Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

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

Press present was Blake Findley from the Northern Iowan.

Provost Gibson offered no comments today.

Faculty Chair Funderburk read from the Faculty Constitution regarding the duties of the Chair of the Faculty as he had been asked recently just what his duties included. He also encouraged everyone to come to the presentation by Benjamin Ginsburg this Thursday, November 29, on the topic of university faculty and university administrators.

Chair Peters led a short discussion of the January Faculty Senate Retreat, striving to find an acceptable date. He then gave a quick run-through of today’s Agenda including the need to docket at the head of the docket the one new item up for consideration and the fact that two items on the docket in regular order will likely not fit into today’s timeframe. The Ad hoc Committee working on Item 1163/1059 on policy process will be ready to report early next semester.

Chair Peters then recognized Senator Neuhaus who gave an update on the work of the Committee on Committees which will report formally soon. And lastly, Chair Peters recognized NISG Vice-President White who encouraged faculty to spread the word among colleagues that the newspapers in the Union (Des Moines Register, New York Times, and USA
Today) are for students and are paid for by student fees with papers left credited toward more papers in the future, so she encouraged faculty to not take the papers just because they are there, are free, and look unwanted.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

Minutes for November 05, 2012, were considered approved after noting that no additions or corrections were received or offered today. Minutes for November 12, 2012, it was decided, would be considered approved at the end of the day on Wednesday, if no additions or corrections are received before then. And all agreed to consider approved today’s Minutes at the end of the day on December 9th, if no additions or corrections are received that need Senate consideration so that the University community will not have to wait until mid-January following the next regularly scheduled meeting to learn of today’s proceedings.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1128 Dead Days Resolution—Report from EPC, request to docket at the head of the docket today

**Motion to docket at the head of the docket today (Strauss/Cooley).
Passed.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1128 1067 Dead Days Resolution—Report from EPC, docketed today at the head of the docket (Strauss/Cooley)

**Vote on NISG Resolution failed.

**Motion to endorse EPC recommendations. Passed.

**Motion to extend recommendations with instructions for announcements by the Provost’s Office and the Registrar. Passed.

1168 1064 EPC Recommendation regarding changes to Electronic Devices Policy, docketed at the head of the docket on November 26th (Terlip Bruess)
**Vote to approve EPC Recommendation passed.

1170 1066 Motion to support language on shared governance in Master Agreement, docketed immediately following 1168/1064 on November 26th (Terlip/Swan)
**Motion to support (Dolgener/Bruess).
**Motion to divide the question (East/Heston). Passed.
**Motion to support Section 1.2, Shared Governance. Passed.
**Motion to amend Section 2.0, Address the Board (Gallagher/Walter). Withdrawn.
**Motion to support Section 2.0, Address the Board. Passed

1167 1063 LAC Curriculum recommendations (Consult/Update on LACC plans) (Heston/Dolgener)
**Discussion completed.

1163 1059 Report from Ad hoc Committee on Policy process, regular order (Heston/Dolgener)
**Not considered yet.

1169 1065 Resolution to Exempt Faculty Work from the University Relations Style Manual Requirements, regular order (Terlip/Swan)
**Not considered yet.

5. Adjournment
Time: 5:11 p.m.

Next meeting:

01/14/13
Oak Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 83 pages, including 6 Addenda.
Regular Meeting
FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
November, 26, 2012
Mtg. 1725

PRESENT: Karen Breitbach, Gregory Bruess, Jennifer Cooley, Forrest Dolgener, Philip East, Chris Edginton, Jeffrey Funderburk, Deborah Gallagher, Gloria Gibson, David Hakes, Melissa Heston, Julie Husband [alternate for Jesse Swan], Michael Licari, Kim MacLin, Chris Neuhaus, Scott Peters, Jerry Smith, Mitchell Strauss, Laura Terlip, Michael Walter, KaLeigh White

Absent: Melinda Boyd, Betty DeBerg, Tim Kidd, Syed Kirmani, Marilyn Shaw, Gary Shontz, Jesse Swan [alternate provided]

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Peters: (3:30 p.m.) Ok, well, we do have a quorum, so let’s go ahead and come to order for our final meeting of the semester, at least our final regular meeting. We’ll cross our fingers and make sure that nothing else comes up that would demand a special one. But this is our last scheduled meeting of the semester.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Peters: I see Blake [Findley] from the Northern Iowan here. Is there any other press that I’m not seeing in the room? There is none.
COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Peters: Provost Gibson, do you have any comments for us today?

Gibson: No comments today.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Peters: Chair Funderburk, as you are taking off your coat. Do you have

Funderburk: I have breathless comments. I do, shortly.

Peters: Do you want to go ahead, or do you want me to go first.

Funderburk: Please. [turn at talk went on to Faculty Chair Peters, then
continued later as transcribed here] Thank you. I have a welcome back
everyone first, especially any of you who happened to be with the Men’s
Basketball Team in the Bahamas over break. [light laughter around]

I have been asked regularly and more lately as to exactly what the Chair of
the Faculty does. Part of the time I’ve been asking that myself. [more light
laughter]

The Chair of the Faculty is the only leadership position stipulated in the
Faculty Constitution that is elected by the entire faculty. While the specific
duties ascribed mainly deal with administering full meetings of the faculty,
there are a couple of other specified duties.

Quoting from the Constitution:

1.34 Acting as spokesperson for the established policies and
positions of the faculty to officers of administration, to the press, to
student leadership representatives, and, consistent with Board
policies and regulations, to the Board of Regents.

1.35 Communicating in writing with the faculty, or with its delegate,
the University Faculty Senate, or with officers of administration on
matters of faculty welfare, educational policy, or general institutional concern.

While oft times the Faculty Chair is overlooked, in many instances, the Faculty Chair is the only position which can attempt to represent the entire faculty regardless of their affiliation with the collective bargaining unit, United Faculty. At times, it seems the Faculty Chair is best positioned to try to bring the various faculty, student, and administrative groups together.

In this case, I wish to do just that by encouraging you and everyone in the university community to join us this Thursday, November 29, as we welcome Professor Benjamin Ginsberg, author of *The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why It Matters*

Carl Elliot wrote a review of the book in *The Wall Street Journal* stating, “*The Fall of the Faculty* reads like a cross between a grand jury indictment and a call to arms.”

Professor Ginsberg’s presentation will take place at 7:00 p.m., Thursday, November 29th in the University of Northern Iowa Commons Ballroom.

In a terrific example of campus wide cooperation, his visit is sponsored by the UNI Faculty Senate Speakers Series, UNI-United Faculty, the Iowa Conference of the American Association of University Professors, the UNI Graduate Program in Public Policy, and the UNI Department of Political Science. The event is free and open to the public.

Please plan to attend what promises to be a thought provoking presentation on a very important topic for all of us.

Thank you.

**COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS**

*Peters:* I’ll go ahead and let you catch your breath. A few scheduling notes. I am working on organizing a retreat as we talked about last time, and I’ve had some non-senators express some interest in possibly coming to that. Recall that the idea of this would be to take a couple of concrete—or sorry, I should say specific problems or specific issues we want to work on in the
Spring, such as some suggestions for the Provost on how to allocate resources within Academic Affairs or a plan of budget consultation that we might want to take to a new president, and have kind of a working retreat where we draft some proposals that could then, after that, come to the Senate for discussion, debate, and alternately action. After getting your responses via email, the morning of Thursday, December 10th seems like it would be the best for the most people, but [voices clarifying January instead of December]. January, sorry about that. Yeah, Thursday, January 10th, seems like it would be the best for the most people, but there is a little hitch in that I might not be able to attend that day because the offsite interviews for presidents might start—will start that Friday, and I might have to leave that Thursday morning. So, there’s a couple options. You can do it without me, which is fine. I don’t get to vote on these things anyway. So, one option would be to have Senators or perhaps Secretary Edginton or Vice-President—Vice-Chair Smith organize things and hold the Retreat without me. And like I say, that would be—that would be fine with me. Or we can try to search for another time. I don’t know if people want to comment on that at this point?

Smith: What about the Saturday before? Is that more appealing to people? It would be more appealing to me.

Peters: For the—you mean the—that would be Saturday, January 12th, I guess?

Smith: Yeah.

Peters: Same thing. For me, it would be the same problem, because I will be in Minneapolis doing airport interviews for presidential candidates. Any thought about that? Or I’ll keep working on it and see if there’s any other solutions.

Strauss: Why don’t you see what days you are available?

Peters: I mean, the other option was Wednesday if we wanted to try to do it before classes, Wednesday, the 9th. But we—there was an issue with,
you know, some faculty members might not be on campus at that time. People aren’t expected to be on campus at that time necessarily. So, we’ll try to find another time perhaps.

There is an item on today’s Agenda, the recommendations on changing the policy process that we are not ready to act on. I don’t know if, Senator East, you had any particular updates on that that you wanted to give people so they know where we stand there? No? Ok. We should be ready to act on it, I think, though, if not our first meeting in January, maybe our second one. Would you agree with that, Senator East? [who indicated, yes] Ok. So, we’ll probably be ready to act on it in January, but we’re not quite ready yet. Essentially, the Committee has put forward its recommendation, had shared its recommendation with a variety of people across campus. We met—Senator East and I met with President Allen and Associate Provost Licari and Tim McKenna, the University Counsel, and they—President Allen supported the basic outlines of the proposal to clarify the policy-making process, make it more transparent, and allow for comment periods before policies go into effect, but there were some objections to some of the particular mechanisms that the Committee had recommended, really kind of pragmatic objections in terms of whether it was worth the President’s time to have a meeting, a public meeting, to announce policies, things like that. But I think we can sort those things out in fairly quick order and get that back to the Senate. And I say “we,” really it’s a Committee of Senator East, Senator Neuhaus, and Senator DeBerg who have done all the work on it.

Speaking of Senator Neuhaus, can you update us a little bit on the Committee on Committees?

Neuhaus: Yeah, we—we’re this close to being done with the committee list. It’s met with a few more adventures than we hoped for. You know, you have to try and get ahold of just about everybody on campus to see who is and isn’t serving on what. And there were a lot of policy changes, but we’re—we’re very, very close to being able to issue that. In fact, I think probably later this week. The Committee is just taking one more look to see on that. But I want to thank in particular the Chairs of the different
[College] Faculty Senates around. They did a—an awful lot of work getting folks onto new committees and reorganizing it. I kind of taxed their email a little bit, but we’re—we’re very close to that. So I think later this week we’ll—we’ll release something. I don’t know maybe if that’s something, you know, it sort of goes to Jeff [Funderburk, Faculty Chair], but it sort of goes to you [Peters, Faculty Senate Chair], whether a spot over there on the—on the Faculty website might be an appropriate place. It’s just nice to refer to. We’ve added a lot more processes and procedures onto it. It’s a little longer document, but I think it will be a little easier for anybody who comes on the Committee in the future to make sense of what’s going on. There won’t be the kind of forgetting that we’ve had in the past with that.

Peters: And in our Bylaws changes of last year, we actually require that it be made available wherever the Senate Bylaws are made available, and we’ll—we need to update all our websites, too, so we’ll probably turn that over to the computer support people to try to get that done, too. So, thanks. Thank you, Senator Neuhaus, and the rest of the Committee on Committees, and all of the members of the College Senates who worked hard on that to get that done.

And then my last comment is to recognize NISG Vice-President White. She has something for us.

White: So you may have noticed that we now have New York Times, USA Today, and the Des Moines Register in the Union, and I would like to ask you to encourage all other professors and yourselves not to pick up those papers, because they are paid for by student fees, and whatever papers aren’t picked up at the end of the day, we do not pay for. So, if you pick up the paper, it comes directly out of the students’ hands and directly out of their pocket, and whatever money is left over at the end of the year rolls over to next year to pay for more papers for more students next year, so all of the money eventually will get into students’ hands, even if that paper is left there at midnight on a Friday. So, thank you.
**Peters:** Thank you. And now we’ll go back and recognize Chair Funderburk. [see comments above under COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK]

**Peters:** Thank you, Chair Funderburk.

**BUSINESS**

**MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

November 05, 2012
November 12, 2012

**Peters:** And now we proceed to Minutes for approval. We have two sets of Minutes. The first, November 5th from our Special Meeting on the military grievance—or Military Make-up Work Policy. We have received no comments or changes to those. Are there any comments or corrections at this point? Without objection then, we’ll consider the Minutes from November 5, 2012, approved.

The Minutes for November 12, 2012, did people have enough time to look over these over Thanksgiving Break? Would there be a desire to put off approval of these? Does anyone have strong feelings about them one way or the other? How about this? I did send Troy Dannen a copy of his remarks, which is a standard thing we do with—with people who are—who take up a good deal of time at the meeting with comments, and I have not heard back from him one way or the other. If I receive no corrections from him by, say, Wednesday, can we at that point go ahead and consider those Minutes approved? Is there any objection to that? I’ll give him a couple extra days for the holiday break. All right, if I hear nothing from him by Wednesday, then we’ll consider the Minutes from November 12, 2012, approved.

I’d also like to do something similar with the Minutes of this meeting. Rather than, if faculty are interested in what we did today, rather than have
to have them wait until January to find out, so if there are no corrections that require the Senate to weigh in on whether they are allowable or not, if there is no objection, we’ll consider the Minutes of this meeting approved on the end of the day December 9th. Any objection to proceeding in that way about today’s Minutes? [none heard or seen] Thank you.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1128 for Docket #1067, Dead Days Resolution—Report from EPC

Peters: We have one item for docketing. It is the Report from the EPC on the Dead Days Resolution that came from NISG. The Report came as a petition with a request that it be considered at the head of the docket today, and so that—I guess, could I get a motion to docket it at the head of the docket?

Strauss: So move.


