

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
09/09/13 (3:31 p.m. – 5:01 p.m.)
Mtg. #1738

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

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

Press were in attendance from the *Northern Iowan*, Linh Ta, and from the *Waterloo Courier*, MacKenzie Elmer.

Provost **Gibson** offered no comments today.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** reminded Senators of the Fall Faculty Meeting next Monday, 3:30-5:00, in Lang Auditorium. Katie **Mulholland**, President Pro Tem of the Iowa Board of Regents, will be there. New faculty will also be introduced at this meeting. In addition, Chair **Funderburk** stated he will submit a petition regarding faculty evaluation of upper level administrators to follow-up on discussions by the Faculty Senate in the past in this area.

Chair **Smith** had several remarks, including a reminder that the Board of Regents meets here this week; he gave specifics as to meeting times, places, and some committees. He also noted various meetings he has had recently with UNI Administration and topics covered. [see below Minutes for complete details of his reporting]

Chair **Smith** also reported enrollment projections, a possible UNI Day at the Iowa capital next February 24th, and progress on a couple of policy proposals the Senate has put forward.

Next Chair **Smith** summarized the upcoming consultative sessions, for consideration of docketing today—one with Provost **Gibson** and Associate

Provost **Licari**, and one with President **Ruud**. He also has talked with several people [including Athletic Director **Dannen**; Liberal Arts Core Director Deedee **Heistad**, some State legislators, Board of Regents President Bruce **Rastetter** and United Faculty President Joe **Gorton**] about possible consultative sessions this year. Various logistics were debated by Senators, and Chair **Smith** will follow-up on those ideas.

Finally, Chair **Smith** concluded his comments by reminding Senators that the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on Monday, September 23rd, in the Curris Business Building (CBB) 319.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

Minutes for August 26, 2013, were approved with no additions or corrections (**Strauss/Nelson**).

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1199 1095 Request for Emeritus Status, John W. **Swope**

Motion to docket in regular order (Swan/Nelson**).

Passed.

1200 1096 Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Associate Provost **Licari** Regarding the Continuous Improvement Legislation (head of the order 9/23/13)

Motion to docket at the head of the order 9/23/13 (Kirmani/Peters**).

Passed.

1201 1097 Consultative Session with President **Ruud** (head of the order 10/14/13)

Motion to docket at the head of the order 10/14/13 (Nelson/O’Kane**).

Passed.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1194 1090 Request for Emeritus Status, Glenn T. **Nelson** (regular order)
(**Kirmani/Terlip**)

Motion to approve request (Kirmani/Nelson**). Passed.

1195 1091 Request for Emeritus Status, Thomas M. **Barry** (regular order)
(**Nelson/Peters**)

Motion to approve request (Peters/Strauss**). Passed.

1196 1092 Request for Emeritus Status, Kevin C. **O’Kane** (regular order)
(**O’Kane/Kirmani**)

Motion to approve request (O’Kane/Kirmani**). Passed.

1197 1093 Academic Affairs Representative on the Advisory Committee
for the Center of Excellence in Teaching and Learning (regular
order) (**Male Senator/Hakes**)

**Motion that the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs be replaced by
the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs as the Academic Affairs ex
officio member of the Advisory Committee to the Center for Excellence
in Teaching and Learning (**Kirmani/Peters**). Passed.

1198 1094 Performance Review of Senate Budget Committee in quasi-
committee of the whole on 9/23/13 (**Peters/Terlip**) Delayed until 9/23/13.

5. New Business

Numerous topics were discussed as potential business for the Faculty Senate to work on this year including the Policy Review Process and the Policy Review Committee, the Faculty/Staff Travel Policy, the Attendance Policy, the Expedited Grievance Policy, the Grade Change Policy, the Curriculum Process and possibly moving to an every-year Curriculum Change Process, and student writing improvement.

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn (MacLin/Hakes**). Passed.

Time: 5:01 p.m.

Next meeting:

Date: Monday, 09/23/13
Curris Business Building (CBB) 319
3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 52 pages, including 1 Addendum.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
September 9, 2013
Mtg. 1738**

PRESENT: Tilahun **Abebe** (alternate for Michael **Walter**), Melinda **Boyd**, Karen **Breitbach**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Barbara **Cutter**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Todd **Evans**, Blake **Findley**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Gloria **Gibson**, Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Tim **Kidd**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Kim **MacLin**, Lauren **Nelson**, Steve **O’Kane**, Scott **Peters**, Gayle **Pohl** (alternate for Marilyn **Shaw**), Gary **Shontz**, Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip** (26 present)

Absent: Chris **Edginton**, Nancy **Lippens** (2 absent)

CALL TO ORDER (3:31 p.m.)

Chair **Smith**: Well, it looks like we meet again. I’d like to call the meeting to order.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Smith: And as we typically do, call for press identification.

Ta: Lihn **Ta** from the *Northern lowan*.

Smith: **Ta** from the *Northern lowan*. (MacKenzie **Elmer** from the *Waterloo Courier* arrived a bit later.)

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Smith: And ask for comments from Provost **Gibson**?

Gibson: I have none today. Thank you.

Smith: You're welcome.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Smith: And comments from Faculty Chair **Funderburk**?

Funderburk: A couple of items. First, one more reminder about our Faculty Meeting, Monday, 3:30 to 5:00, Lang Auditorium. Katie **Mulholland**, the Pro Tem President of the Board of Regents will be with us. We're going to have the new faculty introduced, so be sure, if you've got any new colleagues, have them come.

Then one item that I will ask the Senate to take up has to do with the faculty evaluation of upper level administrators. According to a 1976 document of the Senate, we are to evaluate the performance of the President and—it seems to be the President and the Provost; it doesn't specify—every 5 years. This Body started talking about a different evaluation process last year. So I'll put it through as a petition item asking for either the Senate to decide to reauthorize the Committee, as it was, to begin the process or, if you have other ideas, to take it from there. But since there was discussion, I feel like I need to come back here before we just automatically start the process as it was described before. I believe that's the major stuff for me.

Smith: Senator **O'Kane**.

O'Kane: Yeah, Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**], will we have access to whatever instrument we previously used?

Funderburk: The Committee does.

O’Kane: Well, can we see that?

Funderburk: It’s actually in the notes of year before last for President **Allen**. I can’t locate any that were done for a Provost, and I can’t tell that it’s been done for a Provost since I’ve been here.

[Voices stating and agreeing “ We did Aaron **Podolefsky**.”]

Funderburk: Does anybody have.....

Swan: It’s part of the rules that the instruments be destroyed after we’re completed with them, so the only way to find the information about it would be to consult either Senate Minutes where that was discussed or a meeting of the Faculty, the Minutes for those, if it were discussed then.

O’Kane: I’m not looking to see the _____ [several voices overlapping]

Funderburk: The only reason I’m aware of this is because, having run the one for President **Allen**, we weren’t able to locate the document, and luckily I found the Chair who had run it who had the actual document. So that was—we made a point of attaching the actual instrument when we did his so that next time, through the Senate search, it would show up as at least the instrument. It is revisited each time, however; and some of the questions, obviously, are pertinent to the President but not pertinent to a Provost. And I should note that if you, in fact, don’t—are not fully familiar with the Senate Minutes of 1976 [laughter all around], they are available on the website under resources, and there is a link specifically to that October Senate Guidelines so you can see the discussion and what actually was authorized. And it’s a specified committee that does the work.

Smith: Senator **Heston**.

Heston: The last time this survey was actually put through the Center for Social and Behavioral Research? or Sciences? or whatever it’s called, do

they not have somewhere in their files an empty copy, a blank copy of—I mean, I can't imagine they

Funderburk: Well, the last one they certainly do. I mean, when we did the last one, that was the first time it was done as an online as opposed to an actual piece of paper, so the previous ones were

Heston: Well, if they did Aaron's [former Provost **Podolefsky**] as well, so they should have the Provost—his Provost.

Funderburk: Well, I guess—we—maybe I didn't ask there because I had to get it together before I ever got Gene [Director **Lutz** of the Center for Social and Behavioral Research] involved last time. We'll certainly explore that, depending on what the Senate decision is.

Smith: Any other questions for Faculty Chair **Funderburk**? [none heard]

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JERRY SMITH

Smith: If not, I will make some comments, unfortunately extensive—a bad habit, I guess. A reminder that the Board of Regents is meeting here this week. The Education and Student Affairs Committee, which is one of the committees that is most relevant to faculty, will be meeting in Room C of the Central Ballroom, Maucker Union, from 3:30 to 5:00 on Tuesday. That can be worth going to in the sense that there's stuff that is relevant to faculty. The Board itself meets in open session Room A&B of the Ballroom 9:00 to noon, again from 1:00-3:00 on Wednesday and again, because this year we're hosting things so we have some presentations of our faculty and other things that are relevant. If I'm not mistaken, United Faculty President will be talking to the Board as well. So, it's not a bad thing to do. It's a decent opportunity to get a sense of how things, you know, shake up and kind of get a feel for how the Board views this institution.

Last week I was invited to participate in a meeting with Provost **Gibson**, the Associate Provosts, and representatives from United Faculty to discuss the situation with student evaluations. The Committee, including United

Faculty, Administration, and student representatives, is being formed to develop and improve a student evaluation instrument and process. I hope that the new instrument or process will be available for use in the Fall 2014, which means there won't be any required student evaluations during the current academic year, but faculty will have the opportunity to participate in pilot tests of candidate instruments, so it's a good oppor—a good thing to do, but you're not going to be required to do student evaluations this year.

