few years. I think it was a little bit done in haste. We did not realize at the time that it's a research intensive and equivalent to PhD degree and if you just wanted to go with the change of the name of the Department of Industrial Technology to the Department of Technology, and it was not very well thought out to see the ramifications of that. I don't know; many of you probably knew that I was Department Head for about 20 years and then I elected to step out [the] last five years to enjoy life and do my course teachings and all that. And then last April, Jim **Maxwell**, the Department Head at the time, abruptly left us and Dean **Haack** and the faculty asked me to come back for one more year until we hire a new Department Head.

My first week back in the office, Dr. **Craig Klafter** came to visit with me and he was pleading with me. He said, 'I tried to stop that change. I couldn't, and actually at one time he was told by somebody in that department, not to share the fact that we would lose the recognition of the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education and then this is not the most important part. The most important thing is now we have an opportunity with a university in Germany, the

Zwickau University, that **Dr. Klafter** has been working with for quite a few years now. It is a university that is not allowed to do a Doctorate degree; they only do a Master's degree. They have about 12 students in line now to come do a Doctoral degree in Industrial Technology and Engineering Technology or Industrial Engineering, which our degree could fit very nicely, provided that it is equivalent to a PhD. We lost that equivalency when we went to Doctor of Technology. We can get that to be equivalent to a PhD degree, but it's going to take a tremendous amount of time and money.

**Fahmy:** We are already recognized by the DOE and the National Science Foundation as the Doctor of Technology. So, when I presented this to the faculty, many of them did not know the ramifications of that previous vote, they unanimously voted to go back to the Doctor of Industrial Technology. So, at this time, we are trying to get the name back to the Doctor of Industrial Technology.

We're not changing anything in the curriculum. The curriculum, by the way, has changed very slightly. The Doctor of Industrial Technology, when it was proposed, it was proposed to have 64 credits after the Master's degree; beyond the Master's degree. I know probably that all of you know the PhD is only requesting 60 credits after the Master's and 90 credits after the Bachelor's degree. So there's not much really changed in there. We could still live with the 60 instead of 64, but it is still very solid.

We're trying to get back to that recognition to be equivalent to PhD to get some international [students]. This is not the first time, by the way. We have lost a couple of students from Saudi Arabia because the Cultural Attaché did not see that Doctor of Technology is equivalent to PhD and in these places of the world, the PhD is very important to them. We will probably regain some students internationally as well as nationally, actually. So, that's why we're getting back to renaming—back to the Doctor of Industrial Technology rather than the Doctor of Technology right now. Our faculty approved it unanimously. CHAS approved it unanimously, and we're hoping for your vote so we can progress and get more students in our Doctoral program. But, by the way, since its inception, the Doctoral program has graduated about 94, 95 doctoral people. Most of them, 85% of them are working in academia. I know one of them is a Provost in a small college. About two or three Deans in Colleges or Departments of Technology. Quite a few Chairs of Technology. I know that because of I'm very much

interested. The Doctor of Technology was the main reason for me to stay at UNI for 31 years. I've had the pleasure and the privilege of supervising over 30 Doctoral students of the 93 or 94 graduates. And that you can see this is a very passionate thing for me to come back and re-ask you to approve getting back to the D.I.T.

**Smith:** Any questions or discussion?

**Kirmani:** In support of what Dr. Fahmy has said, I would say that a Doctor of Technology is a more accurate term. I have been on several committees there and I know that. And also, UNI's graduate program has established itself as a brand. It will be in UNI's interest to go back to that.

**Edginton:** Wasn't the program suspended for a period of time, or am I confusing this with another?

**Fahmy:** No. The D.I.T. has never been suspended. It's been very vigorous and we have graduated over 95 graduates. I've been here over 31 years. It's never been suspended in my tenure at UNI; during my time here. And I don't think before me, DIT has ever been suspended. One of the things that might have happened is that the number of scholarships, which started as six scholarships had been down to 3.5 and these scholarships were legislated especially for the Doctor of Technology. We also had at one time over \$22,000 for summer but when UNI got into the very lean times we lost the \$22,000 for summer classes support of teaching courses and the six Doctoral scholarships and tuition scholarships have been now shrunk to 3.5.

**Smith:** Other questions or discussion?

**Breitbach:** As the person whose responsible for teaching your Chemistry classes, for six of your programs, I would also like to speak in favor of this proposal. I don't have a lot of involvement in their Doctoral program, but I do interact with the vast majority of your undergrads, and I do think that the old title better reflects what they intend to do.