NEW BUSINESS

Peters: Is there any new business today? [none heard]
CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1067, DEAD DAYS RESOLUTION—REPORT FROM EPC (STRAUSS/COOLEY)
http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/dead-days-resolution

Peters: Then, let us proceed with our just docketed item Calendar #1128, I guess that would be new docket number 1066, the Dead Days Resolution—Report from the Educational Policies Commission. Just a quick note before

Smith: Looks like we already have a 1066.

Peters: Sorry. I guess it would be 1067, Docket #1067. This is a referral of a resolution from the Senate to the EPC. The resolution itself under Robert’s Rules becomes pending automatically upon completion of the Committee’s report. So, what I’ll do is I’ll recognize Professor [Gayle] Rhineberger-Dunn. She’ll give us the committee’s report [see Addendum 1], and then when she’s done with the report, then we instantly go into discussion over the resolution [see Addendum 2]. Questions about that? Professor Rhineberger-Dunn take it away.

Rhineberger-Dunn: Thanks. I did submit a statement that was generated from the EPC that we all agreed on to make today for you. I’ll just read it, if that’s all right.

“The EPC has discussed NISG’s proposal to have the last Thursday and Friday of each semester designated as a ‘Dead Day,’ whereby (and this is quoting from the resolution) ‘...faculty at UNI allow students the last class day of each semester, excluding night classes and lab classes, to prepare for their finals without the added stress of papers, tests, or new material to study’ (end quote).

“The EPC believes that UNI’s current policy is sufficient. Currently, UNI policy states: (quote) ‘A comprehensive final examination, if required, must be administered at the time indicated on the final schedule. No final
comprehensive examination shall be administered to a class within the last two weeks prior to the officially scheduled final examination period (excluding summer sessions or half-semester courses). In the week prior to the beginning of the final examination period, unit tests, papers, projects, and other assignments are permissible if announced in the course outline/assignment sheet/syllabus or prior to midterm’ (end quote; that’s from the Schedule of Classes).

“The EPC believes that the issue is more a matter of lack of knowledge about the specific nature of this policy. Students have the right not to have unexpected tests, papers, assignments during the last week of classes, while faculty have the right and responsibility to organize their courses in ways that are most educationally appropriate for their students. Therefore, the EPC suggests that the University announce via UNI Online and/or MyUNIverse the above passage each semester, at least one week before classes begin and again at the Monday following Thanksgiving break. “Further, the EPC suggests that a link to the Grievance Policy be included in the paragraph above that is published in the Schedule of Courses, as well as in the announcements previously suggested.

“Based on the petition submitted by NISG, the EPC does not believe that a Dead Day policy will work in a practical way to benefit students. The work load itself does not change, it simply moves a day or two earlier in the week, or potentially means that students would have both a major term paper and a final exam or project due on the same day during finals week. The current policy clearly states that all exams (excluding cumulative finals), papers, assignments, and projects due the last week of class must be announced prior to mid-term. Therefore, students should have enough advanced warning to complete the work assigned for their courses.” (http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/dead-days-resolution; found under Upload Supporting Information for Box A and as Addendum 1)

**Peters:** So, just to be clear, there—there is a motion [as a resolution from NISG] before us for faculty to allow students the last day of class each semester, excluding night classes and lab classes, to prepare for their finals
without the added stress of papers, tests, and new materials to study. We’ll go right into discussion of that, and questions for Professor Rhineberger-Dunn are certainly germane or certainly appropriate. Vice-Chair Smith.

Smith: Yeah, I noticed that you’re asking that the announce—it’d be announced one week before classes begin and again at the Monday following Thanksgiving Break. That would take care of the Fall semester, but would you want some symmetry with the Spring semester so a similar kind of 3 weeks before?

Rhineberger-Dunn: Yes. Yes, we thought it should be before classes started. It could even be really early. I don’t know how everyone varies on how early they get their syllabi done. But, again, reminding people closer to the end of the semester when that might be the most tempting time to move large portions of that would—might disrupt a student’s planned schedule.

Peters: Other questions or comments about the—the motion? None? Senator East.

East: My understanding of what we’re considering is the—the motion that was prepared by NISG, and so I’m wondering will we then come back to—to talk—do we need some sort of Senate action if we vote that resolution down? Do we need separate Senate action to—to ask that these announcements be made?

Peters: I think we would, yes. Senator Heston.

Heston: Just out of curiosity, who would take responsibility for making sure those announcements got made?

Peters: Does anybody know the answer to that question?

Smith: Any volunteers? [laughter around]
Heston: If I might suggest—I—I hate to do this, but I think that since it’s an academic policy, it might ought to come out of the Provost’s Office? Just, I don’t—not that the Provost needs to do it herself, but someone in the Provost’s Office? Maybe any

Licari: This would be something that I would probably would end up doing [loud laughter around]. But I mean I—I’ve handled questions about final exam times and things like that that kind of links to this sort of policy, so that would be fine.

Peters: Senator Strauss.

Strauss: Yes, I hear anecdotal evidence from students in my class that this policy is violated with impunity and frequently around campus.

Peters: Is violated, you said? Frequently?

Strauss: Yeah. That early examinations are often given during the last week of classes or something.

Peters: That—so, early final—comprehensive final exams are given during the last week of classes?

Strauss: Yeah. Can the NISG speak to that? Is this a response to this violation?

Bancroft-Smithe: [Jordan, President NISG] Yeah. I had one

Peters: President Bancroft-Smithe.

Bancroft-Smithe: Oh, yeah, sorry.

Peters: That’s ok.

Bancroft-Smithe: Yeah, I’ve had lots—I mean, I even have one this semester, and it’s a comprehensive final exam that’s before Finals Week. I
think we discussed that when we went over this last year. I mean, it’s been a while, but I think we decided that—or in the discussion it was noted that those professors who follow the rules would follow this rule, and it wouldn’t make much of a difference. And those who don’t follow the rules wouldn’t follow the rules anyways.

Peters: Senator Gallagher.

Gallagher: There are some 2-credit hour classes that don’t—that aren’t accounted for on the exam schedule, and you have a choice, and it’s written, and I’ve even checked with, you know, the Registrar’s Office and everything, the scheduling. You can either give your final exam the last week or Fridays of—Friday of Exam Week. Ok, so we would have to fix that aspect, too, because—you know, if we—actually some people giving their final that last week are—are doing so at the behest of the fact that the exam schedule directs them to do that or wait until Friday of Exam Week.

Peters: Senator Breitbach, I saw your hand up. No?

Breitbach: Oh, no, I just. I’m troubled that students aren’t reporting this. But I know that a lot of times students don’t report something because they’re afraid of action being taken against them and it’s affecting their grades, but it does trouble me that this is happening and that students are not—that the Administration is not aware of it.

Peters: Senator Strauss.

Strauss: I just want to say I would stipulate the fact that there probably are these 2-hour courses where the professors have to do that, but again anecdotal evidence suggests that the policy is violated with impunity. That’s

Peters: President Bancroft-Smithe.

Bancroft-Smithe: For the most part, students don’t really care if they have—if—if they don’t have to be here on like Thursday of Finals Week,
they are fine with that, if the professor wants to do the test the week before. It’s the professors that have like a unit exam on Friday and then next week having the comprehensive. That’s the ones where students don’t—or complain.

**Peters**: Senator **MacLin**.

**MacLin**: I guess I was hearing two separate issues. One, the desire for having 2 dead days, Wednesday for Monday/Wednesday/Friday classes, right now Friday for Monday/Wednesday/Friday classes and Thursday for Tuesday/Thursday classes prior to Finals Week where there would be no class so that you don’t just have the two weekends

**Bancroft-Smithe**: There would still be class.

**MacLin**: There would still be class.

**Bancroft-Smithe**: It’d just—no new material presented and no exams.

**MacLin**: Oh. That’s—I’m—I’m mishearing or misunderstanding the motion then—is that dead days to me are no class, so you would have 4 days to study, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday.

**Bancroft-Smithe**: If I remember, and—and it’s been a while

**White**: February of last year.

**Bancroft-Smithe**: Yeah, it was February of last year [last academic year, February 2012].

**MacLin**: And then the separate issue which I don’t believe is—I’m not hearing is part of this—is this issue that just got brought up of the fact of some faculty giving their final in the last week of class, not during Finals Week. To me that’s different, unless I’m confused.

**Bancroft-Smithe**: Well, violates current policy.
Peters: So, the resolution as it came to us from NISG does mention new material. It mentions these dead days would be free of any tests, papers due, or any new material. Senator Gallagher.

Gallagher: The anecdotal things that I ever hear have to do with people who get behind in their syllabus, which kind of suggests to me that maybe the course isn’t well planned, and they—and this happens throughout the semester, not—I have to—I have to say I have great sympathy for students when they run into a course where things get backed up and all of the sudden new things are dropped on them throughout the semester. I find that problematic. I—I—am I correct about that?

Bancroft-Smith: Uh huh.

Gallagher: So, I think it’s an overall sense of making sure your course is planned carefully and students know ahead of time what to expect and when. And I’d like your response on that, actually.

Bancroft-Smith: Uh, I mean, it sounds good to me [laughter around].

Peters: Professor Rhineberger-Dunn.

Rhineberger-Dunn: If there—it is important that there are—there are multiple issues in here, and one is the issue of the cumulative final versus a planned final. There’s nothing in this—in the current UNI policy that says, “I—you—you can’t have an exam on the last day of class.” It says, “You can’t have a cumulative exam, and you can’t have one that isn’t scheduled.” But if you hand out a fairly complete syllabus at the beginning of the semester, it’s going to say, “You have an exam on the Wednesday/Thursday/Friday of the last week of class.” That is perfectly allowable by this policy. It’s the classes that—well, I think is what is at issue or when we were discussing it are the classes where the final is supposed to be on a Thursday or a Wednesday of Finals Week, and the professor says, “Well, let’s just have it on the Wednesday or Thursday before, during that last week of class.” And that’s not allowable—and under any policy, and so
that’s why in the EPC we suggest that people need to be reminded that this exists, because some people do not know that these policies exist. And—and, you know, the same is true of incompletes. Phil often—Patton often brings this up in our meetings, and the incomplete policy is really very specific to the percentage of material left in the class. But he gets requests to give incompletes for a half a semester, which is not allowable by the policy, because people don’t know. We don’t read the policy, so that’s why we’re suggesting it’s really an—an educational issue, an educating issue here.

Peters: Senator Strauss

Strauss: Is there a corollary policy—at least that I—I’ve had explained to me by my Department Head that—that faculty are required to post their exam during assigned exam periods. So, if a professor were to give—and, I—I—the situation I’m trying to wrap my head around is if a professor were to give a exam, a Thursday exam early, say the week prior to exams, so that the students can all go home, is that professor showing up to that empty classroom? Are they required to do that? I mean, there’s all kinds of petty crimes going on I’m afraid.

Licari: The—the policy, it does state that—that the class is supposed to meet during that scheduled class, or scheduled final exam period, even if there is no final exam given. So, faculty and students should be showing up, at least for some brief meeting, to return graded material or whatever, if there isn’t a final that day.

Strauss: Thank you.

Peters: Out of curiosity, Associate Provost Licari, do you—are you aware of any grievances about violation of existing policy with regard to final exams?

Licari: Since I took this job in the Fall of 2010, I’ve—only 1 issue on this has come to my attention, raised by a student who had a faculty member moving a final exam within Finals Week and it conflicted with a class scheduled—a final that she was supposed to have at a different time. And
the policy very clearly states that, you know, you’re not supposed to do that. So—but only once has a matter actually been brought to my attention.

**Peters:** It doesn’t mean it’s not happening. It just means there haven’t been complaints about it.

**Licari:** It doesn’t mean it’s not happening. I’m just not aware of any faculty, Department Heads, or students bringing those concerns to my attention.

**Peters:** Senator **MacLin.**

**MacLin:** So, Gayle [Rhineberger-Dunn], what you’re saying is that—that the existing policy actually covers exactly what they’re concerned about.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Almost all, except the—their resolution includes new material, which we said is a faculty right.

**MacLin:** Ok. As long as, _________________________________. Ok. Gotcha.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** But, the—the—I mean, in a way—in a way, yes, and in a way, no, because the current policy says you can have a, you know, a unit 4 test on Friday. That does not violate the policy, if you’ve announced it either before mid-term or in your syllabus at the beginning of the semester. It’s the comprehensive final that cannot be given 2 weeks prior to the end—should be during the final exam period.

**Peters:** Yes, Vice-President **White.**

**White:** Can I just speak to what the current policy doesn’t do for what students were concerned about? The Senate, when they voted on this, they were kind of what Gayle [Rhineberger-Dunn] was saying. They don’t want the test or the papers to be due on the last class period or to have a unit test and then followed by a cumulative test on Finals Week. There
isn’t so much concern about, you know, they have the cumulative test a week early and then they don’t have anything on Finals Week. Students like to go home, and so they’re not as concerned about that. But they don’t want the new material and the papers to be due so close to finals because they think that it backloads the semester, that it adds a lot of undue stress and doesn’t necessarily do good for the students’ quality of education when they’re cramming or doing a paper in a rush and not really gaining that academic experience that the professors are after from that paper that’s backlogged on the semester.

Peters: Senator Cooley.

Cooley: I just have a sense of practicality that I’d like to ask about and that is when would be a more appropriate time for the final paper to be due in the student’s opinion, if it wouldn’t be at the end of the semester? [voices murmuring] I’m really perplexed. [now some laughter and voices offering ideas]

White: I— I think that the idea is that it would either be due at the beginning of the week or perhaps the 2nd week before Finals, not the last Friday or Thursday of the class, because then let’s say you have a final paper due on the last Friday of class and then your final for that class is on that Monday. That puts a lot in a 4-day period, where, you know 40%, 50% of your grade may be covered by these. Does that answer your question? I mean, I

Cooley: __________________________ the semester?