I also met with the Associate Provost Craig **Klafter** to discuss the proposed policy for faculty/staff travel. The EPC will be reviewing this policy and making recommendations to the Senate which will then offer its advice to the Administration. This I'll talk about again later, but this is going to be a fairly high priority item for us.

And I see we just have another press—MacKenzie? Yes, from the *Northern*—uh, the *Waterloo Courier*. [Ms. Elmer just came in.]

And this I'm told is—has got some urgency because of—it was flagged in an audit, and the Regents are going to want to see some progress on this, not this time but at the next meeting. So I'm—I'll talk about it later, but it's something we're going to be wanting to talk about.

The 3rd meeting of importance was held this morning, and it was attended by a bunch of people here. It's the first meeting of the President's new and greatly expanded Cabinet, attended by Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] and myself as faculty representatives; Joe **Gorton** was also there representing United Faculty. Some important points from that meeting: it was a full 3½ hours; it was a big meeting. Our President is making a very aggressive Fiscal Year 15 Budget Request to the Regents and to the Legislature. You know, we'd talked about the \$10 million of one-time money that we got for a biennium over 2 years. He's asking to make that permanent each year. I was amazed at that, but that's being very aggressive. In addition, looking for increases for inflation in various programs, requesting money to support BAS programs—Bachelor's in Applied Sciences, I think has floated around on campus before my time—but the kinds of things that would involve collaborations with community colleges and technical programs that they

have, and then helping those people get bachelor's degrees here. And I know it's kind of an issue because it's essentially—it's something very important to him, but it isn't something that's gone through kind of the curriculum process and kind of been set up in a way, so we'll see how that goes.

Official enrollment numbers will be released at Wednesday's Regents' meeting, but the current projections are for Fall enrollment—the number they have right now is 12,141. They are expecting a couple more, might get to 12,150, something like that, an improvement over the Budget projection, which you might recall was 11,800, but still a bit of decline from last year's 12,273. So our enrollment went down. It's kind of capped out. Hopefully it's going to go up, but it didn't go down as much as we had planned for, so that's the good news, and it's pretty close to last year, pretty much flat.

New student enrollment is up 3%. That was offset by a 3.5% decline in returning students. I'm thinking what that is is you lost a big senior class; you had a smaller, you know, sophomore class, etc.; and so bingo, you're going to have a decline in returning students. Total undergraduate enrollment is down 300. Total graduate enrollment is up 150, so the graduates kind of compensated for some of the declines in undergraduates, which is a bit surprising.

At this meeting, the President introduced the new Director of University Relations. There was a presentation and discussion of a mobile device strategy, having apps for UNI—an app, big UNI kind of app. Apparently a lot of universities have done this—I still don't have a smart phone—and other things like that.

One thing—it sounds to me as if there is going to be a search for a Vice President of Enrollment Management. I got the impression that that's going to be a VP position, something we kind of wondered about. But it looks like the President is going to put this very top level kind of person. I'm not sure of that. It wasn't total committed, but that was the vibes I was getting.

One point that was raise—he talked about the UNI Day at the capital. It's going to be Monday, 2/24/14. This would be our second. Apparently the University of Iowa has done this a long time, and they're at the capital around legislators and staff and, you know, family and other people. So some of it is kind of a way of generating admissions; a lot of it is a way of trying to get legislative understanding and potentially support. Now, when I asked, it sounded like what happened last year was you'd have tables that Departments could talk about their programs and some other kinds of things, you know. The Panther guy—what's his name? [several voices saying "T.C."] T.C. I see, I'm not very p.c. [light laughter around]—that they have that kind of stuff, kind of making the show for UNI. But I was wondering, should we have a Faculty Senate table that for the faculty was kind of—I mean, this is mainly aimed at legislators and their staff, to kind of make the case from the faculty and to communicate with them potentially about things like the Continuous Improvement Legislation. So I wanted to throw that out and see—get you to think about it. If we were going to do that, we'd have to reserve the table space by October 15th. I can tell you I personally would be willing to spend the day in Des Moines sitting at our table. Anybody else would be able to, too. We could think about what we'd want to do with that. But it may be an opportunity to do something, you know, and so I'd like to just throw that out as something you might think about, and remind me, and we'll get back to it down the road.

Finally, the session this morning concluded with a discussion of two policy proposals that the Senate had put forward but which got hung up in the review process. Scott [Senator **Peters**] and I had met with the President, I think it was in August before classes started, to kind of get things going again on this. And so he used the—this Cabinet, now, as the vehicle for talking about this and giving us feedback. And, in fact, that large, expanded Cabinet is going to be a player in the policy process. It's going to give the President and the—whatever the senior counsel—advice on "Ok, should we go with a big....?" Looks like it's a very important role here, so those proposals—I'm going to talk about them later. One had to do with the policy process. We proposed changes to that, and they've kind of come back and suggested some changes to our proposal. And the other has to do with curriculum. And, again, we proposed changes to the curriculum

process, and the feedback we're getting is, "Yeah, but we...." There's still some work to be done there.

Finally, I wanted to use the Comments time to update you on developments with regard to the consultative sessions. If you remember, at our last meeting I asked you about what kinds of consultative sessions you'd like. We've got a bunch of them, and I wanted to let you know how that's going.

The first one, if you look at the Agenda—I don't see it yet [lower portion not displayed on screen as yet], but we'll get there—includes a consultative session with Provost **Gibson** and Associate Provost **Licari** for our next meeting on September 23rd, regarding the Continuous Improvement Legislation. And that's been set for our next meeting, and Scott [Senator **Peters**] could add—or it's going to be, it is going to be docketed, or it will be up for docketing today.

Second, also on the list of calendar items for docketing today, is a proposed consultative session with President **Ruud** that would be held on October 14th, the meeting after next. So those two are coming—you know, set pretty much assuming you are amenable.

I've talked with Athletic Director Troy **Dannen**, so he'd be happy to meet with us. What worked for him calendar-wise was November 11th. He has some time for us. He will talk—he is willing to talk about concussions and bring experts along and other matters concerning the Athletic Program.

I talked with Deedee **Heistad**, Director of the Liberal Arts Core. She is anxious to meet with us. She'd—I think she'd like to meet this semester, but I think she is flexible on timing. So that one I'm kind of holding, because we've got to have some spots where we don't talk with people, actually do work, so we'll see.

But now we get to the interesting ones. I e-mailed the six State Legislators from this area, asking if they'd be willing to meet with the Senate. I heard from two of them—the two I expected, Senator Jeff **Danielson** and Representative Bob **Kressig**—both of whom are from Cedar Falls. Both

indicated that October 28th would be a workable date for them. I didn't hear from any others. I sent an e-mail back to all of them, saying "Let's do it on October 28th." After I did that, Jeff [**Danielson**] responded, "Yeah, happy to see you on October 28th." Bob [**Kressig**] responded, "Oh, d---!" He found out now he's got a committee meeting in Des Moines on October 28th. He might not be able to get back in time. He'll try. I ran into Pat **Gadelmann** [Special Assistant to the President for Board and Governmental Relations]. She said, "Hey, if you can get one. Do it. Don't worry about it. The one would be fine." And I'm comfortable that Jeff [**Danielson**] will be here, so if you're on board with that we'll go ahead with—I'll plan for October 28th for that.

More complications with regard to Board of Regents President Bruce **Rastetter**. I suggest—you know, I've got all these things filled. I said, "Well, what about November, December?" No. No. He wants to meet September, October. He really wants to get in touch with the faculty and kind of make the case—tell you, you know, how the Regents feel about this institution, really build a relationship with the faculty. But, you know, we've got a lot of our sessions—are already filled up, and his calendar is pretty well booked, too. So, I suggested calling a special meeting of the Senate for Monday, October 7th, for this purpose. That would not be our normal meeting. But it would be in that gap where we've got a 2-week gap between the last September meeting and the first October meeting, and so it would fill up one of those otherwise, for me, a vacation week kind of. [light laughter around] It would fill it up. [mumbles under breath] It would fill that up, but it would serve our purposes. Now, I threw out regular meeting, open to the press, etcetera, with students. No. He just wants to meet with faculty. He didn't say anything about Administrators. I assume he'd accept you guys as faculty [said to the Provost and Associate Provost]. But he doesn't—he wants it, in essence, a closed meeting. He's comfortable having minutes that I would—we would make available to the faculty. So I wanted to check with you. Are you comfortable with meeting on October 7th with Board [of Regents] President **Rastetter**. I think that would be a special meeting. I would plan—unless we had something else that we really needed to get done then, I would plan for that to be the only item on the Agenda for that meeting. And I'm assuming that we could do that as a, basically as a closed session but where minutes are taken. I don't

know if there's any difficulties with that. How do you feel about that? Is there any opposition or concern about that?

O'Kane: Not necessarily either but a question about that. What is the logic behind having it semi-closed?

Smith: He—I threw out, you know, “Well,” and I kind of threw out we can do—our normal meetings are open to everybody, including the press and students etcetera. And I got back that he didn't want to do that. I don't—I suspect his argument is that they just don't want—he doesn't want the distractions and maybe just wants to be able to commun—he'd feel he'd be able to communicate more freely with the faculty. But he is very concerned to kind of present, you know, to get to know the faculty and to let the faculty know how the Regents view this institution. That's

O'Kane: I assume the press would have access to the Minutes after the fact?

Smith: Technically not, but practically perhaps, would be my guess. [light laughter around] Yeah. He didn't—I could ask him if he wanted it—to restrict it, and if we took minutes to not distribute them. I could find out on that. But

O'Kane: It just gets funny, because minutes—you would assume that minutes are a public record.