**Fahmy:** When we lost the Industrial part of it, we kind of lost our face. Because Doctor of Technology-- is what technology? Is it medical technology? Industrial

Technology meant that we prepare people for industry, government institutions and teachers that teach Industrial and Engineering Technology.

**Smith:** Thank you. Other comments? [pause] Then, I believe we are ready to vote.

**Vote: All aye. Motion passes.**

**Smith:** Thank you, Professor Fahmy

**Fahmy:** Thank you very much for your time.

**1243/1139 Proposed Policy #2.04: Curriculum Management and Change**

**Motion/Second: Nelson/Kirmani**

**Smith:** I'll begin the discussion by providing some background on this matter and identifying the key changes to the existing policy that are being proposed. By way of background, I would add that one of the last things the Senate did last year was to propose a change to policy #2.04 Curriculum Change, with the primary intent of affirming the faculty's role through the Senate in decisions determining academic programs. That proposal got hung up for several reasons in the review process. One of those reasons being a concern that the existing policy and the proposed policy that we made at that time made no provision for faculty management of the curriculum. As a result of these concerns, and other problems with the existing policy, I rewrote the proposal and am resubmitting as a petition to the Senate. The initial version of my revised policy proposal assumed the existence of a Curriculum Management Committee. However, since the Senate has not yet approved the formation of such a body, I dropped that provision. The revised proposal is currently on the website. (I can bring it up in a second.) In my opinion, as well as being a clearer, better written policy, it makes the following substantive changes to the existing policy number 2.04.

First: Policies proposed title: Curriculum Management and Change, pointedly acknowledges the Faculty and the Faculty Senate's role in managing the curriculum [reads from document] That's also stated in one of the provisions under Faculty Senate ....You can see here where it talks about the role of the Faculty Senate. The last part of that paragraph 'The Senate is responsible for ensuring that all academic programs are performing effectively and for advising

the Provost on the appropriate allocation of academic resources.’ The existing policy doesn’t really have language like that.

Second, whereas the existing policy states that with the certain exceptions, ‘the Faculty Senate shall delegate to the UCC and the GCCC responsibility for final faculty approval of all curricular proposals.’ The current proposed policy makes clear that the Senate, ‘has final approval authority for all curricular proposals.’ This language is consistent with how the Senate handled curriculum proposals this year and in years past. We are certainly responsive to UCC and GCCC recommendations, but the Senate reserves the right to review any proposal that it deems worthy of its attention.

Third, unlike the existing policy, the proposed policy provides an appeal mechanism so that proposals rejected at an intermediate level can still be moved forward for consideration by the Senate. And finally, the proposal states that, ‘Except in cases of financial exigency, as defined by current AAUP guidelines, academic programs will not be terminated without the consent of the Senate.’ Now, I know the Provost has some concerns about this provision, but it’s hoped that these could be worked out during the policy approval process. So, that’s the proposal--the substance of the proposal. I’m hoping that the Senate will be willing to approve this and move this forward into the policy review process. Is there any other discussion?

**Cutter:** I like some of these changes, especially the restructuring of the academic units being added and some comments on financial exigency. My one concern is that there’s something here that actually weakens the faculty role in the curriculum process. And that is, if you look at the original curriculum policy, our old curriculum policy, it says ‘usually proposed curricular changes are initiated by departments but they may at times be initiated by the Colleges or by the general faculty.’ That language has been taken out, and there’s some language in the new one that says ‘Although proposals to close or terminate academic program may be initiated by university administration, such proposals...’ So, the new policy actually for the first time says that certain changes, meaning closures and terminations, **can be** initiated by university administrators. That was NOT the case in our original policy. I know changes to terminate **were** initiated, but there’s no in-writing-justification for that in the past and I’m concerned that the charge



of/on this issue by the Senate, was to affirm the faculty role and that we're actually undermining that a little, actually quite a bit, in part of this policy.

**Smith:** Any discussion of that or other issues?

**O'Kane:** I second what Senator **Cutter** said. Seems to me perhaps we could change some language.

**Smith:** Okay. So where's this language in particular?

**Nelson:** The bullet point

**Cutter:** There, you're close. It's not the last one.

**Smith:** That top bullet point on this page here? 'Where curricular proposals within an academic discipline can be initiated by other parties. Your concern, Senator **Cutter**?