White: Say that again?

Cooley: I—I’m—we do have a long semester, so you would think you’d be working towards that final goal with a lot of methodological thought behind it.

White: But if you think realistically [loud laughter], students procrastinate [more laughter], and I think that if you’re going to teach—structure your
syllabus to benefit students, you’re going to consider the nature of students and that students don’t necessarily consider that, “Hey, I’ll get a better grade on this paper if I start on it 3 weeks before it’s due.” So, I think that students are just, you know, asking their professors to look out for them as well. But I understand where you’re coming from, yes.

**Peters:** Senator **East** and then Senator **Heston**.

**East:** Yeah, I was going to essentially ditto. I—I’ve been on the Senate for almost 6 years, I think, and—and I think I’ve seen 3 of these resolutions concerning Dead Week, and clearly it’s—it’s a—it’s an issue that—that frustrates students, and I think the action I’ve seen on it every time of those 3 times, has been “Ehh, nope.” But, I mean, it really does come down to the issue of, ok, the current resolution—the previous resolutions always said a “dead week” so no final, no exams or papers in the last week. And so that again frontloads the week before, and so you’ve got 27 papers due in the week before the final week, which is—creates the same problem. And the current resolution says nothing on Thursday or Friday, so Tuesday and Wednesday are—are—are the same big due date times, and I understand that students procrastinate. I even know at least one faculty member who procrastinates. [laughter around] And I don’t—I don’t think there’s a method around it. I think that—that probably the current policy is good and—and if—if you can figure out a good way to craft that. I mean, I don’t know what the good crafting of the—of such a dead week policy would be, but it seems to me that—that most of these actions appear to be saying, “Let’s just shorten the semester and give the students some extra time to study for finals.” And—which is essentially saying, “Let’s shorten the semester and reduce the rigor of a college education.” And—and I’d like you to think about that when you—if you can, pass that on to the next group that’s going to ask for the dead week resolution. And see if you can come up with something that makes it not appear that way. And—I—that’s—I started out being very kind of receptive and ended up being—smacking you down, and I didn’t intend that.

**Peters:** Senator **Heston**.
Heston: I’ll pass. My views have been shared.

Peters: Ok. Vice-President White.

White: A couple things. The Senate Campus Relations Committee is reconsidering the Dead Days because they realize that it’s probably going to get smacked down again, and they’re—they’re goal is to come up with a more, I guess, thought-out resolution that kind of outlines what they think the policy should look like to hopefully add some clarity to some of the questions that are arising in our conversation today, and then second I think that even if you’re going to move the papers and tests up to the Monday and Wednesday, that still does give the students an extra day to study and an extra day—or helps them guide their calendar to get that paper done in advance, rather than waiting until the back of the semester. And it also eliminates the stress that comes from those last 2 days. Professors say that it makes a big difference, that last day of teaching and being able to do instruction and prev—or give tests. It also makes a big difference for students in those last 2 days to be able to study and organize their calendar. So it does go both ways, and one or two class periods can make a huge difference, both in the professors’ and the students’ lives, so I would consider that. I would also add that you guys were all in college, so I recognize that you know how it feels to be in that semester at the—at the very end of the calendar, and just kind of remember that when you’re considering this, and if you would have benefited, even not from—I can see where you wouldn’t want to give up an instruction day, but if we can just—maybe we take out removing the last instruction day and allowing this new instruction to be given on the last day of the semester but still keep it to where tests and papers can’t be given on those last days of the semester, I think that students would find that to be a comfortable compromise. But just remember that students do really care about this, and you probably will be hearing from them again, if it does get knocked down.

Peters: Do I see any other—yes, Senator Bruess.

Bruess: I hope this is the last comment. [laughter around] But we are kind of beating it to death. I think part of it is just a mischaracterization of dead
week/dead days. There are institutions like Northwestern, a fine institution I hear, where they do have a dead week. And that’s just there are no classes. So, if students want to give up 2 days of Thanksgiving Break and then we can add that to the end, the last day—the last couple of days or the last week even. We can go back to just a Thursday or Friday Thanksgiving, and then those 3 days would be appended to the end, so that’s the way to handle it. And then it goes back to Phil Patton and to—and to that realm. But there—there are schools that have dead—literally are no classes offered. But then you have to make up for it somewhere. That’s the way it’s done.

**Peters:** Any further comment? Shall we proceed to a vote? The resolution before us is—you see on the screen there [projected] right in the middle “Therefore be it resolved that faculty at UNI allow students the last class day of each semester, excluding night classes and lab classes, to prepare for their finals without the added stress of papers, tests, or new material to study.” All in favor, please say, “Aye.” [1 aye heard] Opposed, “No.” [many no’s heard] The motion fails. [voices, murmurings, laughter with Senator who voted aye]

All right. Next up, Calendar Item 1168, Docket #1064 [voice reminding to continue with consideration of EPC recommendations on the Dead Days Policy] Oh, I’m sorry. Yeah. There was, I’m sorry, there was interest in possibly making a motion about the rest of the EPC’s recommendations. Does anyone want to move to endorse those recommendations and pass those recommendations on to the Provost? Senator Breitbach. [who indicated] Seconded by Senator MacLin. [who indicated] So that would be—let me just find that up here for us [on the projected screen] again [http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/dead-days-resolution found under Upload Supporting Information for Box A or as Addendum 1]. That would be this section right here that we would forward to the Provost Office, a recommendation that the Provost’s Office announce via UNI Online and/or MyUNIverse the relevant passage of our policies and procedures each semester at least one week before classes begin and again, should—can we just without a motion can we amend that to be 3 weeks before the end of the semester? [nods
around] And then secondly that—that we—what—what’s that second part there? I’m having a hard time just reading it off the screen there. Link to the Grievance Policy be included in the paragraph above that is published in the Schedule of Courses as well in the announcements previously suggested. So I assume we would pass that on to Phil Patton with the request that that be included in the Schedule of Courses? So, just to be clear, the motion is to make a recommendation to the Provost’s Office about announcing the Final Exam Policy at the designated times and to have a link to the Grievance Policy included in the paragraph above that is published in the Schedule of Courses and in the announcements. Senator Gallagher.

**Gallagher:** Just the Monday following Thanksgiving Break and the Monday following Spring Break, perhaps? [voices saying Spring Break is too early]

**Peters:** Spring Break might be too early. I think let’s just say, I think, “3 weeks before the end of the semester” would be.

**Gallagher:** Oh, Ok. Ok. Sorry.

**Heston:** And the end of the semester is the last day of Finals Week or the last day of classes?

**Peters:** Any strong preference?

**Strauss:** Yeah, 3 weeks before the last day of classes. [other voices agreeing]

**Peters:** Any objection to that language?

**Bruess:** That would put the announcement on the Monday of Thanksgiving week. [laughter around and voices saying email never sleeps and offering language that would work]

**Peters:** Comments? Questions? Debate? Or shall we proceed to a vote? All in favor of these recommendations to the Provost’s Office and to

DOCKET #1064, EPC RECOMMENDATION REGARDING CHANGES TO THE ELECTRONIC DEVICES POLICY (TERLIP/BRUESS)

Peters: Ok, now we proceed to Calendar Item #1168, Docket #1064 another EPC item. This one was referred to the EPC, but there is no resolution yet pending. The Committee’s report does include a recommendation, though, and so much like last time, what we’ll do is we’ll have Professor Rhineberger-Dunn make her report. At the conclusion of the report, then we’ll immediately start debating her recomm—the Committee’s recommendation as if it was a motion before us. And I will try to find it up here [for projection].

Rhineberger-Dunn: I will set the background a little bit. The Senate passed the Electronic Devices Policy this past Spring. And when it—when it went through the policy review process, an issue was brought up that the—Tim McKenna and the President’s Cabinet wanted language, some specific language added to the policy, and Scott and I—Chair Peters and I were in communication with Virginia Arthur and Tim McKenna at the time, and because it was such a—it wasn’t just a minor change to the policy. It was a maj—it had major implications and consequences, Chair Peters and I decided that it should go back to the EPC for consideration to whether or not to add this language and how that language should be added. So that’s where we’re at today, why we’re here again about this policy.

[Reading mostly from Addendum 3] So the EPC has met and discussed the issue of adding quote “language in the policy that said the instructor should allow some means of emergency communication to the classroom” end quote. And that’s an email from Tim McKenna. The EPC believes that adding such a statement violates the spirit of the Personal Electronic Devices Policy. Requiring faculty and/or a student to have their cell phone
on during class is problematic. First, not all faculty members and students have a cell phone. Second, it will undoubtedly be disruptive. Regardless of who is designated as having to leave their cell phone on during class, it is a given that it will go off at some point during class time, and perhaps multiple times. This will require either the faculty or the student-designee to check from whom the text message, voice mail, or email (for those with a smart phone) was sent. Third, not all classroom/rooms/buildings receive cell phone service (e.g., McCollum Science Hall, Rod Library, the Student Involvement and Activities Center, some places up there). Requiring faculty or a student to have a cell phone on in class in these locations is a moot point if there is no service. What accommodations will the university make for these rooms/buildings? If they can make accommodations for these rooms/buildings, then it suggests that university administrators can provide the means of emergency communication in the classroom, rather than relying on faculty and/or students to do this. In fact, the EPC believes that the responsibility for maintaining student, faculty, staff, and guest safety lies with the University administration, and should not be left to individual faculty members in the ways suggested by the President’s Cabinet. It is incumbent on the university to provide the specific means in which students, faculty, staff and guests will be notified of an emergency on campus. [see Addendum 3]

**Peters:** Thank you, and just so we’re clear. The recommendation of the Committee, which will be the motion before us, is for the University to provide appropriate means of emergency notification in the classroom consistent with the last several sentences of the report that Chair Rhineberger-Dunn just read. And I’ll just reiterate that “the responsibility for maintaining student, faculty, staff, and guest safety lies with the University administration, and should not be left to individual faculty members in the ways suggested by the President’s Cabinet.” Is that correct? [Rhineberger-Dunn nodded in agreement.] Ok. Discussion? Any discussion?

**Strauss:** What is the—what—just remind me what is the gist of the current policy that we wanted to have approved? Does it ban electronic devices pretty much?
**Rhineberger-Dunn:** The policy gives the faculty member the option of allowing it or not allowing it; allowing it for some things and not others, so that it was—so that there’s no misunderstanding. If you want and allow any student to bring a computer or a smart phone to class, that’s great. If you don’t want any in your classroom, because of what you’re working on, that’s your choice. And the—in the EPC we discussed, it is—it’s—emergency notification is important. We do have the outside alarm syst—or announcement system, but that might not cover some events on campus where they wouldn’t want it announced on the public system. The—in the EPC, our concern is how many times will a phone go off? And every time, someone’s going to have to check it to see if it’s a UNI e-mail, and I don’t know about the rest of you, but my partner cannot memorize my schedule in 4 months. I routinely get text messages, voicemails, and emails during class time, and I would always have to be checking to see, “Oh, it went off. Who’s it going to be from?” And we know our students have a much more social calendar than I might have. [light laughter] So we didn’t—our—for us, the—there’s 2 issues. There’s the potential disruption in the classroom of requiring “someone” to have a cell phone, even on vibrate. What are you going to do during an exam and other classes? And then, 2 the fact that it should be the University’s responsibility to provide for faculty, not 600 or 700 faculty to provide that kind of means of communication.

**Peters:** Vice-Chair **Smith**.

**Smith:** Yeah, I just want to say I think the EPC has come down exactly right on this, and I strongly support what you’re—what you’re recommending.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Thanks.

**Peters:** Other comments? Shall we proceed to a vote then? The resolution is that the Senate communicate that we’d like the University to provide appropriate means of emergency notification in the classroom. All in favor, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] The motion carries. I will notify President **Allen** and the University Counsel
of our decision on that. Thank you. Thanks, as always, for all the good work that the EPC does.

DOCKET #1066, MOTION TO SUPPORT LANGUAGE ON SHARED GOVERNANCE IN MASTER AGREEMENT (TERLIP/SWAN)

Peters: All right. That brings us to Calendar Item 1170, Docket #1066, and that is the Motion to Support Language on Shared Governance in the Master Agreement. We will need a motion to bring this—we will need a motion to—to discuss this, so can I have a motion to support? Senator Dolgener, can I interpret that as a motion to support both proposals by United Faculty? [he assented with a nod] Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Bruess. [who indicated] Before we get started in discussion, I’ll just say that if there is a desire to discuss each thing separately, a motion to divide the question would certainly be in order. So, with that..... The language on Shared Governance that United Faculty has proposed is there at the top [on projected screen]. The Address the Board language is Section 2.0 there [same projected screen]. [see Addendum 4 for both items] Is that big enough for everyone to see on the screen? Is there any discussion on this? Nothing? Ok. Shall we proceed to a vote on it?

East: I have a question.

Peters: Senator East.

East: Is there currently—my understanding is that there’s currently Board policy relating to discussion with faculty representatives and the Board. Is that true? That there’s—is no Board policy?

Peters: I don’t know if there’s

East: That there’s a practice, I understand, that

Peters: I don’t know if there’s
East: That the other—our Sister Institutions, the faculty are—due—are allowed or due or granted access to the Board at their meetings and we are not.

Peters: So, the faculty representatives do attend the Council of Provosts’ meeting and are in on that meeting, and that’s been either—this year it’s either been Chair Funderburk and myself or Vice-Chair Smith and myself at those meetings. And, of course, the Board meetings themselves are public, and we regularly send at least 1 person to those meetings. In terms of actually addressing an open session of the Board, my understanding is that the—is that all—my understanding is that the faculty governance structures of the other two institutions do that once a year, I think at the April meeting. The P&S Councils, I believe, of all 3 institutions address the Board at the April meeting as well. They may be invited as indeed we might be invited to address the Board at different times, but in terms of regularly addressing the Board, they only have regular presentations from non-represented units. So, no University’s AFSCME representatives regularly address the board, and nobody representing faculty, either United Faculty or faculty governance from UNI regularly addresses the Board since we are a represented unit. That’s my understanding of the current practice. Chair Funderburk.