Smith: They are distributed to faculty. I don't know if they're made available publically. [voices commenting] Scott [Senator **Peters**]? [voices saying they are on the website] Yeah, they're on the website, so they are available.

Peters: I mean—I guess I would start by saying then I like the idea—I like the idea of being able to interact with the Regents and others in a session where the press isn't there because you hear—they talk differently when the press aren't in the room. And I don't mean that to say that they're keeping secrets. I just think they're not as much on guard. They're not as afraid that anything they say will be somehow misunderstood and blown

up. So, I mean, I can see the benefit of it, and I understand that. And I want to—I want faculty to have whatever chance we can have to interact with them. And I don't know how we can do that within our Bylaws [voice saying "No"] the way he's described it. I mean, if you have an open session, it's an open session, and you can't sort of invite faculty in the room and then keep press out of the room. I don't—I don't think you can. And you certainly can't publish minutes—I mean, you could have an executive session, a closed session in which I think it would be—I think you could have a closed session in which the Senate decides that it will—it will essentially write a report out of that closed session to the faculty in some way. But once it goes out to the faculty, again, it's out to the public. I mean, you can't sort of keep it out of—out of people's hands. So, I'm not quite sure—while I appreciate and understand and want to have the forum in whatever way will get us the frankest exchange possible, I'm not sure how you do it the way he wants to do it.

Smith: If I were to tell him that

Swan: There is more discussion.

Smith: I'm sorry [hadn't noticed Faculty Chair **Funderburk's** hand raised at the end of the head table].

Funderburk: I was just going to point out I suspect that he doesn't realize that our minutes are, in fact, a literal transcript normally and that that might have changed his decision in the first place, if he knew it was a literal transcript that we do for our minutes. So I question if he would be willing to do it if it's a literal transcript being distributed in our traditional manner, so I think there are a lot of issues with it. I think if—I wouldn't mind having—we've both negotiated these waters a few times. I think the only clean choice is it's either open or it's executive session, and that's about all our Bylaws offer.

Smith: So, if I offered that choice to him, are you willing to have the meeting in either event? [heads nodding; voices saying "Yes"] Senator **Swan.**

Swan: Another option to avoid the verbatim transcript is to have a faculty meeting, and those minutes are not verbatim. The secretary of the faculty takes those minutes and distributes them widely. And that would then be the whole faculty being able to participate. And we could have a section set aside, if we wanted, for Senators or maybe some other mechanism like that. It doesn't have to be a Senate meeting.

Funderburk: So I should mention that Regent Rastetter was invited to the Fall Faculty Meeting and was eager to attend. He had said, "Yes," at every turn to coming, but once it was processed through his secretary, it became clear that he would be in Wyoming at that time and would be unable to attend. So he was planning originally to be here for the Fall Faculty Meeting but can't be here. And he told me then that he wanted to be on campus as soon as possible to meet faculty.

Swan: An October date for a second faculty meeting the Chair could call?

Smith: I mean, if I threw that possibility in the pile for him.

Funderburk: If we could find a place to do such a meeting, I'd, of course, be willing to do it, because obviously that gets to be a much larger audience and requires a much larger space.

Smith: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: First of all, I agreed to be the Secretary of the Faculty, assuming I would not have any work to do [loud laughter all around], and so I'm resolutely opposed to this event [more laughter]. But, secondly, I mean, can we have a faculty meeting that's only open to faculty members, or other members of the public are.....?

Funderburk: Practically? Let's see. [quiet voices murmuring] I can't think of a way off the top of my head. I would have to dig in the Constitution about that.

Smith: Ok, so unless I hear from you that there—that we could do it—this as a full faculty meeting, I will send to President **Rastetter** the two options

of an open meeting that would be open to press and to students and to everybody versus an executive session meeting. In the executive session meeting we wouldn't take minutes, right? [heads nodding] That's right. So, that'd get Sherry[Nuss, transcriptionist] off the hook. So I'll throw that possibility out to him. I suspect he's going to want to go executive session.

Swan: And the executive session is then just the members of the [Faculty] Senate?

Smith: Yes. Yes. OK. Finally, a potential consultation I didn't bring up at our last meeting. During the summer, while talking with United Faculty President Joe **Gorton**, he expressed an interest in meeting with the Senate. I'd be happy to accommodate him in that regard. I'd like to get your views on this. Among other things, we'd want to discuss the situation regarding the AAUP Motion for Censure that's on hold, how UF feels about the current Administration's efforts to improve relations with the faculty, etcetera. I think it'd be difficult to schedule that this semester but might be good to have it in the spring when he's got a better sense of the relationship between UF and President **Ruud**. So, how do you feel about that, setting up a meeting with President **Gorton**? [heads nod] Ok. I wanted to know that so I could let him know that the Senate would like to meet with him, and I'll tell him that we'll work it out sometime in the Spring.

One more reminder. Our next meeting, and you'll hear about this, our next meeting is not going to be here [in CME 109AB] unfortunately. It's going to be in CBB 319, the conference room in the Business building. We were there for a meeting last Fall—Spring, rather. If you remember, it's tight, so you want to get there early and get chairs. [light laughter around] But it's doable. I mean, it works. It's just kind of tight. But that's the only place I could get for next time. I'll try and—I'll have to find a place for our October 7th meeting with President **Rastetter**, assuming that still comes about.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Smith: Now, the next item of business is Minutes for Approval. Minutes from our last meeting of August 26th, drafted and circulated. Are there any additional corrections or discussion of the Minutes? If not, I'd like a motion to approve.

Strauss: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Strauss**. A second?

Nelson: Second.

Smith: Second by Senator **Nelson**. Any discussion of that? [none heard] All in favor, say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] Minutes are approved.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1199 Request for Emeritus Status, John W. **Swope**

Smith: Next, Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing, starting with Calendar Item 1199 which, if docketed, would be 1095. It's a Request for Emeritus Status for John W. **Swope**. Before I propose this item be docketed in regular order, is there any discussion of the item? [none heard] Then I am proposing that it be docketed in regular order. And I would like a motion to that effect.

Swan: So move.

Smith: Senator **Swan**.

Nelson: Second.

Smith: Seconded by Senator **Nelson**. Any discussion on this? [none heard] Then all in favor, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No.” [none heard] Motion carries.

Calendar Item 1200 Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Associate Provost **Licari** Regarding the Continuous Improvement Legislation (head of the order 9/23/13)

Smith: Calendar Item 1200 which, if docketed, will be #1096, a proposed Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Associate Provost **Licari** Regarding the Continuous Improvement Legislation. We’re especially interested in discussing how the assessment and reporting requirements of this legislation is likely to affect faculty. Any discussion of this item before I propose that it be docketed at the head of the order for our next meeting on September 23rd? Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So, if—I’d like to ask Associate Provost **Licari** if he’s ready at that consultative session to discuss especially the Liberal Arts Core courses? I just imagine that’s the big thing, and especially the courses that perhaps are offered across many Departments and Colleges? So we’re ready to discuss that?

Licari: Thank you, Senator **Swan**, I’ll talk about it in greater length at the session, but I just did want you to know that that is a question that I’ve gotten from, not a lot but a few faculty, on that very issue, so I know it’s of great interest. And this will be the opportunity to talk about that. Thank you.

Swan: Can I follow up?

Smith: Sure.

Swan: And so by “talk about,” will we know what needs to be done? [**Licari** nods.] Ok, so—because that is the thing that my constituency would want to know. Ok.

Smith: Any other discussion before we—before I propose that it be docketed at the head of the order for next week? Then I’m proposing that—a motion to docket at the head of the order. Do I have a motion to that effect?

Kirmani: So move.

Smith: Senator **Kirmani**. A second? Senator **Peters** [who indicated]. I always have to look at the name. I know these people, but I look at the names [tents] for some reason. [laughs lightly] It’s been moved by Senator **Kirmani**; seconded by—oh, any discussion? I have to do discussion first. Any discussion of this? Ok. We’ve got a motion, seconded to docket this consultative session at the head of the order on our next meeting September 23rd. All in favor, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No.” [none heard] Motion carries.

Calendar Item 1201 Consultative Session with President William **Ruud**
(head of order 10/14/13)

Smith: Finally on our Calendar Items, #1201 which, if docketed, would be 1097, a proposed Consultative Session with President **Ruud**. The President has expressed an interest in meeting again with the Senate. You will recall we met with him this Summer several occasions. We’ve reciprocated. We can talk about possible topics for discussion after we’ve agreed to consider docketing this Calendar Item. So you can give me some ideas what I can pass along to him. Some of the obvi—stuff is pretty obvious, Budget and enrollment and stuff, but we’ll be entertaining other things. But first before that, again I’d like a discussion preceding the docketing. I’m going to propose to docket at the head of the order for our 10/14 meeting, but do we have any discussion before we go to that? Senator **Swan**.

Swan: Just a quick, I wanted to ask what the topic or topics of discussion were for the consultative session, and I would like that to be stipulated in the consultative session motion—“to consult with President **Ruud** about the Budget” or “about X, Y, Z.” And so, Mr. Chairman, why do you want it to not stipulate that in the motion?

Smith: I wanted to leave it open to faculty to kind of say particular topics and also leave it open to President **Ruud** to bring up topics that he might want to talk about. I see it almost as information exchange and not just consultation in the strict sense of that term.

Swan: So, you wanted us to bring topics on that day but not stipulate them before?