**Cutter:** That could be read that way, but specifically the second to the last bullet. I think that paragraph maybe needs some work. It says on the second to the last bullet point, 'although proposals to close or terminate academic [programs] may be initiated by university administration.'

**Smith:** Okay, and so how would you propose to amend that?

**Cutter:** I would cut out the phrase and you could just say, 'All proposals to close or terminate academic programs **must** go through the normal curricular review process.'

**Motion to Amend/Second: Cutter/O'Kane**

**Smith:** Any discussion of that amendment?

**All aye: Motion passes.**

**Smith:** And now we go back to discussion of the proposal as amended. Any further discussion of it?

**Cutter:** I did have another comment on that particular paragraph, but it is a slightly different issue. Where it says 'except in cases of financial exigency as defined by current AAUP guidelines, academic programs will not be terminated without consent of the Senate.' I'm thinking that maybe it should say, 'Proposals to terminate academic programs for financial reasons must follow current AAUP guidelines.' Because, even programs that are terminated under financial exigency **do** include faculty involvement. So, I think it might work better that we just have a general statement that 'we'll follow AAUP guidelines', separate from 'academic programs will not be terminated without consent of the Senate.'

**Smith:** So, are you proposing that as an amendment?

**Cutter:** Yes.

**Smith:** Do we have a second? [pause] Do we have an amendment that we understand?

**Cutter:** That's it. I don't think we have language. I guess what I would say is, 'In cases of financial exigency, the university will follow current AAUP guidelines.' And then period. You can just say, 'Academic programs will not be terminated without the consent of the Senate,' in that sentence.

**Smith:** If I understand correctly, you're saying, 'In case of financial exigency, the university will follow current AAUP guidelines. Academic programs will not be terminated without the consent of the Senate.' Is that correct? That's proposed as an amendment.

**Motion to Amend/Second: Cutter/O'Kane**

**All aye. Motion carries.**

**Smith:** Now, we're ready to vote on the proposal as amended twice. Any further discussion of it?

**Cutter:** Wait. I'm sorry. Its back to that first thing: The language that we took out in the Preamble that said, 'proposed curricular changes may be initiated by

department but at times may be initiated.’ Can we just put the Preamble back in? Our old Preamble back in?

**Smith:** The old Preamble was kind of a mess. A lot of the stuff from the Preamble is in there, it’s just...

**Cutter:** Well, paragraph two of the Preamble is not. Can we insert paragraph two of the Preamble?

**Smith:** [Pause] I guess I’m not sure what that adds, but it’s your proposed amendment. What substantively do you feel this adds?

**Cutter:** Just the statement that ...’that proposed curricular changes are initiated by the departments but may at times be initiated by Colleges and general faculty.’ [pause]

**Smith:** Is it something...

**Cutter:** It’s talking about faculty ownership. I didn’t want to take that out.

**Smith:** Well we do have that addressed later in the policy, or do we not? It does come up later in the stuff that we just talked about, if I’m not mistaken.

**Cutter:** No, not stated outright. So I wouldn’t want to lose an outright statement we had in there before.

**Smith:** I think we’re running over, too.

**Peters:** This is really important and I don’t want to see us make the same mistake we made last year under almost exactly the same circumstances, where with time running out and our last meeting of the year, I as Chair, thought it was really important that we try to pass a new policy about this, and so we pushed a policy through that maybe wasn’t quite complete. And, it ran into trouble further up the line and so I wonder if we should ask this ad hoc committee that’s being put together to figure out how policy revision—how any necessary changes in policy comport with what the Senate’s already decided regarding siphoning off certain kinds of policy proposals as not needing to come to the Senate, and so maybe

have the committee—this would be the starting point for the committee-- [murmurs of assent] and it sounds from around the table that there's a lot of agreement on this already. We've already agreed on a couple of amendments to it, so, one possibility here would be to table the proposal as amended, give it to this committee to work on, and maybe Jerry, you and Tim, could work come up with a fairly aggressive timeline for the committee to report back to the Senate in the fall, so we can get this thing done.

**Motion to Table: Peters/Swan**

**Smith:** Discussion?

**Terlip:** I was just wondering if we ought to make discussion of this part of the Senate retreat, and this would be another way to get the deadline.