Funderburk: And this—part of the reason why I read what I read today was that it would seem that historically the intent had been that the Faculty Chair. It’s not something I’m asking to do, but it clearly seemed from our Constitution that the intent was that the Faculty Chair. With the formation of a collective bargaining unit, I think the decision was made from the Board that all activity would happen in negotiations, and somehow we’ve been left out of any representation. So, I’m not arguing for one way or the other, but I think that some call for us to be included with the same ability to address the Board would seem appropriate. Then it’s up to the faculty to decide what they think the rep—appropriate representation would be. But—and whether or not that’s an issue of the Master Agreement or a letter to the Board requesting it. They’re as confused about our faculty governance as most of the people involved in it. [laughter around]
Peters: Yes.

Husband: Well, one—one way to compromise that might be to change the language to reflect something like, rather than “Faculty Senate” substitute something such as “Faculty, Chair of the Faculty, and its, you know, his designate—his or her designate.” Something along those lines to suggest that the Faculty Senate could be the consultative Body or it could be some other logical appointee of the—the Faculty Chair.

Peters: And I would—I would simply point out that since we don’t do the actual negotiation, we can’t really wordsmith—that’s up to United Faculty and the Board in their negotiations to—to do the actual arguing about language, but we could certainly—if we were to pass this resolution, we could certainly express our sense that—that—that the Senate isn’t the only Body that acts for the Senate [sic faculty], or that—that the—the Faculty Chair might also be an appropriate person to represent the faculty. Any further discussion about this? So the motion before us is to support inclusion of both sections into the Master Agreement, Section 1.2 Shared Governance as there on the screen, Section 2.0 Address the Board [see Addendum 4]. If there is no further discussion—section, we will proceed to a vote. Yes, Senator East.

East: If it’s not too late, I would like to move to divide the question.

Peters: Ok. Is there a second?

Heston: I’ll second.

Peters: Seconded by Senator Heston. My—I—I read into this, and motion to divide the question is not debatable. So we’ll proceed immediately to a vote. All in favor of dividing the question, please say, “Aye.” [a few “ayes” heard] Opposed, please say, “No.” [some “nos” heard] Can I see a show of hands, please? I think the nos take it, but I’d like to make sure. All in favor, please raise your hand? In favor of dividing the question. [counting]

Funderburk: I have a proxy vote.
Peters: That’s right. Chair Funderburk is a proxy vote today. So that was [counting again] 8. All opposed to dividing the question? [counting] 8 [light laughter, then louder laughter as they realize the Chair will have to cast the deciding vote, and voices commenting, comparing him to Lincoln] Yeah, no kidding. Well, I think I will err on the side of—of—on the safe side here, and we’ll go ahead and have—I’ll be in favor of more debate rather than less, and I’ll support dividing the question. So, [laughter again around]. So, let’s proceed in turn. Let’s proceed with Shared Governance. Are there any comments on that? Any discussion on that? Supporting Section 1.2 Shared Governance? Shall we proceed to a vote on that? All in favor of expressing our support for inclusion of Section 1.2 on Shared Governance in the Master Agreement, please say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] The ayes have it. Motion carries. Now we proceed to Section 2.0 Address the Board. Discussion on expressing our support for that section? Senator Breitbach.

Breitbach: Having served on 4 different bargaining teams, I know that when we—when we do go into negotiations, we are negotiating with just 1 or 2 people from the Board, and I do believe that it would be beneficial to have United Faculty be able to address, just for a short period of time, and take to them, to the entire Board, concerns that they have, and to be able to do that more than every 2 years when they are only granted access to the lawyer and 1 or 2 Board members. So I am very much in favor of Section 2.0.

Peters: Other comments? Senator East.

East: I think my concern, my primary concern is that—is that this seems to go beyond what other faculty at other institutions have with respect to addressing the Board, and that it requires 2—that it happen twice a year rather than once a year, which seems to be the current practice. And I’m also a little uncomfortable with—with the notion of—of—of it being United Faculty rather than—the faculty govern—the other faculty governance. I’m not—I—I would like the Board to hear United Faculty at their faculty—at their Board meetings just as they hear other faculty, but I
would also like the Chair—Faculty Chair to have an opportunity to speak also, perhaps a shared opportunity. I—I think that educating about our shared—our—our governance system is a good thing, and—and it—it would be useful and—and—to—to be able to present some sort of united front where both the Faculty Chair and United Faculty representative are—are included in that, would seem to me to be a better approach, and—and—than—than just United Faculty.

**Peters:** I would observe that the motion before us is to support Section 2.0 and that nothing would stop—nothing could stop anyone from moving to amend it to say that we would—we could support Section 2.0 and further requests that the Board allow us or the Chair of the Faculty to address the Board on a regular basis. Senator **Hakes**.

**Hakes:** Isn’t the history of this that both other institutions because they are not represented by a union have their Faculty Senate having two 10-minute period—is it designated as 10 minutes?

**Peters:** I don’t recall, but it’s pretty short. It is something like that.

**Hakes:** Twice a year.

**Peters:** I think—actually I think they only do it once a year. Keep in mind this is negotiation, right? So United Faculty is proposing twice a year.

**Hakes:** Would it be reasonable to write this in terms of equal representation to the other two Regent schools, as opposed to designating our representative and designating how long? It doesn’t—I mean, that—isn’t that what we’re seeking? This to be put on similar footing independent of the contract negotiations for other concerns? And this is very

**Terlip:** This is the actual language they’re ask—asking to put in the contract, so it would be contractual once it was verified. They’re just asking for our support for the contract language, as I understand it. Don’t you? We can’t modify contract language.
Peters: Chair Funderburk.

Funderburk: Well, I think that one of the things that faculty ought to decide is it—it—I do think that we’re being cut out by the other two having representation there. It’s very clear what their structure is, that the President of their Senate is not a chair, but the President of their Senate is the elected official of the entire faculty at both those institutions, so that representation happens. But I think that the appropriate thing for me would be if the Faculty Senate faculty decide who their designated representative is or to make some comment that just that leadership of the faculty should be represented the same way as the others. And we all know how that changes from year to year who might be the best representative at the moment, and we would determine whether it was the Chair of this Senate or the Chair of the Faculty in combination with UF at the time. But I don’t know how we make that statement. It seems like I’m in support of this, but it did seem like we’re in a gray area with the Senate endorsing language for the UF and saying the UF is now the faculty’s representative.

Breitbach: I would agree. I would support that.

Peters: I saw Senator MacLin with a hand, I think.

MacLin: Well, I just was going to say but we’re being asked to support their language. I don’t think we can modify it. We could say that we don’t support it, but it seems that we’re being asked to say, “Hey, we think this is important, that UNI get some representation at the Board meetings through—in this instance they’re asking it through United Faculty.” And then if we want to provide language or recommendations to United Faculty on our own with the passage or the not passage of this saying that we want it to be a little bit broader, but aren’t we being asked to approve this particular language?

Peters: That—that is what we’re asked to do, yes. Senator Heston.
**Heston:** Does—does United Faculty have purview over all of the same things that this Body does? I don’t think United Faculty can address questions of curriculum.

Male voice: That’s correct.

**Heston:** And it would seem to me that the primary purpose—I mean, I would be curious to know what these other groups, what they typically talk about. Do they talk about curriculum? Do they talk about faculty welfare? Do they talk about “Rah, rah we’re doing good”? I mean, what—what do they do in these things?

**Peters:** It is mostly about salary and other work-related issues.

**Heston:** It is mostly about salary. Ok.

**Peters:** Their—their regular—their regular appearance before the Board is mostly about that.

**Heston:** Salary. Ok, that’s very useful to know. That puts it in a context. Thank you.

**Peters:** Let’s see. Are there other hands? Despite some comments, I have yet to hear any motion to amend or anything like that, so the motion before us is still to support this particular language. The motion is to support this language. We could certainly amend that motion by saying we support this language and we support something else. Or

**Gallagher:** I move to amend.

**Peters:** Or, yes

**Gallagher:** I move to amend that it would be United Faculty and Chair of the Faculty.
**Peters:** That we support inclusion of section 2.0 and that we also call on the Board to regularly have the Chair of the Faculty or desig—or designee?

**Gallagher:** Yes.

**Peters:** Or designee address the Board?

**Gallagher:** Yes.

**Peters:** Is there a second to that motion? Seconded by Senator Walter [who indicated]. I do want to make sure I have the language clear.

**Heston:** All right. I just wonder if it would be cleaner to do two separate motions, just act on this one as is and then have a second motion which is really about this Body having a spokesperson who gets to talk at a regular kind of time, if that is—seems germane. I think tangling it together only confuses the issue further because this will get sent to the Board, what our motion exactly is and how it’s worded, will just add confusion about what our government system is and how it works and doesn’t work and who is really the spokesperson and under what circumstances. I think it would be much cleaner to actually have—deal with one as it’s written, we either support it or we don’t. And then if we want as a rep—Body to be represented, make a motion about us and what our—our role is, what our action should be, not kind of tack ourselves onto United Faculty.

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

**Bruess:** Procedural question. Is that new business?

**Heston:** I don’t know. Or should it begin through a petition? Or

**Bruess:** That sounds like new business.

**Peters:** That might be new business.

**Hakes:** Does her[Gallagher’s] motion have a second?
Peters: It was seconded by Senator Walter. So right now we are—we are discussing the motion to amend.

Female voice: They can withdraw ________________________________

Peters: Chair Funderburk.

Funderburk: I guess I have to say I share your sentiments [to Heston] in a large part on that. I—I can see being supportive or not supportive of this, but it is a separate issue, that it should be a separate thing. But somewhat—it almost feels that as if the Senate votes to support this that they’re saying that would therefore be the statement of it, as opposed to the Senate deciding it’s not really our business, UF’s talking to the Board or not. It’s theirs, you know. But maybe we need to take up another action later saying that the governance structure being represented the same way as the others would be appropriate.

MacLin: And I guess that I would just say that

Peters: Senator MacLin.

MacLin: that if as it seems the consensus of the discussion is about salary, UF is the one that can talk to the Board about salary, not our Faculty Chair.

Funderburk: In discussions, that’s the point that that gets into Iowa Code where you can and can’t talk about certain things, and that I think is where the mindset came of cutting everything out in the first place. So, if we decide to pursue something outside of what they’re saying, it would need to stipulate that there would not be any intent on our part to discuss salary, work conditions, those kind of ideas.

MacLin: Sure.

Funderburk: because those are United Faculty.
Peters: Senator Gallagher.

Gallagher: So, if—if most people are in favor of separating these two things as Melissa suggested, I’m happy to withdraw my amendment.

Peters: Senator Walter, do you? Is that ok with you? All right. [he assented with a nod] The amendment has been withdrawn. Is—is there any further comment on the motion to support Section 2.0? Senator East.

East: I don’t know quite how to state this or communicate this to—to whoever is doing this. I fully support the notion that—that faculty at UNI should have access to the Board as the faculty at the other institutions do. And that message I want—I would like that message to be delivered to both United Faculty and to the Board. And I don’t—I don’t know how best to do that. I—I don’t even know how I’m going to vote on this, because I—I am very much in support of that notion, but I don’t want to tie—I mean, this is a matter for negotiations, and I don’t wish to tie anyone’s hand—the Union’s hands when—as—as they negotiate this. I don’t—I—I mean, I think that we need to communicate to them what we believe. I don’t know how to do it.

Peters: Senator Terlip.

Terlip: Is it—I’m not clear on parliamentary procedure here, but is it poss—it is possible for us to pass a resolution without having docketed the discussion, isn’t it? So that we could hypothetically make—pass a resolution saying that after this vote is taken that we endorse the Union, speaking about Union issues, and would welcome the opportunity for whomever to speak about governance issues. I mean, I think we can do a resolution, if that’s what we believe—if we want to make a statement at the same meeting. That’s just a thought.

Peters: Yes, Provost Gibson.

Gibson: Yeah, I—I just want to make sure that you understand that the other two institutions, when they address the Board, it is regarding salary
issues. I just want to make sure you understand that. So then if—if you want to address the Board, it would need to—if the Senate or the Senate’s designee wants to address the Board about other issues, then it would seem to me it needs to be a separate action. The only reason the other two institutions are addressing the Board is because of salary, and for UNI it’s United Faculty who has that responsibility. So they’re kind of mixing things.

**Peters:** I would say one other thing in—in response to Senator **Terlip**, and that’s that—that I have certainly been pushing in a variety of ways to get more access to the Board. And, you know, eventually I just—I just contacted each individual Board member and have now met with—with almost all of them, and one of the things that—that I’m trying to get them to do is to go back to having just simple receptions, when they’re on campus, with faculty members. Even that would be better than what we’ve had in the—the past several years, which is almost no access to the Board. If—I—I would say that if we wanted to pass some sort of formal resolution expressing our desire to have more access to the Board in various ways, it might be better to have a fuller discussion about it where we could lay out some of the ways that we would like—some of the things we would like to see.

**Terlip:** I—I—I guess I was trying to look at, was there a sense of urgency associated with this that it needed to go up at the same time? That was all.

**Peters:** The only urgency really on this is that negotiations between United Faculty and Board begin tomorrow, and so [light laughter around]—and so if we want to express our support for their proposal, we have to do that part of it now. The rest of it, the Board actually doesn’t have another meeting until February.

Female: Call the question.