Smith: No, I would propose that you would bring them now or sometime before so that I can give him a heads-up on “the faculty would like to know about such and such.” If I can do that, then he’s prepared for it. Obviously, he’s going to know that we’ll be interested in the Budget, we’ll be interested in enrollment, but if there are other particular topics that you want to bring to his attention and have him think about and prepare for, we can—you can let me know, if you can think of them now, or you can let me know anything within the next several weeks.

Swan: So you would be open to stipulating them in the motion as well as by saying _____ [voices overlapping]

Smith: If there is something that you feel strongly should be, that it’s particularly important that you’d like to have in the motion, we can do that.

Swan: Otherwise, it’s just an open consultative session that you’re proposing?

Smith: Yes. Any more discussion before we take up the docketing motion itself? And, again, I’ve suggested that this be docketed for the head of the order at our October 14th meeting, which is meeting after next. Is there anyone who would care to make that motion?

Nelson: So move.

Smith: Senator **Nelson** moves.

O’Kane: Second.

Smith: Senator **O’Kane** seconds. Now discussion of this, and at this point it is as good as anytime, if you’ve got particular topics that you would like to have included here, bring them out. I mean, again, there are the usual suspects, and we all know what they are. But if there are other things that are of particular interest to you—you know, that issue about—I don’t know if any of you—the BAS thing, Bachelors of Applied Science. I understand that it came up on campus some years back, and it was rather controversial. I don’t know if any of you had familiarity with it. That might be something that we might ask him about. Senator **Strauss**.

Strauss: I have a question. Is this going to be a public session or an executive session?

Smith: No, this will be a public session. Senator **Nelson**.

Nelson: In your opening remarks at our first meeting you talked about, you know, some of your views about curriculum and so forth that, you know, might need to be addressed. I’d be curious if the President had ideas along that regard that he would want to bring to our attention, you know, like comparing us to universities he has experience with or whatever? Does he see things related to curriculum that he would like to bring out (?)?

Smith: Ok, so curriculum-related issues? Ok. Thank you. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I think this kind of dovetails on the Bachelor of Applied Science idea that you raised earlier, but as we’re looking to, you know, in the short term expand enrollments and in the long term keep it stable, and he’s talking about forming these types of partnerships, I think I would like to ask him questions about the relationship between those endeavors and faculty-controlled curriculum. So how does he plan to both make those kinds of proposals to form those partnerships and work with the faculty to actually shepherd those things through the curriculum process that he, you know, that he feels strongly about are important for the future?

Smith: Very good. Very good. Any other comments on this? [none heard] Then I think we’re ready for a vote on the docketing? All in favor of

docketing this consultative session with President **Ruud** for the head of the order on October 14th, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] It is approved. Motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

Smith: Now, as I said in my preview email for this meeting, the Senate’s Bylaws prescribe an “order of business” that has us ask for and consider “New Business” after we’ve docketed new calendar items but before we consider items that are already on our docket. And if I move that up a little bit [speaking of the Agenda projected for all to see], which I will in a second, you’d see the next thing after our docketing is “New Business.” What I’d like to do is have the Senate’s permission to deviate from this order of business so that we can be sure to address all the items currently on our docket, the docketed items, before using whatever remains in today’s meeting to talk about other topics that I’ll introduce under the heading of New Business. And those are mostly kind of an agenda. What should we be trying to do during the rest of the year? So, if I have—do I—if I have your permission to do that, I’d like to move into the docketed items and then after that, if we’ve got any time left, to come back through New Business and talk about this kind of year going forward? Are you comfortable with that? [heads nodding] Any objections? [none heard]

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET 1090, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, GLENN T. **NELSON**
(REGULAR ORDER) (**KIRMANI/TERLIP**)

Smith: Ok, so now let’s do Consideration of Docketed Items. The first of which, Calendar Item 1194, Docket #1090, is a Request for Emeritus Status for Glenn T. **Nelson**. I need a motion to approve this.

Kirmani: So move.

Smith: And a second? Moved by Senator **Kirmani**. Second from?

Nelson: Second.

Smith: Senator **Nelson**. And now we are open to—I will entertain comments and statements regarding Professor **Nelson**'s contributions to the University. And I believe Senator **Kirmani** has something to say.

Kirmani: I will read parts of a letter which Douglas **Mupasiri**, the Math Head, has written to Jerry [Faculty Senate Chair **Smith**] Ok, so “Throughout his tenure of service at UNI, Dr. **Nelson** was a central figure in the elementary mathematics education program. He was a key player in the planning, design, and development of the curriculum proposal which created the Undergraduate Minor in Mathematics Teaching for Elementary Education Minors [*sic* Majors]. This Minor was to become the primary focus of this attention until his retirement. But perhaps the thing that most set Dr. **Nelson** apart among his peers was his belief in the idea that the most powerful and impactful tool in the teacher preparation programs is the classroom experience that prospective teachers get during their training.... For this reason, Dr. Nelson sought every opportunity to bring his students to school classrooms. He spent countless hours in the classrooms at the Price Lab with his students.” And he has given some more details [see Addendum 1 for complete letter], and then he says that “Those of us who have known Glenn have marveled at his ability to connect with his students and at his enduring commitment to them beyond graduation. He stays in touch with former students and can be counted on to share with other faculty members where these graduates teach, how their professional careers are going, when they get married, and when they have children. It is the rare faculty member who gets this invested in the lives of his or her students. Dr. **Nelson** set the bar high for all of us. We wish Dr. **Nelson** the best as he embarks on the next chapter of his life in retirement. We will miss him. We strongly support his application and urge the senate to grant him faculty emeritus status.”

Smith: Thank you, Senator **Kirmani**. Are there any other comments or discussion regarding Dr. **Nelson**'s request for emeritus status? [none heard] Then, I move—like to vote on this. All in favor of approving this request for

emeritus status, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No?" [none heard] It carries.

DOCKET 1091, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, THOMAS M. **BARRY**
(REGULAR ORDER) (**NELSON/PETERS**)

Smith: Next item on our docket is Calendar Item 1195, Docket #1091, a Request for Emeritus Status from Thomas M. **Barry**. I would appreciate a move to approve this. Moved by Senator **Peters** [who indicated], and a second by Senator **Strauss** [who indicated]. We'll entertain a discussion, and I will offer some comments that I received from John **Valentine**, the Director of the UNI School of Music. Quoting from Professor **Valentine**, "Tom **Barry** has had a remarkable career at UNI, not only as an incredible teacher, but as a professional performer. He has been well-respected by colleagues, students, and community members during a career spanning from 1973 to 2013. Tom also served as a professional audio engineer for the School of Music and long-standing principal oboist to the Waterloo-Cedar Falls Symphony Orchestra. Professor **Barry** has taught hundreds of students who have become successful music teachers in Iowa schools, professional musicians, professors, or successful business leaders. Tom's saxophone and oboe studies have been so successful that when he announced his retirement, two national searches had to be mounted in order to serve his large student enrollments. It is remarkable that he leaves his career at the top of his game with one of the largest studios in UNI history. The entire School of Music faculty has great respect for Tom's career and collegial presence on our campus." Now, in addition to those comments from Professor **Valentine**, there were also comments from Robert **Washut**, Professor of Jazz Studies at UNI, who said, "The breadth of what Tom has brought to the School in terms of artistry and technical assistance is significant. We are colleagues and friends. Tom has put together all the audio and recording for every jazz band and combo concert I've been involved with. He's fastidious, and he does it right every time." Are there any comments or discussion with regard to Professor **Barry's** request for emeritus status? Faculty Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: I'd like to weigh in also. I've taught with him 3 times team teaching a music technology course, and he is a very fine teacher. I will also note that he actually has been doing 3 people's jobs. They only replaced two of them because he's still here doing the audio work. He's putting in full-time hours on that. He also plays with another groups. Many people probably see him most often with "Checker and the Bluetones" around town. You know [the group] [acknowledging Senators' reactions], he plays in that band, and he now has more time for that as well. So he's been a real inspiration for everybody and a great person to work with.

Smith: Thank you. Any other comments? [none heard] Then I believe we are prepared to vote on this. All in favor of approving this Request for Emeritus Status, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No?" [none heard] The motion carries.

DOCKET 1092, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, KEVIN C. **O'KANE**
(REGULAR ORDER) (**O'KANE/KIRMANI**)

Smith: The third and final request of this kind, Calendar Item 1196, Docket 1092 is a Request for Emeritus Status for Kevin C. **O'Kane**. I'd like a move to approve this.

O'Kane: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **O'Kane**. A second from Senator **Kirmani** [who indicated]. And now discussion. And again I've got a letter from Professor **Wallingford** who is the Head of the Computer Science Department, and he wrote this letter. It is somewhat of a transmittal letter but also providing support of this nomination. "Professor Kevin **O'Kane** has recently retired from his faculty appointment in the Department of Computer Science at the University of Northern Iowa. This concluded 21 years of meritorious service to UNI, comprising a 4-year stint as the first Head of the Department, followed by 17 years of research, teaching, and service of the Department, University, and profession. Prior to his arrival at UNI, Professor **O'Kane** served for 13 years as a faculty member and Department Head at the Universities of Tennessee and Alabama. Based on these 34

years of meritorious service in higher education, I nominate Professor **O’Kane** for faculty emeritus status. Are there any other comments or discussion with regard to this motion? [none heard] Then, I believe we’re ready for a vote. All in favor of recommending that Emeritus Status be granted to Professor Kevin **O’Kane**, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] Motion carries.