**Smith:** Any further discussion of the motion to table?

**All aye: Motion to table proposal passes**

**Smith:** I think that will conclude our work with one additional item, do we need to pass a motion to adjourn.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Motion Gould/Second by acclamation: 5:04

**Peters:** I want to thank the Chair for his service this year. [applause]

**Smith:** Thank you all. Having drunk the big thing...[points to cup; laughter]

Submitted by,  
Kathy Sundstedt  
Transcriptionist & Administrative Assistant  
UNI Faculty Senate

## Addenda

Letter of Support for Emeritus Status of Dr. Gene Lutz

April 28, 2014

Dear Chair Smith and Faculty Senate Members:

This letter is from the faculty and staff of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology and myself as Head of that department and is in support of emeritus status for Dr. Gene Lutz, Professor of Sociology and Director of the Center for Social and Behavioral Research. Dr. Lutz has been a member of our department for 38 years and I have known him professionally and personally for 23 of those years. He is both a model citizen and friend. His contributions to the department, college, university, community, and profession are clearly worthy of emeritus status. Though for more than the last two decades he has had a 100% appointment at the Center and has not been involved in the day to day activities of the department, his influence early on helped direct the course of our department and is still influential today.

Dr. Lutz received his Phd from Iowa State University and was hired at UNI in 1973 as an assistant professor and worked his way through the ranks to full professor in 1986. During that time he taught a range of courses but made the strongest impact in the area of social science research methodology. Dr. Lutz has been the Principal Investigator for over 70 studies of public health and other topics, and the administrator for scores of additional studies. He is also an Adjunct Clinical Professor at the University of Iowa Department of Community and Behavioral Health.

Dr. Lutz has been Director of the Center for Social and Behavioral Research (CSBR) since 1988. The Center for Social and Behavioral Research (CSBR) is a freestanding unit within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Since its beginning in 1967, CSBR has conducted close to 700 funded research studies on a wide variety of topics. Among these are public health, crime/safety, environment/energy, education, housing/planning, and public opinion/policy priorities. However, public health is the predominant area of research and most activities are of an applied research nature, designed to assist public agencies in answering questions about public opinion and the impacts of public programs. The CSBR has collected data from over 400,000 Iowans by telephone interviewing, face-to-face interviewing, mailed questionnaires, focus groups, and web surveys. Every year CSBR provides direct research training and experience for many UNI students. The kind of research embodies the mission of a regional comprehensive university, such as UNI.

In addition to students, the CSBR supports the research efforts of faculty. For example, Anne Woodrick states that, "Gene took an interest in a number of my research projects and facilitated my hiring of a Spanish language transcriber. He contributed financially to my research as well. His support for faculty research extends beyond the research projects affiliated with the center."

Similarly, Michel Devlin explains that, “I credit Dr. Lutz with introducing me to what it means to be a community engagement scholar. He was the first faculty member I met here that was doing grant work 20 years ago when I came to UNI. Within my first semester, he had already invited me to work with him and the Black Hawk County Health Department on a public health assessment. His enthusiasm for serving the public, ability to develop community-campus partnerships, and his emphasis on applied scholarship that can improve the lives of people around us is truly inspirational, and has left an important legacy for us all to follow.”

Finally, this quote from Joe Gorton exemplifies why we all support his emeritus status in sociology. “Professor Lutz is a gifted researcher, a great colleague and one of the finest administrators I have ever known. Over the years, I have had the opportunity to work with him on a variety of grant projects. In every instance, those collaborations were characterized by his complete dedication to collegiality and the highest standards of scholarship. In my opinion, he exemplifies all that is good about our university.”

Dr. Lutz will continue to contribute to UNI, the community, and his profession. He will maintain an office and presence on campus and all the resultant benefits of emeritus status, if granted. It is with great honor that I and the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology support the awarding of emeritus status for Dr. Lutz.

Thank you for your consideration,

Phyllis L. Baker  
Professor and Head  
Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology  
University of Northern Iowa

## Letter of Support for Dr. Dharendra Vajpeyi

Department of Political Science



April 16, 2014

Jerry Smith, Ph.D.  
Chair, Faculty Senate  
University of Northern Iowa  
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Dear Professor Smith:

I write to support the emeritus application of Professor Dharendra Vajpeyi. During his time at UNI, Professor Vajpeyi served as Head of the Department of Political Science, received numerous awards, and touched the lives of thousands of students along the way. He is an internationally-recognized scholar and popular professor at the University of Northern Iowa. His departmental colleagues will miss him greatly when he retires.