**Peters:** The question has been called. We need to vote on calling the question. All in favor of calling the question, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around]. Opposed, “No.” [none heard] All in favor then of expressing the Senate’s support for Section 2.0 Address the Board and the inclusion of

Neuhaus: Chair Peters.

Peters: Yes.

Neuhaus: Do we need or should we communicate this officially to United Faculty? I know you said

Peters: Yes.

Neuhaus: that Minutes would come out late this time.

Peters: I will e-mail—I will try to do that this evening yet. I’ll email Dan Power, Cate Palczewski who I think is the Chair of the Negotiating Committee, and I’ll also email Provost Gibson and Executive Director Don Lee and maybe Tom Evans, the Board’s lawyer, to let them know as well.

DOCKET #1063, LAC CURRICULUM RECOMMENDATIONS (CONSULT/UPDATE ON LACC PLANS) (Heston/Dolgener)

Peters: That brings us to the—let’s see, as I mentioned earlier, we’re skipping the Report of the Ad hoc Committee on Policy Process (1163/1059). Hopefully we’ll get through that early in January. That brings us to the Liberal Arts Core.

Heistad: Woo hoo! [who had been waiting a long time for her turn to address the Senate; laughter around] Do you want me to sit up there [in guest speaker area]?

Peters: [nodding] We’ve got a name [tent] for you and everything. [voices murmuring while seating arrangements made]
Heistad: Thank you all for giving me the opportunity to come and update you on the Liberal Arts Core. I thought what I would do is just share two points with you, and then if you have any questions, I can answer your questions. I’ll try to be brief.

I submitted a document recently that was the LAC—the Liberal Arts Core Committee’s response to the Liberal Arts Core Review Steering Committee’s recommendations [see Addendum 5]. We received those recommendations earlier this Fall, and I basically wanted to update you on what we’ve been working on this semester.

When we received the recommendations, they came to us in two forms. We had a list of recommendations as well as a type of Form L that tried to incorporate all of the recommendations [see Addendum 6]. What we did is we created a subcommittee that then went through the two forms so that we could kind of figure out how this would actually work in real life with all of the different types of recommendations that were coming our way.

We recognize that there are 3 curriculum changes that are in process that are currently being discussed, as you are all aware, the proposed changes, and there I’m referring specifically to changes regarding the addition of Cornerstone, the elimination of Personal Wellness, and the change in the number of credit—er, the change in the structure of Western Humanities. So those 3 changes are at the very beginning of the curriculum process. They’re going to have to be vetted by faculty and Departments, affected programs, College Senates, the UCC, and eventually, I think, come here as the last stop before going to Regents.

The Phase 2 are some of the recommendations that we couldn’t quite classify as something that was actually pending. Basically what happened is that the next group of recommendations focuses on what we could consider to do in the future. The development implementation of those changes would depend on faculty interest. So those we—we put in a separate section. And, in particular, we thought that it was important to come to you to draw your attention to what appears on page 3. So it’s Phase 2: Future Considerations, Recommendation #2. [see Addendum 5,
We thought that we should just update you on this because it could affect your business next semester.

Basically, the LAC-RSC is recommending that we “upgrade the writing instruction and assessment here with writing-enhanced courses/majors as an exit requirement.” Making this portion of the curriculum change an exit requirement kind of moves it out of the curriculum in some ways but not totally. So, we just wanted to bring that to your attention, because we’re not sure if that’s something that you would like the LACC to work on or if it’s something that the Education Policies Commission or the group that was just here [EPC, Educational Policy Commission] would have to work on. And so we just wanted to make sure that you are aware of that in case you wanted to take it up in the Spring as part of your business to give us direction on which way we should go with that.

So that’s basically my update. You can see that, you know, we’ve been talking about a lot of stuff at our meetings.

**Peters:** On the—on the writing instruction, so this is not something that would, under normal circumstance that—under normal circumstances it would not go through the curriculum process? That’s what you’re saying, because it’s not a course proposal, it’s not a program?

**Heistad:** Well, I mean, that’s—I think that that’s a question. I think that it is curriculum. The way that it came to us as a possible exit requirement makes it different in that it would put it in the same category as something like our language requirement. I mean, it is—certainly is part of the curriculum. It affects, you know, the number of hours, everyone. But it’s not—number-wise it’s not within the confines of the Liberal Arts Core.

**Peters:** Ok. So would that be—so, the question for us would be—so you—you’re—you are may—is your Committee officially making a recommendation at this point that—or is this something you’re still talking about?
Heistad: Well, we just—we see it as a future consideration. We’re not sure, you know what we s—what we propose here as one idea, and this was actually, I think, the LAC-RSC idea that the LACC—so the Liberal Arts Core Committee would set up a faculty committee to develop a proposal that would then go to you, to the Faculty Senate, with consultation from the Education Policies Commission [sic]. So, you know, would it come to you first? Would they formulate it? We also have a University Writing Committee. We also would have the option of the Faculty Senate—we say—we say here that the Faculty Senate would ultimately decide if this is part of the Liberal Arts Core—sorry, that should just be LAC [noting an error in the document]—or an exit requirement. Now, if we make it a part of the Liberal Arts Core, in some ways that sends it back into the curriculum. I mean, there are lots of different ways that we could do—we could pursue this, but it’s a larger question at the moment than just the Liberal Arts Core.

Peters: Questions?

Edginton: I have a question.

Peters: Yeah, Senator Edginton.

Edginton: How does the general framework, how is it going to be vetted down in those Departments that are impacted by changes in the Liberal Arts Core? You know, it seems to me that, you know, there’s 2 ways that you could go about this. And one is to have a discussion about the general framework from a broader perspective and then go into the units; or you could start with the units up. And last week we had a little bit of conversation here in this meeting about the process of vetting the framework.

Heistad: Well, I think that, you know, any faculty member anywhere can propose a curriculum change. So I think that they’re coming in in different ways. We have, you know, faculty who are working on the curriculum change. For example, if you take Humanities, there are faculty who are writing up the proposal who will then have to send it to the Liberal Art Core Committee for vetting. The way that—I mean, I think that to the best of my
knowledge we’re following just the normal curriculum cycle, which is that faculty propose curriculum; they then consult with all affected Departments; eventually it goes to the Senate—the College Senates; and then it goes to the UCC and then here. So, I mean—I’m assuming that’s what’s going to happen.

**Edginton:** But if you went to a Department and there was a roadblock at that Department, then the next logical step would be that you would then take it to the Faculty Senate—to the Senate of College and have that conversation.

**Heistad:** Right.

**Edginton:** If you wanted to bypass that roadblock. Otherwise, do—you’re not able to pass the roadblock at the Department level?

**Heistad:** Well, I think that ultimately what happens is that those consultations, both pro and con—I mean, we could take something—you know, the LAC supposedly belongs to all of us, so these changes would have to go through each and every Senate. You could have a Senate that fully supports it; you could have another Senate that sides maybe with a Department decision on it; and ultimately all of those packages go to the UCC, and they sort it out.

**Edginton:** So, then there could be cross conversations between the College Senates.

**Heistad:** Yeah. I think that one of the things that’s really important to the Liberal Arts Core Committee is the notion that we all need to be talking about this. I mean, it is really important to our Committee that all of this be very transparent. These are difficult conversations to have. They have to be had at all levels, and I can tell you that they’re not necessarily pleasant conversations, but they do have to take place. And so I think that part of our effort in coming before this Body is to make sure that you go back to your constituencies to make sure these conversations are taking place.
**Edginton:** The concern that I have is that somehow they would be done on an ad hoc basis, that they would not be systematized and that people wouldn’t understand, you know, the conversation that we’re having here. That, in fact, if you disagree at the Departmental level and then you go to your College, and let’s say your College confirms your perspective, then isn’t the responsibility of your College Senate to go to other College Senates and have the conversation? I mean, is there going to be some process that will be laid out, that will be identified so that that open conversation can occur?

**Heistad:** I think that’s the curriculum—I mean, that would be a question for the curriculum.

**Edginton:** Because I think it’s a little bit different when we’re talking about revising the Core. It’s that, you know, I mean there’s a little bit extra responsibility that has to be assumed here to make sure that those conversations go on on a campus-wide basis as opposed to within a committee itself that represents those people who are inside that committee, who may or may not be

**Heistad:** Right. Yep. And I absolutely agree.

**Edginton:** Ok. Well, will you organize that?

**Heistad:** No. [laughter all around]

**Edginton:** Who will be responsible for organizing that?

**Peters:** I think Associate Provost Licari might have the answer to that.

**Licari:** Yeah. It—it is the curriculum process, Chris—Senator **Edginton,** Secretary **Edginton,** sorry. The—the way in which the Liberal Arts Core proposal winds its way through, it’s delivered to the Liberal Arts Core Committee who reviews it, makes a recommendation, turns that recommendation over to all affected Departments, and it then enters the regular curriculum process for all deliberation that would normally take
place through the curricular change, and at that point then once the Liberal Arts Core Committee has made its recommendation and turned that recommendation over to all affected Departments, the Committee’s role, the Liberal Arts Core Committee’s role is—is not exactly done but mostly done. It becomes a participant, but it’s no longer the driver. And if that’s your concern, I—I think it can be—it can be allayed by the fact that it will be turned over to the regular curriculum process, and so it would get a departmental review across campus. It will get a review in each College Senate, and at that point it would probably behoove the College Senates to begin conver—conversing with each other probably prior to the UCC meeting in which that—the—LAC proposal is taken up, because I can probably foresee that that UCC meeting or meetings would be contentious. And I can see that the UCC would probably end up dumping this in the Senate’s lap, either totally unable to resolve the differences or mostly able or only partially able to resolve the difference, and it would come to the Senate. The Senate, of course, is the last resort for resolving the differences in the—in the curricular process. So, the—the—the process to change the Liberal Arts Core is designed to be as open and participatory as possible, as any curricular change would be. So, I—that—and so it wouldn’t really be the Liberal Arts Core Committee or the Liberal Arts Core Director’s job to shepherd this through necessarily. It would just be going on with the—with the regular curriculum process.

**Peters:** I had East, MacLin, and then Heston.

**East:** That—that doesn’t sound correct to me. I mean, see—that for instance dropping the writing requirement or dropping the Personal Wellness courses from the Liberal Arts Core would be, it seems to me, a proposal that’s—that’s submitted by the Liberal Arts Core Committee and would have to receive—all Departments would have—all affected Departments presumably would receive a consultation, but I—I don’t see how that goes before a—a—all of the College Senates because—I mean, the—the College Senates don’t have to approve Liberal Art—they only approve courses that the—curriculum changes that relate to their College. They don’t—they don’t address curriculum changes that relate to other Colleges unless—at least that’s my recollection of the process.
**Licari:** The Liberal Art—the curriculum process for Liberal Arts Core changes very specifically states the fact that the Liberal Arts Core Committee would make a recommendation, refer it to all affected Departments, and it would then wind itself through the normal curriculum process.

**East:** The normal curriculum process, though, doesn’t go to College Senate because a College Senate isn’t responsible for the Liberal Arts Core requirements.

**Licari:** But all departmental decisions go for review at the College Senate level.

**East:** Right, but if you just delete something from a pro—the Liberal Arts Core, that only—that had—that doesn’t have an effect on a curriculum of a particular College. So a—this sounds to me like if the Math Department takes a—currently has one of my courses required in their major, they have to consult with me—with my Department rather—with my Department in order to take that out. We get to—we get to object to it, but that happens in our College Senates or in their College Senate,

**Licari:** I see where our—our

**East:** and so

**Licari:** We’re talking past each other. The—the Liberal Arts Core Committee would determine which are the affected Departments.

**East:** They have to consult with all the affected Departments, but they only consult. It still goes probably to—straight to the UCC, it would seem to me, unless—unless—is there—is there a requirement in the—in the current thing that says “All Senates have to address Liberal Arts Core requirements”?

**Peters:** Professor **Heistad**, do you know an answer to that?
Heistad: Well, I—I guess that—that the way that we—that we’re thinking about it, if you take for example the Personal Wellness—the Personal Wellness, you know, there—there are different issues here because the Liberal Arts Core isn’t saying to get rid of the course, ok?

East: Right.

Heistad: Right, it’s a program change. So it would seem as though the Liberal Arts Core would do the Form L as it affects the Liberal Arts Core Program, would then seek consultation, which from our Committee’s perspective, it is all of the faculty, or it’s, you know, the entire University. And so from our perspective we would think that consultation at the level of the Department that offers the course would be, you know, very important, and at a secondary level would be consultation with the Senate so that faculty could have the discussion, the College Senates.

Edginton: Can I just ask a question? But doesn’t the Core impact on every student’s education at this University; therefore, isn’t it the proprietary interest of every Department and every College on this—on this campus?

Heistad: There are some who would think that any curriculum proposal would need to go to every single Department on campus.

Edginton: I—I mean, really, I mean the Core belongs to the entire faculty, not just to one Department or to one College.

Peters: I need to interject for a moment. We’re at our time limit [5:00 p.m.]. Would Senators be interested in extending our debate for, say, 10 minutes? Is there any objection to extending for 10 minutes? [Heistad joked, and everyone laughed loudly.] Chair Funderburk, did you have something directly on point here before we get back into our normal queue?

Funderburk: Yeah, well, actually I was trying to get in the queue, too.
**Peters:** Oh. Oh. Ok. Ok.

**Funderburk:** Which was partly to say what Dr. **Heistad** just said was that I think there’s two parts of this which are getting confused—is the assumption seems like the automatic assumption is if something’s not in the LAC, the courses go away. And I don’t think that should be an automatic.