DOCKET 1093, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS REPRESENTATIVE ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE CENTER FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING (REGULAR ORDER) (MALE SENATOR/**HAKES**)

Smith: Now, next item on our docket, Calendar Item 1197, Docket #1093 regarding the Academic Affairs Representative on the Advisory Committee for the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, and I’ll put the petition up on the screen [projected] in a minute. The petition was put forward by Professor Susan **Hill**, who has graced us with her presence. She is the Director of the CETL and is asking that the Academic Affairs rep. on this Committee be changed from the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs on the grounds, as I understand it, that this is the person to whom she reports administratively. We talked about this a bit 2 weeks ago when the item was docketed. I provided our transcript to Professor Hill so she could understand and give consideration to the concerns that were raised at that time. So, I’m going to ask Professor Hill to join us at the table, which I asked her to do that already, and to open our discussion by explaining the rationale behind her position. And while she’s doing that, I’m going to—but before she does that, I should get a motion here to take up this item of business, asking for a motion to approve this proposal. Do we have a motion to that effect?

Kirmani: So move.

Smith: Senator **Kirmani**. And I take Senator **Peters** as a second for that motion. [who indicated] Now we are prepared for our discussion, and we are going to start off with Professor **Hill**.

Hill: When I made this request, my assumption was that part of the reason that the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs was the Academic Affairs rep. on this Committee had to do with the fact that there wasn't another Associate Provost and that this was kind of a pro forma, "Let's put the person under whom faculty development—under whose auspices faculty development came as the person who was the advisory board rep." So, clearly that was a false—or a bad assumption on my part, so I'll clarify with a little bit more context. In a lot of universities, including the University of Northern Iowa, the idea of faculty professional development comes under the auspices of an Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, not Academic Affairs. It's not that those two things aren't related, but because it's the professional development of faculty, which is under the auspices of Faculty Affairs, CETL kinds of organizations are often under that person's auspices. I'm sure you can find exceptions to this, but that seems to be the kind of general rule, and it is the way that UNI has also understood this in the past and, I think, now. And the Advisory Board's function, in my mind, is to help the Teacher Practice Center in terms of its mission, its vision, its goal, in terms of what's best for faculty professional development, and because of that, it's very helpful for the Associate Provost of Faculty Affairs to sit on the Committee as the ex officio rep. from the Provost's Office. It's not solely about the fact that I report to that person, but there is a certain practicality of that. If Associate Provost **Licari** were to continue, or that position continue, that person would have to report to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs about what happened in said meetings with the Advisory Board. And I wrote this to put the position in and not the person in, so that the position is the ex officio position on the Board, not the person. So that if the person changed, you wouldn't have to change the person again. So, that's my rationale.

Smith: Any questions or discussion? Thank you, Susan [**Hill**]. [quiet for a bit] Oh, my. Are we ready to vote?

Swan: But that's not what the motion—the discussion in the proposal talks about removing the Academic Affairs Associate VP [*sic*, Associate Provost]and replacing it with the Faculty Affairs, but the motion doesn't. The resolution: therefore, be it resolved that the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs sit ex officio on the Advisory Committee. So that would—

that adds a person to the Advisory Committee. It doesn't replace a person. And I'm understanding that the Director wants to replace the advisory—the Academic Affairs VP, Associate VP, Associate Provost rather—so many administrators—with the Faculty Affairs. So that should be in there.

Smith: So, if we said that: be it resolved that the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, or his or her representative,

Hill: Replace.

Smith: Sit as the ex officio, or replace would be the better language?
[several voices at once]

Hill: I think that probably what we need to say “replace the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs as the Academic Affairs official representative on the Committee.” I mean, I guess I could reword that for you if you need me to. [several voices at once]

Swan: Well, no, that's the question. So, in whatever document that established this, it says “there will be an Academic Affairs representative”?

Smith: Yes.

Swan: Ok, so that's why you have stated it that way.

Smith: Ok, so we take that then as an amendment to the motion or as the motion? This is where we get this procedural stuff.

Hill: It's not that complicated.

Smith: I know.

Hill: What I really want to have happen is that the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs be replaced by the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs as the Academic Affairs ex officio member of the Advisory Committee to the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning.

Smith: So, we will take that as the motion. Are you comfortable with that? [asking motioner/seconded] That is the motion that has just been discussed that was moved and seconded. Is there any more discussion of that motion? Then we will vote on it. All in favor of that motion [light laughter due to the motion's structure], please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No?" [none heard] Thank you. Thank you, Susan.

Hill: Now I can call a meeting of my Advisory Board. I appreciate that very much.

DOCKET 1094, PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE IN QUASI-COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON 9/23/13 (**PETERS/TERLIP**)

Smith: Ok, now, one more calendar or one more docketed item, 1198, docketed 1094 is listed on the Agenda for informational purposes. We're not going to act on it today, but it was docketed for consideration at our next meeting. And just a reminder then, this is kind of a review of the Senate Budget Committee. We had an original item that included this review with kind of new representatives. We split that motion. We dropped the idea of, at least for the time being, of electing new or appointing new representatives, but are left with the task of reviewing the charge, mission, etc., of the performance of this Committee, and that will be taken up at our next meeting. So we just put it out there to keep you aware of that. That's going to be coming up. That then completes the Consideration of Docketed Items.

NEW BUSINESS (REVISITED)

Smith: As I said, what I wanted to do is to kind of get a whole space now for New Business, and we actually have some time, so I'd like to use the remaining time that we have to talk about our agenda for the coming year, what we should try to accomplish. This is something that we would normally do during a retreat which we didn't have this year because we had a lot of other stuff going on.

One thing to note, this is a curriculum year for us. Those of you who are new and those who aren't new, probably, say, in December, but more likely in January, we're going to have lots of curriculum proposals. Sometimes it goes very quickly. Sometimes it can be very protracted and lots of complications. But that's work that we will have to do for the most part in January.

In addition, there are a number of policy matters that will be coming before the Senate for our review, some of which are carryovers from last year; others are relatively new. And so I want to talk about some of those, the first of which is the proposed Policy Review Process. Now this is one where we developed a proposal that would review the process by which policies are made and reviewed in this University. We put it forward. It got kind of hung up, in part because of the switch to a new President. Scott [Senator **Peters**] and I met with President **Ruud** in August. We talked about it. It was discussed again at this morning's Cabinet meeting. There is general support for having two faculty representatives on the Policy Review Committee, but they did not—and we'd—there had been concerns raised about stipulating that one of those representatives be appointed by United Faculty. There are concerns that other collec—other bargaining units on campus would want similar representation that would clutter things up. So, we talked about it this morning, and Joe **Gorton** [President of United Faculty] was there and pretty much on board with this. We would—the proposal that we would put forward then—this is going to be a revision of the proposal that we had put forward—would call for two faculty representatives on the Policy Review Committee appointed by the Senate. And then the Senate itself could make the commitment—we could decide that one of those appointed by the Senate would be one that had the approval or support of United Faculty. So we could do that at the Senate level rather than stipulating in the Policy that there had to be a United Faculty rep. on this Committee.

We had in our proposal to trim some members from that current Policy Review Committee. They've got HR people. I think there's somebody from the Foundation or Development Office. That was not supported. People felt that these constituencies that are currently represented on the Policy Review Committee should be represented, but we should add faculty

representation as I just described. So, that's going to come back to us—in essence it's coming back to us right now, and you should understand, I think, the way the Cabinet is going to be used here. It was brought up this morning in Cabinet. He's using this—President **Ruud** seems to be using the Cabinet as a source of University-wide input on policy and other matters. And so, yes, you have this Policy Committee that's a smaller Body that kind of vets things, but eventually it goes to the Cabinet where again every constituency, including United Faculty, is in a position to weigh in on it. So, what I'm going to suggest is that I'll make some revisions to our Proposed Policy, bring it forward, get it on the docket for discussion and debate, and then we can presumably approve a revised proposal that, if we do it well, I think will sail through the approval process. So that's how I'm proposing to go forward with this. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Yeah, I would just say that—that just to kind of remind people what the purpose of this Policy Review Committee—it reviews any Policy Proposal that's put forward that's originated by anybody on campus who wants to suggest a new policy, but it does not have the power to veto anything. The most it can do is send it along to the next step—this is our proposal—it would send it along in the next step of the process with a different recommendation. So, it would still go up to the Cabinet. It would just be with a new recommendation. And then this new larger Cabinet would have that debate and sort it out and make a decision about whether to send it back down. So

Smith: I don't think that the Cabinet, even the larger Cabinet, is going to have final approval on it. I think what it will do is make a recommendation that will hold a lot of weight with the President. But I think the President and whatever that higher Body is called, that will be where the final decision is made.

Peters: So you'll want to get some clarification on that from President **Ruud**, because the language we proposed specifically said it must be approved by the President and the Cabinet.

Smith: Ok. Ok, thank you. Now, another issue—yes? Senator **O'Kane**.

O’Kane: Although I don’t have an example, I imagine we can think of the time where an issue in which a person will have divided interests. They might want to have their interests follow the Union or the Senate’s wishes, which are not necessarily the same thing. Maybe they usually are, but one can envision a time when they would not.

Smith: Yeah. Well, I mean, the Senate can decide whether we want to—I mean, are you saying that with the point of the Senate making sure that there’s United Faculty representative on the Policy Review Committee? Are you

O’Kane: That person may find themselves in the position where, “Uh oh. Where do my loyalties lie?”

Terlip: But that’s true for anything with policies. “It’s really good for my Department but not necessarily the entire faculty.” So you’re always going to have divided loyalties.

Smith: Senator **Nelson**.

Nelson: And if someone is representing and appointed by the Senate, certainly faculty who are members of United Faculty can attend Senate meetings and perhaps request to speak to have an influence over what that person might represent, you know, to the Policy Review Committee that they’re a member of. So I don’t see that being a significant problem as long as there’s a process by which faculty can have a representative, and the larger Body of faculty can speak through those representatives.