Professor Vajpeyi earned his Ph.D. in political science from Michigan State University and joined the Department of Political Science in 1969 as an assistant professor. He was promoted to associate professor in 1972, and attained the title of professor in 1979. In 1984 he served as a Senior Research Fellow at the Hoover Institute at Stanford University. Professor Vajpeyi became Head of the Department of Political Science in 1988 and served in that capacity until 1998. During his tenure as Head, the Department of Political Science grew through his embrace of teaching non-western humanities courses in the Liberal Arts Core. He has been active in university governance; serving on the faculty senate and chairing the graduate council were among his many contributions. During his career at UNI, Professor Vajpeyi was awarded both the Outstanding Service Award and the Outstanding Scholarship Award from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. He has always been a proponent of utilizing students in faculty research. It is a fitting testimony that two of his former students recently endowed the Vajpeyi Fellowship that recognizes one faculty member in the Department of Political Science who incorporates students into their own research.

It should be noted that Professor Vajpeyi's research in the area of civil-military relations, development, and environmental policy is internationally recognized. He has edited or co-edited 19 books, and authored more than 25 book chapters, in addition to authoring numerous journal articles. He has been active in the International Political Science Association (IPSA), chairing the Research Committee on Technology and Development, and often organizing regional IPSA conferences.

After forty-five years of service to the University of Northern Iowa, its students and the community, Professor Vajpeyi will be retiring at the conclusion of the 2013-14 academic year. His retirement will leave a void impossible to fill in the Department of Political

Jerry Smith, Ph.D.

April 16, 2014

Page 2

Science. His colleagues will miss his contributions to departmental governance, as well as his wit and good humor. His students will miss his passion in the classroom, where he sometimes wove stories of elephants and tigers from his native India into his discussions. On behalf of the Department of Political Science, we recognize and thank Professor Vajpeyi for his commitment and dedication to the University of Northern Iowa, its students, and the Department of Political Science. It is fitting he be given the title of Professor Emeritus.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Donna R. Hoffman". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name and title.

Donna R. Hoffman, Ph.D.

Head and Associate Professor



## Letter of Support for Dr. James C. Walters

Department of Earth Science



April 28, 2014

Dr. Jerry Smith  
Chair, UNI Faculty Senate  
University of Northern Iowa

Dear Dr. Smith,

I would strongly recommend Dr. James C. Walters be awarded Faculty Emeritus Status at the University of Northern Iowa. Normally I would be present at the Senate meeting for the discussion of this proposal, but at this time I am attending the Earth Science seminar where Dr. Walters is providing an update on his research concerning northeast Iowa's periglacial environment. This seminar is the last that Jim will be presenting as a regular faculty member in the Earth Science Department, a position he has held since 1975. Jim Walters was one of the three founders of the Geology Program at the University of Northern Iowa, along with Emeritus Professors Wayne I. Anderson, and Kenneth J. De Nault, a program which was evaluated by external reviewers for the 2012 Academic Program Review as "...the ideal model of teacher-scholars by their dedication to teaching, research, and involving their students in collaborative research." Dr. Walters was a key component of this quality program which was erroneously terminated in spring 2012.

As mentioned above, Dr. Walter's UNI career began in 1975 following doctoral studies at Rutgers University. For 39 years he taught students in a variety of courses including the General Education/Liberal Arts Core course, *Physical Geology*, and advanced geology courses including *Geomorphology*, *Iowa Landforms*, *Oceanography*, *Glaciers and Glaciation*, *Environmental Science Seminar*, *Geological Field Methods*, *Geotectonics*, *Spring Field Trip*, *Spaceship Earth* (an early LAC course which was basically *Environmental Geology*), *Studies in Field Geology* (a 4-week summer course in Colorado), *Natural Environments of Alaska and Western Canada* (a 6-week summer course), summer workshops for teachers which varied in length from one to eight weeks, *DataStreme Oceans* (online course), *Readings in Earth Science*, *Independent Studies in Earth Science*, *Internship in Earth Science* and *Undergraduate Research in Earth Science*.

Jim Walter's concern and attention that he has provided to students in his geology courses throughout the years is clearly seen in the quality of the geology graduates, many of whom have gone on to careers in industry, the public sector and academia. His attention to students' needs naturally extends beyond the majors in our department to all groups including LAC students in his *Introduction to Geology/Physical Geology* course throughout the years. I can personally attest to the quality of his instruction in this course since for one semester I sat in on the entire course and significantly increased my own geology knowledge. He spends a great deal of time providing meaningful experiences in classroom and lab experiences, experiences that can last well beyond the end of the semester. Often students would attest to his personal attention that he provided to help students understand difficult concepts, or as an advisor provided helpful information about careers and graduate schools.