**East:** I don’t think that at all.

**Edginton:** Well, I think that—don’t—there are those that do, and I think that you’re making a good point that—that it’s two different things. It certainly may be the required number of consumers goes away, and then some decisions need to be made about the Department of staffing and how much does the course need to exist if it’s not required. And I can see that the weight in from Departments being really important for that as an impact on the Department, but finding the way that the faculty talks in a bigger sense about, “Do we all agree that this is what every degree program should have in it?” is where we have a problem with our curriculum process at the moment. We don’t really have a—other than the UCC itself or the LAC—and I think that gets to the point of how to have the new writing exit requirement. It was going to be one of those things of how to do that. And that is a bigger question the Senate needs to kind of sort out how everybody can have a voice but no one has veto.

**Peters:** Senator **MacLin**.

**MacLin:** I was actually just trying to get Mike’s **[Licari]** hand noticed.

**Peters:** Oh, ok. Senator **Heston**.

**Heston:** I—I guess I need to be really clear. What’s the timeframe for all of the changes you’re proposing here as opposed to the timeframe for the new version of Humanities you’re talking about, dropping Personal Wellness, and was there a 3rd? There was a 3rd thing.

**Heistad:** Adding Cornerstone.
**Heston**: Adding Corner—adding Cornerstone as an option?

**Heistad**: Uh huh. Yeah.

**Heston**: So those I would see coming through

**Heistad**: Well, we’re at the beginning of a new curriculum cycle, so at this point you’ll have discussion at, you know, the Department level usually. We think that these—these items are big enough, but, you know, we just want to encourage as much conversation as we can get. In the Fall, the curriculum packets will be sent to Senates. After they go to the Senates next Sp—or, sorry, in the Spring they’ll go to the Senates. Next Fall they go to the UCC, and then they come to you. So, we’re at the very beginning of the process.

**Heston**: And will those—but my question is will all of the changes that are proposed here as recommendations be in those new packages, or will it just be the limited 3 that you’ve identified so far?

**Heistad**: Right, the—if you see the—the three are phases. Phase 1, Changes to propose during the 2012-2014. [see Addedum 5]

**Heston**: My page 4 doesn’t seem to have that. I don’t know what it is.

**Heistad**: Ok, so on the first—on the—on the first page, we have the Phase 1, Changes to propose during the 2012-2014.

**Heston**: Ok, that’s what I needed.

**Heistad**: That’s what we think are coming through.

**Heston**: All right. The two documents I was looking at don’t have that.

**Heistad**: And then we have the Phase 2, which is just future, and we don’t know when those will be
Heston: Ok, so all of these other changes, the writing intensive stuff, you’re thinking about for the future?

Heistad: Well, that—I mean, that’s why I came, is that we’re not particularly thinking about it. It would have to be the will of the faculty to create a course called Global Humanities or to add the writing enhancement or all of the other recommendations. We don’t have a plan for that.

Heston: So, what will stop this from just getting paper that gathers dust?

Heistad: Well, in terms of the—I think that the other conversation that was going on is that you have faculty who are interested in the 3 changes, right? And those could actually go through this curriculum cycle. In the meantime, if there were faculty who wanted to work on a U.S. experience course—well, much like we’ve done with Cornerstone. I mean, it takes a couple years to get a course like that going; they would want to start working on it now because that—the intention is not to include that in this curriculum cycle.

Heston: Right, but there’s changes—there’s a reduction in the number of social sciences recommended. There’s a whole variety of changes, and it doesn’t—it’s not clear to me that there’s anybody who’s going to champion those once we get past these 3 changes.

Heistad: Well, I do think

Heston: Is that an accurate perception?

Heistad: I don’t think so. I mean, I do think that—that there are faculty around campus who are interested in some of these changes. I don’t think it’s the role of the Liberal Arts Core Committee, necessarily, as a committee, to push these changes, but I do think that there are faculty who are working on things. For example, you have the social science faculty who are right now working on a reorganization of Categories A, B, & C. So I
do think that there’s movement, but I don’t think it’s going to happen this curriculum cycle.

**Heston:** Ok.

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

**Terlip:** Yeah. Is there—I know you’ve got some information about how the changes are—C on page 4—how the changes are going to be—go forward, kind of continuing this discussion.

**Heistad:** Uh huh.

**Terlip:** Is there any sort of plan to communicate this to students, because there are lots and lots of rumors out there flying, and in particular concerns about which program they’re going to be in and how—what they’re going to count? And are we going to grandfather people? So, is your Committee doing anything to address those concerns?

**Heistad:** Yeah, I think that that has really surfaced in Personal Wellness. I’ve heard it from multiple fronts that we have some issues going on. We have students who are being told by teachers that Personal Wellness is going away, you know, so we definitely have an issue there. My question, I guess, would be for Associate Provost **Licari** in terms of when we move to a new catalog. Let’s imagine that in two years we have a new Liberal Arts Core that has eliminated something. Would students then get to choose which Core they would do, or would it just affect incoming students?

**Terlip:** Or in the next 2 years, if the change has been approved, what’s going to happen?

**Licari:** Hmm. Good question? You put me on the spot here. [laughter around]

**Heistad:** I meant to email that to you by the way. [more laughter around]
Licari: You know, normally we would hold students to the catalog that they came in on. That’s the default. So I think that’s the—I think that’s the default. If there was some exception that needed to be made for a particular student, we would consider it, I suppose, but I think the default that if you came in under the existing Liberal Arts Core, that would be the Liberal Arts Core that you were expected to complete. If we changed the rules half-way through on somebody and they’ve now taken classes that no longer are contributing towards their degree or they find out now that they need to take a new class when they didn’t have to before, that’s really not very cool to do to students. And so I think we would try to keep students to the catalog that they came in on.

Terlip: On the other hand, if we’re arguing it’s better, why are we going to hold them to something that’s now changed?

Licari: Well, if you want to—if you want—if—if we—if you, the Senate, wants to declare something, a recommendation that, you know, that we be able to make exceptions for students, then that would be fine. But otherwise I think we would go with the graduation expectations that students came in on.

Peters: Senator Smith.

Smith: I was just looking at the Curriculum Review Process Handbook, and it does have the language for how final proposals—there’s the preliminary proposal, final proposal. And it is as Associate Provost Licari indicated—enters the regular curriculum review process by undergoing review in all the affected Departments, all College Senates or College Faculty Councils, the UCC, the University Faculty Senate, etc. There is a little bit of ambiguity there in that it says “all the affected Departments,” but it doesn’t say “all the affected College Senates.” It just says, “all College Senates.” I’m not sure what was intended there. Going back to Senator Edginton’s point about, yeah, changes in the Liberal Arts Core affect all faculty. They do, but they don’t affect all faculty as members of Departments. They affect all faculty as members of the UNI faculty. And that’s—that’s where they all have a stake, and they’re in this process, and I’m sure the Senate can
ensure this. There will be plenty of opportunities as there has been in the past for all faculty across this campus to weigh in and express their viewpoints. So it doesn’t have to go through Departments, or I would argue, even through the Senates of all—of all the Colleges on campus, to enable all faculty to have appropriate input here. And talking to Senator Heston’s point about what will happen with some of the follow-up things. If the Senate would care to promote some of those, I think—and suggest the need or value of those, for instance, the writing one, I think the Senate could play a valuable role in encouraging faculty to undertake the kinds of developments that then going through the Liberal Arts Core we could bring forward as ways of proving this program. But, you’re right, if it doesn’t happen, there’s a risk of inertia. There are lots of changes that many of us felt very strongly about but that don’t lend themselves to the, you know, the kind of straightforward Form L process, but nonetheless that we think would really improve the program and improve our students’ education, so it’s quite possible that the Senate can play a role in—in pushing those kinds of things forward.

**Peters:** We’re out of time. I’ve got two people in the queue still, Senator MacLin and Senator Dolgener. Are they—are they quick comments?

**MacLin:** Never.

**Peters:** Never. [laughter all around] Senator Dolgener, do you have

**Dolgener:** Just one comment concerning what Associate Provost Licari said, so the Liberal Arts Core is different from major programs because in major programs you—the student has a choice to graduate under current catalog or the one they entered under.

**Licari:** Right, but the default is that they are not automatically shifted to a new major.

**Dolgener:** Right. Right.
Licari: I think that’s what I was getting at. The default would be they stay with the Liberal Arts Core that they came in under.

Dolgener: Right.

ADJOURNMENT (5:11 p.m.)

Peters: Ok. With that, is there a motion to adjourn?

Strauss: So move.

Peters: Moved by Senator Strauss. Seconded by Senator Hakes. All in favor, please say, “Aye.” [ayes all around] We’ll be back in January. See you then.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate
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Follows are 6 addenda to these Minutes.
Recommendation from EPC on NISG Dead Day Proposal

To: UNI Faculty Senate  
From: Educational Policy Commission  
Re: Recommendation regarding NISG “Dead Day” Proposal  
Date: November 12, 2012

The EPC has discussed NISG’s proposal to have the last Thursday and Friday of each semester designated as a “Dead Day,” whereby “…faculty at UNI allow students the last class day of each semester, excluding night classes and lab classes, to prepare for their finals without the added stress of papers, tests, or new material to study” (NISG Senate Petition).

The EPC believes that UNI’s current policy is sufficient. Currently, UNI policy states: “A comprehensive final examination, if required, must be administered at the time indicated on the final schedule. No final comprehensive examination shall be administered to a class within the last two weeks prior to the officially scheduled final examination period (excluding summer sessions or half-semester courses). In the week prior to the beginning of the final examination period, unit tests, papers, projects, and other assignments are permissible if announced in the course outline/assignment sheet/syllabus or prior to midterm” (Schedule of Classes).

The EPC believes that the issue is more a matter of lack of knowledge about the specific nature of this policy. Students have the right not to have unexpected tests, papers, assignments during the last week of classes, while faculty have the right and responsibility to organize their courses in ways that are most educationally appropriate for their students. Therefore, the EPC suggests that the University announce via UNI Online and/or MyUNIverse the above passage each semester, at least one week before classes begin and again at the Monday following Thanksgiving break. Further, the EPC suggests that a link to the Grievance Policy be included in the paragraph above that is published in the Schedule of Courses, as well as in the announcements previously suggested.

Based on the petition submitted by NISG, the EPC does not believe that a Dead Day policy will work in a practical way to benefit students. The work load itself does not change, it simply moves a day or two earlier in the week, or potentially means that students would have both a major term paper and a final exam or project due on the same day during finals week. The current policy clearly states that all exams (excluding cumulative finals), papers, assignments, and projects due the last week of class must be announced prior to mid-term. Therefore, students should have enough advanced warning to complete the work assigned for their courses.
Addendum 2 of 6

NISG Resolution on Dead Days

SSR 2012-19

A Resolution for: Dead Days on Campus

Sponsored by: Student Affairs Committee

First Reading: January 25, 2012

Second Reading: February 1, 2012

Vote: 15-13-4
Affirmative: Bancroft-Smithe, Bell, Castro, Chesley, Crusie, Cooling, Davis, Findley, Gibbs, Givens, Koss, Lunn, Riffel, Schreiner, and Stevenson
Negative: Alfred, Apling, Botzum, Derringer, Johnson, McGraw, Moran, Nelson, Parker, Preston, Schreur, White, and Wollums
Absention: None Absent: Enabnit, Konrady, Lim, and Sullivan

Speaker Action: Ryan Alfred—Speaker

WHEREAS: The week before finals is currently very stressful and much studying already takes place for students; and

WHEREAS: Students at the University of Northern Iowa need at least one day preparation in the classroom for finals week; and

RECOGNIZING: The last class day of each semester, not including night classes, before finals should be free of any tests, papers due, or any new materials given; and

FURTHER RECOGNIZING: The Northern Iowa Student Government believes this plan would vastly improve students’ preparation for finals in each class; and

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED: The NISG Senate recommends that faculty at UNI allow students the last class day of each semester, excluding night classes and lab classes, to prepare for their finals without the added stress of papers, tests, or new material to study; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: This resolution be sent to Faculty Senate Chair Dr. Funderburk, Executive Vice President and Provost Gibson, The Northern Iowan, and all other appropriate persons.
EPC Statement of Changes to Electronic Devices Policy

To: UNI Faculty Senate

From: Educational Policies Commission

Date: November 5, 2012

RE: Educational Policy Commission statement regarding changes to 3.17 Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom:

The EPC has met and discussed the issue of adding “language in the policy that said the instructor should allow some means of emergency communication to the classroom” (email from Tim McKenna). The EPC believes that adding such a statement violates the spirit of the Personal Electronic Devices policy. Requiring faculty and/or a student to have their cell phone on during class is problematic. First, not all faculty members and students have a cell phone. Second, it will undoubtedly be disruptive. Regardless of who is designated as having to leave their cell phone on during class, it is a given that it will go off at some point during class time, and perhaps multiple times. This will require either the faculty or the student-designee to check from whom the text message, voice mail, or email (for those with a smart phone) was sent. Third, not all classroom/rooms/buildings receive cell phone service (e.g., McCollum Science Hall, Rod Library). Requiring faculty or a student to have a cell phone on in class in these locations is a moot point if there is no service. What accommodations will the university make for these rooms/buildings? If they can make accommodations for these rooms/buildings, then it suggests that university administrators can provide the means of emergency communication in the classroom, rather than relying on faculty and/or students to do this. In fact, the EPC believes that the responsibility for maintaining student, faculty, staff, and guest safety lies with the University administration, and should not be left to individual faculty members in the ways suggested by the President’s Cabinet. It is incumbent on the university to provide the specific means in which students, faculty, staff and guests will be notified of an emergency on campus.
Proposed Language in
United Faculty’s initial proposal to the Board of Regents,
Section 1.2 Shared Governance and
Section 2.0 Address the Board

Section 1.2 Shared Governance:
The Iowa Board of Regents and United Faculty recognize the unique roles and responsibilities of the University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate. We recognize that Faculty Senate consultation in the decision-making process regarding educational policy and curriculum, standards for granting of academic degrees and academic credit, personnel decisions that can modify the faculty’s professional identity, professional quality, working environment, budgets, programs, and methods of teaching is important. The parties recognize the necessity of a collegial governance system for faculty in matters of academic concern. It is mutually desirable that the collegial system of shared governance be maintained and strengthened so that faculty shall have a mechanism and procedure, independent of the collective bargaining process, for making recommendations to appropriate administrators and for resolving academic matters of concern to the faculty.