Smith: Ok. Any other comments on this point? Yes, Senator—Vice-Chair **Kidd**.

Kidd: Just a—and this might be unrelated, but I remember the last time a policy went through there was a public discussion period before it was put through?

Smith: Yes.

Kidd: Is that still going to be?

Smith: Yes. Yes.

Kidd: Ok, just wondering.

Smith: Now, the next policy that I wanted to talk about, and I alluded to it earlier in my opening comments, have to do with Faculty/Staff Travel Policies. There was also one about Student Travel Policy, but it appears not to be something that we have to weigh in on. I think it's being taken care of effectively, but the Faculty/Staff Travel Policy requires action on our part and some fairly immediate attention. Some of you may recall that Associate Provost **Klafter** met with us last year. I don't know that he put the proposal in front of us, but he has put forward a faculty-friendly proposal. And what I mean by that, it's a proposal that allows faculty to go kind of where they want to go, including potentially risky/dangerous areas if the faculty chooses, and this has been objected to by the Enterprise Risk Management Council, which is one of the things that's kind of holding up approval of this. They have objected on the grounds that it exposes the University liability. Associate Provost **Klafter** has said there are ways of dealing with this, but they have wanted a more restricted Policy on Faculty Travel—Faculty/Staff Travel. Associate Provost **Klafter** wants a more lenient one that leaves it up to faculty, and, you know, if necessary, sign a waiver of whatever, but give the faculty the rights to do what they want to do. So he believes, and I think correctly, that his proposal will benefit—will, in fact, be appealing to faculty to the Senate, and it will benefit from the Senate's approval. He'd like to have us weigh in on it, hopefully support his policy. He thinks that will help it get over the hurdles in the rest of—in dealing, for instance, with the Cabinet. And so he wants, you know, wants us to act on this.

Of course, we're going to want some input from the EPC. I'm not sure how far they've gone with this. I'm going to be meeting with Francis **Degnin**, of the EPC later this week, but there is a time issue here. This issue is connected to or a concern raised by a recent audit, and those go before the Regents, and as I've been told by the Provost and Associate Provost, this runs the risk of being kind of a yellow flag. Eventually, if it's not taken care

of, it becomes a red flag issue which attracts all sort of negative attention from the Regents. So we'd like to get this approved not by this Regents' meeting but at least have significant progress by the next Regents' meeting in October. And so what I plan to do is put this on the calendar for our next meeting on September 23rd so it could be considered on October 14th, hopefully at that time with input from EPC. I personally suspect that this policy will not be all that controversial, but I could be wrong. We never know how those turn out, but I wanted to give you a heads up that I'm trying to get this a little bit fast-tracked, but I want to have—I want to make it available to, you know, to faculty at large to kind of weigh in and be aware of it. But I'm hoping that we can get this—I'm hoping that this—we can get Senate action on this on October 14th so that our folks can go before the Regents at their meeting later that week I think it is, and say, "Yes, there is significant," you know, "we're making progress on this." Are you comfortable with that basic approach to this? Any concerns or comments on that? Yes, Senator **Cooley**.

Cooley: In your initial comments on this topic, you suggested this had something to do with accounting?

Smith: It was with auditing. It's connected to an audit, and I don't know the details of this, but they do audits of the International Programs or something, and I guess a concern was raised that we didn't have a policy governing this kind of travel, which lacking a policy potentially, you know, sets the University up for behaviors that could get it into financial—great financial troubles. So that's—that's kind of the concern that the priority—get it fast for the Regents. That's this audit connection so it's doing that.

Cooley: I guess we'll need to see more materials about this. It sounds fairly complex when you describe it that way.

Smith: I don't know if the audit side of it affects us. The policy itself—I've gotten it; I haven't read it, but it, you know, it's a bunch of pages of very not thrilling reading, but it will, you know—I don't know that it will be controversial, but it's something that does have some time pressure on it. Any other comments? Yes, Senator **Peters**.

Peters: It is a petition that we got last year, and then we referred it to EPC, so it is—it is on our

Smith: So it is back—so I'll have to dig it out and find the docket number and re—reignite it. Now, any—yes.

Terlip: I recall that discussion, and I know part of it were some definite concerns about infringement on academic freedom, so since we're going to have to act upon this really quickly, I think it might be a good idea to maybe flag it on our website somehow so that faculty can see it more easily than having to go to our Minutes and then find it. That might be easier for us to get input, for everybody to look at the real document rather than the rumor mill circulating what it means.

Smith: I'm not sure how to flag it on the website or what to do there.

Peters: I do. I can help you with that.

Smith: Ok, thank you. Other comments? [none heard] There's a related matter. This—when—when I was talking with Associate Provost **Klafter**, he pointed to the composition of the Enterprise Risk Management Council, which is again the Body that's raised this concern about, "Gee, you know, we don't allow faculty to do this, that, or the other." What he pointed out was that there are no faculty on this group. And those of you who were here last year may recall we had quite a contretemps with the issue of access to buildings after hours for students. Again, that was the Enterprise Risk Management Council trying to push that. We did a lot of push back—Kim [Senator **MacLin**] had a lot to do with that—and got them to back down on their policy and be much more accommodating to the needs of our students. So it occurred to me that we ought to ask the President to allow the Senate to appoint a faculty representative to the Enterprise Risk Management Council. And if you are supportive of that, I will initiate the petition and take it through the stuff and go through the motions to do that. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: You could just ask him and see if he'll do it.

Smith: Just like that?

Peters: I mean, it would save us some business. It would save us some meeting time. [voices commenting and laughing] The next meeting you have with him, ask—point out there's no faculty member, point out they are considering policies that affect us, ask if he can appoint a faculty member to it or allow us to appoint a faculty member to it.

Smith: Do I need him—to get it put in writing? If he just says it, is

Peters: I mean, it's up to the Senate. I'm just proposing that it might be an easy way to take care of it. If the Senate prefers, you know, formal action and have it—that's fine. But it's not a Senate committee, so it's not one we control anyway.

Smith: Right.

Peters: It's up to—did he put it together or did Vice President **Hager**? I don't know.

Smith: It's his committee. I think it reports to him.

Peters: Whoever put it together controls that. So, you know, if you can get it done faster, just by asking it, my own view would be just to ask.

Smith: Well, let me try that. If it doesn't work, we'll do it the other way. OK? *Sehr gut*. The Attendance Policy, some of you remember we put a lot of time into that last year because of some issues with veterans. It's back. [laughter and dismay expressed] I know. It is not because of veterans. This time because of a Federal Mandate regarding students who are pregnant. [vocalized groans] Yes, indeed. So that will be on the plate of the EPC to try and draft language that accommodates the Federal requirement, and then it will come back to us. And it's getting hairier every go-round here. Another one was the Grade Change Policy. Oh, I'm sorry, yes, Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Since you brought up the Attendance Policy, the Expedited Grievance Process proved to be—you know, it worked, but it was a little thorny, and so I can—I think we should probably amend that a little bit to specify what the President of NISG has to do because last year’s President did a great job, but he just had to make it up as he went along, and it was extremely stressful and difficult, and I don’t think we should put a student in a position of having to make those kinds of choices. So that’s probably something that we should look at, too.

Smith: Anybody else on that? So I should tell the EPC to be looking at that Expedited Grievance Process and possibly fixing that?

Peters: Yeah, I mean, I would—I would be willing to make a few recommendations to them. It wouldn’t—it won’t be hard. It’ll be an easy thing to do that.

Smith: Ok. Ok. Good. Grade Change Policy, I think was administrative grade changes. We had a lot of fun with that last year. Bounced it back big time to the EPC. I suspect at some point they’ll come up with a revised proposal for another shot. That’s not high on their list, given these other things that have to be done, but I would anticipate at some point this year we’ll have to look at the Grade Change Policy.

And another policy proposal in the works that will need revision, and I mentioned this earlier because this is one, again, that was picked up at the Cabinet meeting this morning, has to do with what I think is the most important issue the Senate will address this year is management of the curriculum. Some of you will remember that the issue came up late last year. We had a report from a Committee that the Senate set up. In fact, many of the Committee members are here—Barbara [Senator **Cutter**], myself, Laura [Secretary **Terlip**], Todd [Senator **Evans**], two-thirds of that Committee—Gayle [alternate Senator **Pohl**], oh yes. Five/six of the Committee here—at which time we proposed a Curriculum Management Committee of sorts as well as a number of other curriculum changes. This came up way in our last meeting of the Senate last year. We approved changes to the policy, but we didn’t actually establish the Curriculum Management Committee. We didn’t approve some of the other kinds of

things. Now the policy proposal itself kind of got hung up again in considerable part because we didn't provide a mechanism by which the faculty, through the Senate, could manage the curriculum. And Administrators, from what I'm seeing, are very happy for the faculty to take responsibility of curriculum, but they want to see that laid out, how they're going to do that in the Policy. And so we've got to—you know, this was discussed this morning at the Cabinet meeting. We're going to have to think about curriculum management. And do we need another committee? Could we use the existing committee structure and existing committees to do this? This is something we're going to have to be talking about this year. It's a major issue.

There are a couple of other issues, though, that came up as well from that Committee's Report, and those are ones that I think are simpler and, in fact, that we can move forward on. There was a request that the University move to a curriculum process that allows curriculum proposals to be initiated every year, rather than every other year. And everybody I've talked to says, "Yeah, that's a good idea." So what I'm suggesting is that we, in fact, you know, through the petitioning process—I don't know, maybe we could do this directly, too—but I think it's better in this case to do a petition process approved by the Senate, let the Administration know that we'd like to work with them to make this happen. You could start curriculum proposals every year. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: All you have to do is change—I mean, we change the Curriculum Handbook, and it's done.