Jim's research has continued throughout his academic career, generally with an emphasis on Alaska. Over the years he would regularly travel to Alaska to continue his research projects with a variety of colleagues to study the geological, geomorphological and hydrological variations in many areas around Alaska including the central Alaska Range, Tanana Flats, Denali Highway region, Tangle Lakes, High Valley area, Yukon-Tanana Upland, Seward Peninsula, Yukon River, Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta, Kokrines Hills, and North Slope of Alaska regions such as Point Barrow, Umiat and the northern foothills of Brooks Range. His research has resulted in over thirty published abstracts, and 23 peer reviewed articles. In addition he has also authored or co-authored over 18 reviews/guidebooks/reports for a variety of groups. Students are frequently involved in his research and he has also mentored a significant number of undergraduate research projects for the geology degree. He has also served as advisor or committee member for graduate students in various degree programs, such as Biology, Environmental Science, Science Education, and Geography.

In a small department such as the Earth Science Department, it is often the case that all faculty members contribute to various committees or searches within the department, and Jim has done a significant amount of service for the department over the years. From 1995-2010 Jim served as Head of the Department, and provided effective leadership during that time. He continued to teach not only the LAC courses while Head, but also his advanced courses in *Geomorphology*, *Glaciers and Glaciation* and *Iowa Landforms*. He also worked with the Iowa Limestone Producers to develop and obtain funding for a summer workshop course for current K-12 Iowa teachers. The course, *Geology of Iowa for Teachers* was offered each summer from 2002 until 2011 to approximately 20-25 teachers each year. This was an intensive week-long course that involved a great deal of logistical work, coordination with local industries, and often 12-hour days of travel and work with the teachers. This workshop helped provide valuable knowledge about local geology to teachers from across the state.

Jim has also had a significant impact on the university community through his work on a variety of committees and leadership positions over the years. Amongst the various college and university committees he has worked with are the Strategic Plan Committee, Sustainability Advisory Council, Energy Conservation Committee (Chair), Museums Strategic Planning Task Force, Bachelor of Liberal Studies Committee, Committee on University Research, Faculty Budget Committee, Affirmative Action Committee, Committee on Energy and Environmental Studies/Education (Chair), and a cadre of search committees throughout the College of Natural Sciences.

Perhaps one of the most important service activities Jim has had is associated with Sigma Gamma Epsilon, the National Honor Society of the Earth Sciences. Since 1976, Jim has been the faculty advisor for the UNI chapter of SGE, and has, in the past, served as the National Vice President of the Central Province, and the National President. Currently, Jim is the National Secretary-Treasurer of SGE, and oversees all technical/financial responsibilities of this nationwide organization with nearly 200 chapters. Jim's leadership and mentoring over the years has helped the local chapter students earn the Sigma Gamma Epsilon National Quality Chapter Award for three consecutive years.



UNI Faculty Senate  
April 28, 2014  
Page 3

Jim has also been an active participant in a variety of groups located off campus, many with an emphasis in geology and environmental sciences. He is currently on the Iowa Geological & Water Survey (Iowa DNR) Advisory Board, the Dry Run Creek Watershed Technical Advisory Board, and the Advisory Panel for Iowa STATEMAP Geologic mapping program. Over the years he has also been active in the Iowa Academy of Science (Election Committee, Membership Committee, Geology Section Chair), and the Geological Society of Iowa (Board of Directors, President, Treasurer). For many years Jim has worked with the local limestone producers, BMC LLC, to provide geological expertise to the public at the annual Earth Science Week Open House event at the local quarry. This event would have between 500 and 1000 visitors of all ages learning about the quarry, geology, and about a wide range of earth science resources on a Sunday afternoon in October.

I could probably fill several more pages with information about all that James Walters has done over the years that highlight the quality of his work as a faculty member in the Earth Science Department and as a geologist. The closure of the geology programs in 2012 has resulted in the premature retirement of a generous man, who worked tirelessly to provide all (students, colleagues and the public) with an exceptional educational experience. While some were more concerned about the quantity of students impacted by faculty in programs across campus, it is the case that James Walters has provided a meaningful and positive influence on the education and lives of his students throughout the years. He is a worthy recipient of Emeritus Faculty status.

Sincerely,



Dr. Siobahn Morgan  
Colleague of Dr. James C. Walters  
Head, Department of Earth Science