Section 2.0 Address the Board
United Faculty shall have the right to address a regular meeting of the Board for at least ten (10) minutes at least twice per year. Any additional requests shall be granted if three (3) days notice is given unless a majority of the Board in a public vote denies the request for specific reasons publicly stated.
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LACC Response to LAC-RSC Recommendations and Form L

Date: October 27th, 2012
To: UNI Faculty Senate
From: The Liberal Arts Core Committee
Re: Liberal Arts Core Committee Response to LAC-RSC Recommendations and Form L

After review of the LAC-RSC recommendations for changes to the UNI Liberal Arts Core, the UNI Liberal Arts Core Committee recommends the actions stated below. Our recommendations fall into three categories: a) Overall changes recommended (with procedures to implement noted in italics after recommendation), b) Areas to be maintained/continued, and c) Recommendations for changes to the process for future changes to the Liberal Arts Core.

This occasion provides us with an important opportunity to continue the development of clear student learning outcomes and assessment practices, aligned with LAC goals and outcomes for LAC categories (or sub-categories). The LACC emphasizes the crucial importance of assessment to the strength of the Liberal Arts Core program and encourages the development of assessment strategies that involve faculty in their creation and implementation, measure student performance as well as student perceptions of learning, recognize the value of both student and faculty time, and provide useful information for ongoing improvement of teaching and learning.

A. **Overall Changes Recommended**

**Phase 1: Changes to propose during 2012-2014**

**Change Humanities requirement to 2 required 3-hour courses: Humanities I & II.**

This would require Form L (LACC would do) and curricular course change forms for courses (Humanities faculty group would do).

**Comments from LAC-RSC Final Report**

[http://www.uni.edu/vpaa/documents/LACRSCFINALREPORT_000.pdf](http://www.uni.edu/vpaa/documents/LACRSCFINALREPORT_000.pdf)

The LAC-RSC supports the Humanities Coordinating Committee’s proposal to offer Western Humanities in two 3-hour courses (as opposed to the current requirement to take 2 out of 3 Humanities courses).

Survey results are not particularly helpful here. Faculty comments suggested that there is a lack of faculty understanding regarding the current requirements for humanities. In the survey, 43.7% of faculty strongly agreed or agreed that a sequenced, 6-hour Western Humanities was best. 56.2% of faculty strongly agreed or agreed that a sequenced
6-hour Global Humanities was best. The difficulty with using survey results for making recommendations in this category is that questions regarding diversity also included options for Global Humanities. Moreover, there was much debate about the idea of Global Humanities within the LAC-RSC. Given the changing world that we live in, a number of LAC-RSC members support the creation of a global humanities sequence that would give students a more comparative perspective on cultural continuity and change. A number of LAC-RSC members emphasize our students’ need to understand the Western culture of which they are a part, and think that Global Humanities would dilute focus away from Western Humanities. The compromise solution within the committee was to offer an option that would give students a choice. The creation of a Global Humanities sequence would require interested faculty and faculty development.

Add First-Year Cornerstone as an alternative for current Category 1A & 1B. This will require a new course add form (Cornerstone Coordinator would submit).

Comments from LAC-RSC Final Report
http://www.uni.edu/vpaa/documents/LACRSCFINALREPORT_000.pdf

A 6-hour Cornerstone course, integrating written and oral communication, as well as first-year experience outcomes, should be developed. This course would be an option for first-year incoming students who have not satisfied either the LAC oral communication or the writing requirement. The current “College Writing and Research” and the “Oral Communication” courses would remain as options for those students coming in who need one of these courses, or who choose not to take the Cornerstone course. Since this course includes an orientation to academic expectations at UNI, this course can only be taken at UNI.

In the 2010 survey, 50.4% of faculty strongly favored and favored this idea, though 62.3% of respondents to a question asking about the current writing and oral communication courses preferred the current requirements. In responses, there were concerns about having enough interested and /or capable of teaching Cornerstone. Faculty development in the areas of first year experience, reading and writing will alleviate fears of faculty capability in teaching incoming-first year students the appropriate processes for writing and speaking. Putting Cornerstone into the LAC as an option gives students more opportunities to meet oral communication and writing requirements.
Remove Personal Wellness from the LAC.

This would require Form L (LACC would do). The LACC encourages faculty with expertise in this area to propose coursework in other categories and consider teaching in interdisciplinary courses such as First-Year Cornerstone.

Comments from LAC-RSC Final Report
http://www.uni.edu/vpaa/documents/LACRSCFINALREPORT_000.pdf

Faculty are clearly divided on the inclusion of Personal Wellness in the LAC. 42.1% of faculty strongly agree or agree that we should eliminate Personal Wellness as a requirement in the LAC. 39.7% of faculty strongly agree or agree that we should require a 3-hour Personal Wellness course with activity labs. The LAC-RSC understands that any recommendation that we make will leave a large group of faculty dissatisfied. It is true that, as a number of faculty commented on the survey, personal wellness is a goal of the LAC. Some wellness issues, such as healthy behaviors, alcohol abuse, and relationship issues are addressed in the Cornerstone course being piloted in fall 2011. The LAC-RSC would also like to see courses in Public Health, Epidemiology, and Global Health, such as those recommended by AACU’s report, “Curriculum Guide for Undergraduate Public Health Education,” be developed in the Critical Thinking, U.S. Experience or Social Science categories of the LAC. These inclusions would require Personal Wellness to be re-conceptualized within the LAC. In terms of broader educational outcomes, it should be noted that many wellness programs are offered to students in dorms and in extra-curricular programs. The LAC-RSC would also support an exit requirement that required students to take 2-3 Lifetime Activity courses (student athletes exempted).

When we asked faculty which courses they would cut from the LAC to make it shorter, 55.9% would remove personal wellness.

Phase 2: Future Considerations

1. Reconfigure Social Science category (or other components of the LAC) to include a U.S. Experience requirement (set of courses). [Explore interdisciplinary possibilities for these offerings.]
   A faculty committee would develop this course (or set of courses), and propose it in a future curriculum cycle. This would eventually require a Form L submitted by faculty committee. If new courses are added, the LACC suggests the faculty committee follow the First-Year Cornerstone model in initially offering an experimental version, with assessment and faculty development built in from start. The faculty committee or LACC could pursue Carver money or grants to help pay for faculty development.
2. **Upgrade writing instruction and assessment, with writing-enhanced courses/majors as an exit requirement.**

   LACC would set up a faculty committee to develop a proposal to submit to UNI’s Faculty Senate, with consultation from the Educational Policies Commission. The Faculty Senate would ultimately decide if this is part of the LACC or an exit requirement only and how to administer it. The faculty committee could pursue Carver money or grants to help with faculty development to adapt current courses and majors for this purpose.

3. **Develop Global Humanities sequence, adding as an option to Humanities requirement.**

   A faculty committee would be set up to develop these courses, with the goal of proposing them in a future curriculum cycle (which would require new course add forms eventually). LACC suggests the faculty committee follow the First-Year Cornerstone model in offering initially experimental versions of the courses, with assessment & faculty development built in from the start. The faculty committee could pursue Carver money or grants to help pay for faculty development.

4. **Add Transfer Cornerstone course (for students who don’t take First-Year Cornerstone course) [explore possibility of 2 hour vs. 3 hour Transfer Cornerstone course].**

   Faculty committee set up to develop this course and propose it in future curriculum cycle (would require new course add form eventually & Form L, since it is a new requirement that has not existed before). Suggestion to follow First-Year Cornerstone model in offering initially in experimental version, with assessment & faculty development built in from start. Pursue Carver money or grants to help pay for faculty development.

5. **Develop Scientific Literacy course and add to category of Natural Sciences. [Explore possibility of interdisciplinary offering of this.]**

   A faculty committee would be set up to develop this course (or set of courses), and propose it in a future curriculum cycle (which would require a new course add form eventually). The LACC suggests the faculty committee follow the First-Year Cornerstone model in offering initially an experimental version, with assessment and faculty development built in from start. The faculty committee could pursue Carver money or grants to help pay for faculty development.

6. **Replace Capstone with Critical Thinking requirement.**

   LACC would set up a faculty committee to develop goals/outcomes, course requirements, assessment plan, and set of courses which would meet these goals. This change requires Form L (LACC does) for dropping Capstone & replacing with Critical Thinking set of courses. This would be phased in, with students being able to take Capstone until enough Critical Thinking courses are available. The faculty committee or the LACC would pursue Carver money or grants to help pay for faculty development.
7. **Explore possibility of time-sequencing of LAC program (first-year, second-year, third-year, & fourth-year).**
   The LACC recommends waiting until other changes are done, and the LAC program is stabilized with these changes. This could be pursued by LACC at that time, if there is still impetus on campus for this change.

B. **To Be Maintained/Continued**
   1. Retain current category system (vs. another organization of categories).
   2. Continue development of clear student learning outcomes and assessment practices, aligned with LAC goals and outcomes for LAC categories (or sub-categories).
      The LACC emphasizes the crucial importance of assessment to the strength of the Liberal Arts Core program and encourages the development of assessment strategies that involve faculty in their creation and implementation, measure student performance as well as student perceptions of learning, recognize the value of both student and faculty time, and provide useful information for ongoing improvement of teaching and learning.

C. **Process for Changes Recommended (in addition to the italicized suggestions above)**
   1. Adopt the changes independently, since some require more courses and faculty development than others.
   2. Take this response to the university Faculty Senate in fall 2012. Consider feedback at the LACC level. Send to full faculty and put on LACC website, asking for feedback to LACC representative.
   3. Pursue multiple-year Carver grant money for faculty and curriculum development for above changes, when necessary.
LAC Form L Proposal

This proposal attempts to incorporate proposals made by the LSCRSC in their report. (Revised January 2012, available on the Provost's website http://www.uni.edu/vpaa/documents/LACRSCFINALREPORT_000.pdf)

1. PROPOSED RESTATEMENT OF THE LIBERAL ARTS CORE

This proposed restatement includes restatements of goals and outcomes for the Liberal Arts Core. Goals for specific components—and sometimes courses—are DRAFT SUGGESTIONS that have been written in language that allows assessable outcomes to measure them. It is NOT THE INTENTION of this proposal that these goals be considered the final word; rather they are a STARTING POINT FOR DISCUSSIONS THAT WILL CREATE AN ASSESSABLE LAC. It is the intention of this document that teaching faculty of each component will determine the final purposes, goals and outcomes for the components that are aligned with the overarching goals of the LAC.

UNI LAC Terminology
To achieve consistency in terminology across UNI’s Liberal Arts Core curriculum, the following assessment terms are used to describe student learning within the core.

Purpose: Broad statement that speaks to the overall nature and intention of learning and achievement

Goal: Broad statement that speaks to the overall nature and intention of learning and achievement

Outcome: Explicit statements describing how students can demonstrate achievement of or meet a set goal. Outcomes will be developed for specific components/courses—and will include assignments, tests, projects, etc.,--based on course goals.

Sample goal/outcome

Goal: Communication covers the skills individuals (selves) need to send and receive messages, but also the language, grammar, concepts and associations to words and images that allow us to interact with each other socially. You are going to work on achieving this goal by:
Outcomes:
   a. Composing and presenting effective written and oral messages in a variety of contexts.
   b. Documenting your awareness and skillful use of effective writing and speaking processes.

LIBERAL ARTS CORE PURPOSE
The purpose of liberal education at the University of Northern Iowa is to provide students with the foundation needed to realize their potential, to prepare them to lead lives that are thoughtful, meaningful, creative, responsible, and productive. So educated, UNI graduates can be expected to be committed to personal development, ethical action and social responsibility in a dynamic, culturally diverse, global society. In summary, it is intended that as a result of this liberal education, each UNI graduate will be a well-educated person.

LIBERAL ARTS CORE GOALS
To this end, the Liberal Arts Core—along with a student’s major(s) and/or minor(s)—provides meaningful opportunities for students to

1. **learn about the natural, social, and created worlds in which they live.** Areas of inquiry relevant to this goal may include, but are not limited to:
   a. Natural sciences: Methods and findings. Scientific methods and culture. Important scientific findings and theories. Technology
   e. Culture: Western and non-Western. History, philosophy, religion, art, and literature. Cultural beliefs and values. Exploring one’s cultural identity from a local, national, and international perspective.
   g. Academic literacy. Knowing the university, its structure, processes, and curricula. Evaluating the nature and purpose of liberal education.

2. **develop and enhance skills to acquire information, think and communicate effectively, and interact successfully in interpersonal and social situations.** Areas of inquiry relevant to this goal may include, but are not limited to:

c. Information literacy. Ability to employ traditional and modern information technologies to access and analyze information.

d. Quantitative skills. Numeracy. The ability to analyze and use quantitative data, and to apply mathematical and statistical concepts and methods.

e. Aesthetic expression. Ability to interpret, evaluate, and enjoy artistic creations.

f. Inter-personal skills. Emotional and social intelligence. Leadership and teamwork. Conflict resolution and negotiation. Effective participation in relationships, groups, and citizenship activities. Inter-cultural competence.

3. **examine ethical principles and reasoning, participate in civic discourse as self-reflective and self-aware citizens, and recognize the values and consequences of living in an increasingly diverse and globally-focused society.** Areas of inquiry relevant to this goal may include, but are not limited to:

   a. Ethics. Examining major ethical perspectives and how to use those perspectives to make decisions.

   b. Personal responsibility and well-being. Disposition to take responsibility for one’s actions and life-style. Healthy behaviors. Personal financial literacy.