Smith: It's in the Curriculum Handbook, so it should

Peters: Am I—Associate Provost **Licari**, I'm right about that, right?

Licari: You are right.

Peters: I mean, it takes no action from the Provost's Office whatsoever? And is that—is that correct?

Licari: I think—I think all we would do would be just to check it off, and it's just a quick change.

Peters: So it's something we control entirely.

Licari: Uh huh.

Smith: Ok.

Peters: It's just a matter of the Curriculum Handbook, I think.

Smith: Senator [*sic* Faculty Chair] **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: And I think that we just want to be careful to think it through a little bit,

Peters: Yeah.

Funderburk: if we decide to do that so it's not—becomes a free-for-all that's impossible to wrap your head around for the Committee to really follow things through, so it—we can do it, but we need to do it wisely.

Smith: Is it—so is it going to happen now in the normal course of things, or is there something else we have to do?

Peters: We would have to—the Committee last year made some recommendations.

Smith: Yes.

Peters: We haven't acted on those recommendations as a Senate. In order to act on those recommendations, we would need to rewrite the relevant portions of the Curriculum Handbook.

Smith: Ok. But I thought you just said that'd been done.

Peters: Once we—once we rewrite the Curriculum Handbook to be consistent with the recommendations that Committee made, then it is done at that point.

Smith: Ok. Yes, Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: I mean, I think what everyone is getting is we'd have to decide on a specific "What's this one-year schedule going to look like? What's going to happen when?"

Smith: Well, my understanding is the same thing happens as happens now, it's just that you can start things happening every year rather than every other year.

Cutter: Right, but that would take some altering, because things happen every 2 years, and I—are we going to speed everything up, or are we going to have—I mean, I think a group is going at least have to sit down and figure out the logistics of that.

Terlip: And I think we need to look carefully at implementing only 1 piece of all of the proposals before we could do that, because I think that worked because we thought some other things were going to happen, too, so when you only do that, I'm not sure. We haven't gotten through what might happen, so

Cutter: I under—oh, I'm sorry. I understood that as something that was kind of separate from our other recommendations, though, so I—the—that it was not essentially a part of the management package. It's something we wanted to do anyway because we thought the current process was kind of cumbersome, and it took too long to get things changed.

Terlip: But we were talking about having to specify a lot of things about what was a routine change. I mean, none of that is done, so

Smith: Senator **Nelson**.

Nelson: For those of us that are new, could we be referred to the Minutes or whatever where this was discussed?

Smith: Yes, in fact we can—I can get you the docket, the item that includes the document that was provided.

Nelson: That would be very helpful.

Smith: That gets me—Senator **O’Kane**.

O’Kane: Was that document approved or ratified by the Senate?

Smith: Yeah, that’s the thing.

O’Kane: As if we’re talking now like it’s a done deal to do this?

Peters: No.

Terlip: It went back to the Committee.

Smith: Right. It’s such that kind of got stalled, and the Committee itself has pretty much evaporated, so it’s—I don’t know if it was tabled or what, but we did approve, specifically approve I know the policy changes, but we didn’t approve—I don’t recall that we approved

Terlip: It still hadn’t made its way through all the College Senates when this Senate heard it, so we were waiting to hear back from whichever College Senate it was before we approved, but I don’t think we ever.

O’Kane: So this Body never said, “Yes, we’re going to switch to one-year.”

Smith: That is my understanding.

Peters: Yeah. That’s correct. We never ever approved it. I mean, we just ran out of time. The clock just ran out before we could get that far.

O’Kane: It sure does look like something we should vote on.

Smith: Ok, so then I would, as I suggested initially, is I would put that as a petition and bring that to the Senate through the—through our normal procedure here for a vote. Secondly, and this relates to the points that Laura [Senator **Terlip**] made and also Senator **Cutter**. Among the recommendations of this Committee were proposals to try and find ways of streamlining the curriculum process so that in fact, potentially at least, you could have some curriculum proposals that didn't take 2 years, irrespective of when you start them, you could maybe get them done fast-track. We're talking about things that are relatively minor—word changes, etcetera, etcetera. So it seems to me that the appropriate thing to do there, correct me if I'm wrong, would be to request the UCC and GCCC asking them to review the curriculum process up through the stages that they're involved in and identify ways of streamlining the process, and potentially doing a triage, sorting out the stuff that takes the full, extended process, versus things that can be done on a very fast-track basis. That, in my view, would be a request to those Bodies to do that. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I would recommend that the Chair reconvene that Committee and kind of assess where the Committee is in terms of getting the feedback from everybody, because you had gone around—the Committee had gone around to, I think, almost all the Colleges but maybe hadn't visited—I can't remember now.....

Terlip: One College, and it went to the GCCC and UCC and

Peters: And, I mean, I know the Committee did a good job to go and discuss its proposals at a lot of different places, but I seem to remember that there was something—there was some place that they just weren't able to get to because the College Senates were very busy with the curriculum stuff in the Spring. It was hard to do scheduling. And then at that point what the Committee can start working on—the Committee could then come back to the Senate, you know, report on the consultations it did, how those wrapped up, and if the Senate wanted to proceed to a vote on those recommendations, you know, we could do that—sort of authorize moving forward with these things, because whereas, like I said, you could just rewrite the Curriculum Handbook, but you wouldn't want somebody to

go off and rewrite the Curriculum Handbook until they are at least confident that the Senate has approved this in principle, right? So—and I think I would just, rather than treating them as each separate things, especially since the approval of the policy proposal may hinge on some of the other things we do, I think it might make sense to just get the band back together and move forward from there.

Smith: I don't know. How do you guys feel about this? People that have been on that Committee?

Terlip: I think we need to regroup and bring it back to the Senate, because it was tabled, and we didn't have an official vote.

Cutter: And like Scott [Senator **Peters**] said, the Senate is the Body that makes these changes, so—I mean, I wasn't here in the Spring, but if we don't have all our recommendations solidified and ready to come back to the Senate, we've got to get that done.

Smith: Ok, so I will—Steve [Senator **O'Kane**]?

O'Kane: I'm a little concerned about where the rubber meets the road, that is where the people actually sit down and write up the—say, a 2-year curriculum package. I happen to know that, at least in Biology, that is a grueling activity. The folks that are involved in doing that provide countless hours of service. But then to ask those people to do it every year, wow! [many voices saying “no, no, no”] Wait, am I missing something? [voices saying “yes, yes”] I wasn't here last year either.

Terlip: This is like you have a new course that is not going to be a major or a minor change, and you want to run it on an off year. It could go through—this is not like _____ [voices overlapping]

O'Kane: Oh, ok. Thanks for clarifying this.

Smith: So you could initiate proposals every year.

Terlip: You'll still have the 2-year one, but there will be some things that you couldn't do in 1 year.

Pohl: Or you want to change your curriculum _____

Terlip: And some things you wouldn't go through at all, like you need an "if" in the catalog.

O'Kane: Ok. Very good.

Pohl: Or an "or."

Smith: Ok, so, yes, Senator **Abebe**.

Abebe: We still have something similar at the department level. Whenever faculty develop new courses, they usually run them as test courses for a few semesters. If they are happy, then they submit a proposal to include the courses in the catalog. How is the proposed rule different from what is practiced, and why do we need a new rule?

Peters: It's that—one of the rationales behind it is my recommenda—or my recall that the Committee's recommendation was that in the context of vetting new programs that are proposed, the Committee felt like that one thing—felt that one thing that happens is that people work very hard for 2 years on proposing a new program, and they make it through the whole process, and then they get to the end of the process, and somebody raises a problem or raises an issue. And at that point it's either we approve it or we kill it, and you have to wait 2 years ago before you get to do it again. So, one of—I know one of the things the Committee was talking about was the idea that if you didn't—if you had a process that was a little more flexible and where you could originate proposals on what we might now call an "off cycle," if you could do that more regularly, then when it got up to the UCC or the Senate and people found issues with it, they could simply go back to the Department and say, "Can you address these problems?" And the Department can say, "Yeah, and it might take us a couple months, but we can do it." And they could report back and then maybe it could get approved.

Terlip: Rather than waiting 2 years.

Peters: Rather than—and so that was one of the rationales that was behind the Committee’s recommendation.

Heston: One of my concerns with the current curriculum process is that we end up having huge amounts of stuff to process in a very short period of time, so we do nothing oftentimes for 18 months, depending on who you are, whether you’re the UCC or you’re the faculty Senate in a College or the Curriculum Committee in a College or the Department. You wait 18 months, and then you work really hard for 6 months to get something to go through a process, and everybody gets this massive dose of information, and you get curriculum packages from Colleges that are this big [holds hands horizontally 10 inches apart], and you are to process that in 2 weeks. It makes no sense to me to try and put everyb—to try and run so much curriculum through such a tight and timely, time-locked fashion when some things need a lot more time for discussion and consideration and others don’t. But we don’t have any good way to partition those out and separate and move the trivial stuff, or in some cases the emergency stuff, because sometimes we in Teacher Ed. get edicts from on high that says, “You must make this change now.” period, and then we have to organize all of that to make that happen. So I really think our 2-year cycle is very clumsy, and it—and I don’t think it provides us the opportunity to really look closely at curriculum because we have so much to review in such a little amount of time.

Smith: Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: Unless I misunderstand, the Catalog is tied to the curriculum cycle, right? Catalog comes out every 2 years, and when there’s a change in the curriculum, that is a change in the Catalog, and that goes back to students coming in under a Catalog, so basically you’d have to—it seems like you’d have to have a Catalog every year, a Catalog change every year.

Smith: Yes, it seems. Associate Provost.....

Licari: That is exactly right. We would have a new Catalog published online each year with reflecting whatever curricular changes the faculty put into place the previous year. Students would be held to whatever Catalog that they came in under, just as they do now. The new software system, I know we're still working out bugs, and we're improving the performance of it. We're working with the company even right now to improve it, but one nice thing about it is that the curricular software is also the Catalog software so that publishing a Catalog each year is actually no big deal. So from that standpoint, too, from just the shear nuts and bolts of things, it's actually not a problem. So, I'll just add my 2 cents in that I strongly support an annual curricular cycle. It provides faculty with much more nimbleness in terms of making switches in their curriculum rather than you getting a steady stream of concerns from students about something, and you have to wait 2 years to fix it? That's ridiculous. You should be able to make your adjustments right now.

Dolgener: One other question, doesn't a student have the option of staying with the Catalog they come in under or, if it's changed, going with the new Catalog?

Licari: That's correct. If they wish, if the curriculum has been changed and they perceive some benefit, they can have themselves re-declared under the new Catalog, absolutely.

Smith: Faculty Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: Two notes, one is that those asking about the recommendations. Those are all online, if anybody's curious. It would be docket 1079, so they are there, but they are sketchy. So there's still some work to be done. And then going back, part of this idea goes back to what Senator **Heston** was saying was the amount of this, because 2 years ago part of the conversation was going through it and making it every year cycle with possibly keeping it a 2-year bringing one proposal but doing half the University one year and half the other year just so that the people looking at it could actually look at everything more thoroughly. And then with the idea of getting rid of the things that were essentially clerical in nature, fixing numbers to align with things, so I think there's still some working out

how you would do that in the curriculum and see which is the better way. If it's going to be a free-for-all, everybody can do it every year, or if it's designated for the big changes as opposed to smaller changes or mandate the changes in the case of Ed. things. So I put it out there for what it's worth.

Smith: Any other discussion of curriculum at this point?

Terlip: I have a question that kind of relates to this.

Smith: Secretary **Terlip**.

Terlip: The first thing that you said, because next Spring we'll be looking at curriculum, are we going to be able to access all the proposals as Senators or is that bug fixed in the system yet? Or will it be fixed by the Spring so that we can go ahead?

Licari: If it isn't, it should be. But if it isn't, it will be.

Terlip: Ok.

Peters: I think the problem last year was that early on there were some that weren't in the system yet, and I think the later ones that came along last year everybody could see.

Licari: I'm not aware of any access problems.

Terlip: Ok, I just had people tell me stories, so if we're going to look at—I just wanted to bring it up because I didn't want to get to December, and then go "Whoops, we don't have access."

Licari: No, you should have access right now. The concern we're working on right now is usability so that you can log in and be able to sort proposals a little bit more effectively.

Smith: Ok. A couple of other items that are pretty much, like it or not, are on our agenda. We've already talked about the need to address the

consultation with Budget. And that's, you'll see, already on our docket for the next meeting, 1094. What kind of budgetary input process or mechanisms make sense for us, given the new president and how he's structuring the organization?

We also have to implement the mechanisms called for by the new Master Agreement regarding due process standards for faculty dismissals. This came up way at the end of last year in April. We approved some stuff, but I think we got the "enabling legislation" so to speak approved, but we have to kind of pin down exactly how to get faculty eligible for and potentially on committees that might have to be called for this kind of thing.

That's the bulk of what we have to do, and that's a lot of stuff, but I'm hoping that we can do more and that, in fact, the Senate can get in the habit of initiating improvement programs/projects, things that will try to make this a better university. I suggested in some of my email messages that that ought to be something that we consciously commit ourselves to. I've got thoughts of my own on this regard, but I'm open to any thoughts that anybody else has, and we can get people together who would want to follow an initiative—one possibility that I want to suggest: several years ago I was on a committee that reviewed and proposed changes to the Liberal Arts Core, and as part of that effort, we did a survey of faculty that found, among other things, strong faculty support for efforts to improve student writing. Indeed, as I recall, a majority of faculty favored requiring students to demonstrate an acceptable level of writing competence as a graduation requirement. But in the spring of 2012, this is the year of the troubles, the University Writing Committee submitted a report to the Senate which offered an account of the current state of student writing and recommendations for improving it. The report was received by the Senate, accepted by the Senate, but we really never acted on it. And I talked to a member of the Writing Committee last week, and she suggested that they put this out kind of figuring the Senate would give some guidance, and they were going to go forward, and we didn't really give them much. So I would think that it may be an opportunity for us to use that Writing Committee to try to get an initiative going that would address the issue of improving student writing. Now, we have a position, a vacant position, on that Committee. I'm certainly willing to accept volunteers for that position, and

hopefully somebody who would not only be the Senate's rep. on the Committee, but who would also be willing to kind of push for the Committee and guide the Committee towards developing a program to improve writing on this campus. If nobody is willing to volunteer, I will offer my own services for the remainder of this year to do that, serve that function, and you can bet I would be on there pushing to get something going. So I don't know how you feel about that. Any reaction to that? How do you feel about the idea of having an initiative to try to improve student writing on campus? Senator **Nelson**.

Nelson: Maybe we should revisit the report and, depending on when the Committee meets, if you do not want to do that as well as Chair the Senate, I would be willing to serve on that Committee.

Smith: Ok, thank you. Any other comments?

MacLin: Just a quick comment that one thing I would not like to see is that the Committee or us end up saying that the responsibility for teaching students to write or having them write rests with a particular unit of the LAC or something like that. In fact, if people want students to be better writers, they have to assign them to write and not rely and complain when they get students who can't write, if they themselves do not have students write.

Smith: Ok, thank you.

Terlip: Yeah, on that Writing Committee, now that we have the Center for Teaching, can we establish if they are a member of that group on there, because it would seem to me that faculty members are going to need resources, if they are going to teach writing and they haven't in the past. So, it might be a good idea to look at that kind of structure as well.

Smith: So, you're saying there should be cross-membership between those—the Committee for CETL and the Writing Committee?

Terlip: Yeah, I think they at least need to know what they're talking about, even if it's ex officio. I don't know if that'd be Susan [**Hill**] or somebody she appoints.

Smith: Ok. Any other thoughts or comments on that? I'll see how we go ahead with that and perhaps take up Senator **Nelson's** offer here.

ADJOURNMENT (5:01 p.m.)

Smith: We've reached our 5:00 p.m. adjournment time happily. So I'm willing to ask someone to move to adjourn.

MacLin: So move.

Smith: By Senator **MacLin**. And a second?

Hakes: Uh huh.

Smith: Senator **Hakes**. And I don't think we need to vote on this. We'll see you next in 2 weeks in CBB 319, the Business building. See you then.
Meeting adjourned.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting: Monday, September 23, 2013
Curris Business Building (CBB) 319
3:30 p.m.

Follows is 1 Addendum to these Minutes.

Addendum 1 of 1

Testimonial for Glenn T. Nelson

September 9, 2013

Memo: To the Faculty Senate

Re: Statement of support for Dr. Glenn Nelson's application for faculty emeritus status

On behalf of the Department of Mathematics I wish to submit this short statement in support of Dr. Glenn Nelson's application for faculty emeritus status. Dr. Glenn Nelson's long and illustrious career in mathematics education at UNI began in 1974. At the end of the 2013 academic year Glenn retired as one of UNI's most revered faculty members.

Throughout his tenure of service at UNI Dr. Nelson was a central figure in the elementary mathematics education program. He was a key player in the planning, the designing, and the development of the curriculum proposal which created the Undergraduate Minor in Mathematics Teaching for elementary Education Majors. This Minor was to become the primary focus of his attention until his retirement. But perhaps the thing that most set Dr. Nelson apart among his peers was his belief in the idea that the most powerful and impactful tool in teacher preparation programs is the classroom experience that prospective teachers get during their training. The more classroom experience pre-service teachers get the better prepared they are to be effective teachers upon graduation. For this reason Dr. Nelson sought every opportunity to bring his students to school classrooms. He spent countless hours in classrooms at the Malcolm Price Laboratory School with his students.

In a recent article in the Department of Mathematics newsletter two of his long time colleagues, Dr. Vicki Oleson and Dr. Edward Rathmell wrote this of Dr. Nelson. "As a very patient and great listener, Glenn's ability to lead effective class discussions was the envy of many other faculty members. He always seemed to draw insights from his students that often did not happen in other classrooms. Glenn expected students to take control of their own learning, and he carefully asked questions that encouraged students to consider both mathematical content and pedagogical approach to classroom topics, while offering complete respect for their thinking". Evidently Dr. Nelson recognized the importance of the central elements of the 2012 Common Core Standards years ago and was using them throughout his career.

Those of us who have known Glenn have marveled at his ability to connect with his students and at his enduring commitment to them beyond graduation. He stays in touch with former students and can be counted on to share with other faculty members where these graduates teach, how their professional careers are going, when they get married, and when they have children. It is the rare faculty member who gets this invested in the lives of his or her students. Dr. Nelson set the bar high for all of us.

We wish Dr. Nelson the best as he embarks on the next chapter of his life in retirement. We will miss him. We strongly support his application and urge the senate to grant him faculty emeritus status.

Sincerely,

{signed}

Douglas Mupasiri, Ph.D..
Professor and Head