4. **integrate and apply knowledge, skills and values to new situations and ideas, exhibit intellectual curiosity, and become life-long learners.** Areas of inquiry relevant to this goal may include, but are not limited to:


   c. Contextual awareness. Historical context. Disposition to adopt a broad, inclusive perspective.

   d. Integration and connectedness. Recognizing and articulating relationships among knowledge, issues, and disciplines.
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LAC AND THE MAJOR
The Liberal Arts Core, along with a student’s major(s) and/or minor(s) is an integral part of a UNI student’s education. Majors and minors build on and enhance the knowledge, skills and values learned in the LAC.

Therefore, a UNI graduate:

1. knows the methods, approaches and questions asked by a variety of different disciplines/fields in order to be an effective problem-solver. This means that UNI students learn about the natural, social and created worlds in which they live.
   - The LAC should offer opportunities for students to explore the methods, approaches, and questions asked by different disciplines and fields so that students can use multiple approaches in concert with their major discipline or field to solve problems. This means that LAC courses need regularly and clearly to articulate the kinds of questions, methods, approaches used by the respective disciplines/fields within the context of providing an appropriate level of discipline-specific knowledge, and to engage in inter- and cross-disciplinary inquiry when possible.
   - Majors should give students opportunities to solve problems/examine issues/produce creative or practical projects within the major discipline/field that demonstrates a synthesis of knowledge/approaches/methods learned in LAC courses with major courses.

2. uses a variety of different skills to acquire information, to think and communicate effectively, and to interact successfully in interpersonal and social situations.
   - The LAC should offer opportunities for students to enhance their skills in speaking and writing in many different contexts, to acquire knowledge of a variety of research and data collection methods, and to learn how to apply these skills in different social and professional contexts. This means that LAC courses need to give students opportunities to speak and write in a variety of situations using multiple formats, to collect and analyze data, and to assess the value and applicability of different kinds of information.
   - Majors should give students opportunities further to hone their writing and speaking skills, to practice the research methods of the discipline/field, and to demonstrate how the specific discipline/field contributes to and draws from a variety of other disciplines/fields.

3. examines ethical principles and reasoning, participates in civic discourse as a self-reflective and self-aware citizen, and recognizes the values and consequences of living in an increasingly diverse and globally-focused society.
   - The LAC should offer opportunities for students to learn ethical principles and reasoning and apply them to a variety of different contexts and situations, to participate meaningfully in civil discourse, and to learn about diverse cultures in global contexts. This means that LAC courses need to give students opportunities to grapple with the multiple challenges and prospects of living in an increasingly diverse society and world, and to
reflect on, and practice, what it means to be engaged citizens who contribute in meaningful ways to the communities in which they live.

- **Majors** should offer opportunities for students to enhance their knowledge of ethical principles and reasoning within a specific discipline/field, to engage and apply those ethical principles, to participate in civic discourse, and to examine how the specific discipline/field plays a role in interpreting and interacting with our increasingly diverse and globally-focused world.

4. can integrate and apply knowledge, skills and values to new situations and ideas, exhibit intellectual curiosity and is a life-long learner.

- **The LAC** should offer opportunities for students to expand their intellectual horizons with experiences that encourage them to develop and to translate their knowledge and skills to new areas of academic inquiry, explore areas of interest not directly related to their major(s) and/or minor(s), and to experience in their academic and co-curricular interactions with faculty and peers the value of intellectual curiosity and life-long learning. This means that LAC courses should demonstrate the importance of approaching intellectual questions and problems from multiple perspectives, and that faculty teaching LAC courses should exemplify and demonstrate the values of intellectual curiosity and life-long learning.

- **Majors** should offer students opportunities to apply and synthesize the knowledge, skills, and values they have learned throughout their college careers.

**THE LIBERAL ARTS CORE AT UNI (new courses/changes in italics):**

**TOTAL: 43 or 46 hours**

**COMPONENT 1. COMMUNICATION (6 hours required)**

**Proposed Purposes and Goals**

**Writing and Research**

**Purpose:** Enhance writing and research skills, and knowledge of the processes of effective writing.

**Goals:** Students who take this course will:

1. Be able to produce written texts that are focused, clear, complete, and effective.
2. Display the knowledge of and ability to practice the processes of effective writing.
3. Be able to assess the value of different source materials for a given writing project.
4. Know how to avoid plagiarism and appropriately cite sources.

**Speaking and Listening**

**Purpose:** Enhance oral communication skills and knowledge of the processes of effective oral communication.

**Goals:** Students who take this course will:
1. Display competence in creating and presenting oral messages in a variety of contexts.
2. Develop thinking and listening skills necessary for effective communication in a variety of relational contexts.

First Year Cornerstone (experimental status, F11) (6 hours)

Purpose: First Year Cornerstone (6 hours) offers students the opportunity to practice the skills necessary for the transition to intellectual, academic, and social life at UNI, such as critical thinking, decision-making, ethics, and working with diverse perspectives and points of view. Written and oral communication are emphasized as central processes of inquiry and life-long learning.

Goals: Students who successfully complete this course will:
1. Compose and present effective written and oral messages in a variety of contexts.
2. Document awareness and skillful use of effective writing and speaking processes.
3. Demonstrate strategies for succeeding in college and beyond.
4. Work constructively in groups to solve problems and accomplish tasks.
5. Recognize that there are multiple perspectives and world views, and identify how these differences affect interactions with others.
6. Examine the impact of one’s own beliefs and values on interactions with others.

COURSES
A. Reading and Writing (3 hours required)
UNIV 1059* First Year Cornerstone
*This course will be taught in 2-semester increments and a student must complete both semesters or will not apply to Component 1 credit.
ENGLISH 1005 College Writing and Research (3 hours) OR
ENGLISH 2015 Craft of Academic Writing (3 hours) OR
ENGLISH 2120 Critical Writing About Literature (3 hours)
B. Speaking and Listening (3 hours required)
UNIV 1059* First Year Cornerstone
*This course will be taught in 2-semester increments and a student must complete both semesters or will not apply to Component 1 credit.
COMM 1000 Oral Communication (3 hours)
OR two courses distributed as follows
COMM 2256 Oral Interpretation: Text in Performance (3 hours) OR
COMM 2255 Public Speaking (3 hours) OR
COMM 2257 Argumentation and Debate (3 hours)
AND
COMM 2344 Interpersonal Communication OR
COMM 1205 Group Communication Skills (3 hours)
COMPONENT 2. QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES AND UNDERSTANDING* (3 hours required)

Proposed Purposes and Goals
Purpose: Enhance knowledge and skills in quantitative and logical reasoning.
Goals: Students who complete this course will:
1. display competence in using quantitative techniques to interpret, display and work with quantitative information.
2. display competence in making valid arguments and drawing correct conclusions from quantitative information and their analysis of it.

CHANGE: All students should be required to take the base-level Mathematics in Decision Making course OR pass a waiver exam to demonstrate minimal competency on quantitative/financial literacy (students would be provided with support tools in preparing for the exam). Math for Decision Making courses should have at least one unit focused on some aspects of financial literacy (compound interest, credit ratings, retirement planning, financial risk and security, etc.)

COURSES
MATH 1100 Mathematics in Decision Making (3 hours)
MATH 1420 Calculus I (4 hours)
STAT 1774 Introductory Statistics for Life Sciences (3 hours)
STAT 1772 Introduction to Statistical Methods (3 hours)
CS 1025 Computational Modeling and Simulation (3 hours)
*Elementary Education students may meet the quantitative requirement by completing MATH 1201

COMPONENT 3. CIVILIZATIONS AND CULTURES (9 hours required)

Proposed Purposes and Goals
Humanities (6 hours)

CHANGE: Two required courses in 6 hours. The content and time periods covered by these courses to be determined by the Humanities faculty, who previously approved this change, and are presumably working on revising Humanities I & II.

Purpose: Enhance knowledge of the Western tradition as expressed in its literature, philosophy, religion, politics, arts, sciences, and technology. The study both of history and of core texts in their contexts is central to this process. Humanities I and 2 also emphasize the development of core skills such as reading, writing, and critical inquiry.

Goals: Students who complete Humanities 1 and 2
1. Be able to explain the contents of the works of literature, religion, philosophy, etc. which they were assigned; be able to place those works in the historical and/or cultural context within which they were written; and discuss what importance they have for the intellectual and/or religious tradition of the West.
2. Be able to place major works of art, sculpture, and architecture within the periods and cultures to which they belong, and discuss how those works relate to intellectual, religious, or historical developments in those periods and cultures.

3. Identify significant historical events and developments in the periods which they studied, discuss their origins, how they relate to intellectual, religious, and other cultural developments, and their importance for Western civilization.

**Non-Western Humanities (3 hours)**

*Purpose:* Enhance knowledge of a specific non-western geographic focus area as expressed in its literature, philosophy, religion, politics, arts, sciences, and technology. The study both of history and of core texts in their contexts is central to this process. Non-Western Humanities also emphasizes the development of core skills such as reading, writing, and critical inquiry.

*Goals:* Students who take these courses will:

1. Be able to explain the contents of the works of literature, religion, philosophy, etc. which they were assigned; be able to place those works in the historical and/or cultural context within which they were written; and discuss what importance they have for a specific non-Western culture.

2. Be able to place major works of art, sculpture, and architecture within the historical periods and culture to which they belong, and discuss how those works relate to intellectual, religious, or historical developments in those periods and cultures.

3. Identify significant historical events and developments in the periods which they studied, discuss their origins, how they relate to intellectual, religious, and other cultural developments, and their importance for the development of the specific non-Western culture.

[**Global Humanities (9 hours)** – would need to go through curricular processes for LAC inclusion.

*Purpose and goals would align with current western and non-western humanities courses.*

*Purpose:* Enhance knowledge of global cultural traditions as expressed in literature, philosophy, religion, politics, arts, sciences, and technology. The study both of history and of core texts in their contexts is central to this process. Global Humanities also emphasize the development of core skills such as reading, writing, and critical inquiry.

*Goals:* Students who take these courses will:

1. Be able to explain the contents of the works of literature, religion, philosophy, etc. which they were assigned; be able to place those works in the historical and/or cultural context within which they were written; and discuss what importance they have for understanding global cultures.

2. Be able to place major works of art, sculpture, and architecture within the historical periods and culture to which they belong, and discuss how those works relate to intellectual, religious, or historical developments in those periods and across cultures.

3. Identify significant historical events and developments in the periods which they studied, discuss their origins, how they relate to intellectual, religious, and other cultural developments.]

**COURSES**

A. Humanities (6 hours required)

- HUM XXXX Humanities I (3 hours)
- HUM XXXX Humanities II (3 hours)
B. Non-Western Cultures* (3 hours required)
ANTH 3159 Cultural Anthropology of Korea (3 hours)
HUM 3121 Russia/Soviet Union (3 hours)
HUM 3122 Japan (3 hours)
HUM 3123 Latin America (3 hours)
HUM 3124 China (3 hours)
HUM 3125 India (3 hours)
HUM 3127 Middle East (3 hours)
HUM 3128 Africa (3 hours)
HUM 3132/ANTH 2410 Native North America (3 hours)
HUM 3137/ANTH 2411 Native Central and South America (3 hours)
*SPAN 3020 (3 hours) may substitute for the non-Western Cultures requirement.

COMPONENT 4. FINE ARTS* (3 hours required)

Proposed Purposes and Goals
Purpose: Enhance knowledge and skills relevant to creative thinking and doing in music, theater, art and dance.
Goals: Students who take this course will:
1. Develop the vocabulary for reflecting, analyzing and discussing historical and contemporary aspects of music, theater, art or dance.
2. Experience, practice or perform creative activities.
3. Analyze the meaning and significance of particular artworks in their historical and cultural contexts.

PEMES 2034 Survey of Dance History (3 hours)
THEATER 1002 Theatrical Arts and Society (3 hours)
MUSIC 1100 Soundscapes: Music in Culture (3 hours)
ART 1002 Visual Inventions (3 hours)
ARTHIST 1004 Visual Perceptions (3 hours)
*MUSHIST 1020 may substitute for the Fine Arts requirement for all music majors.

COMPONENT 5. LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND WORLD RELIGIONS (3 hours required)

Purpose: Explore diverse forms of human expression and enhance understanding of the ways that literature, philosophy and religion shape and reflect common patterns of human life.

Proposed Purposes and Goals
Literature (3 hours)
Purpose: Enhance knowledge about different genres of literature and the skills used to read critically and analyze literary texts.
Goals: Students who take this course will:
1. Be able to identify different genres of literature, including the novel, short story, essay, poetic form, etc.
2. Be able to read different kinds of literary texts closely and critically.
3. Know and be able to apply various critical approaches used for literary analysis.

**Philosophy**

**Purpose:** Enhance knowledge and skills associated with questions relevant to the academic discipline of philosophy, such as the nature of self, reality, meaning, knowledge, truth, faith, value and obligation.

**Goals:** Students who take this course will:

1. Be able to describe and analyze the arguments made in philosophical texts.
2. Be able to evaluate and construct philosophical arguments.
3. Engage in reasoned discussion.
4. Identify and analyze at least two major philosophical problems in their historical and contemporary contexts.

**Religion**

**Purpose:** Enhance knowledge of the beliefs and practices of the major world religions, and develop skills and knowledge associated with the academic study of religion.

**Goals:** Students who take these courses will:

1. Be able to articulate the rationale for the academic study of religion, including various definitions of religion and the components of religious systems.
2. Know the major beliefs and practices of the Abrahamic faiths: Judaism, Christianity and Islam.
3. Know the major beliefs and practices of the Religions of South Asia: Hinduism and Buddhism.
4. Know the major beliefs and practices of the Religions of East Asia (Chinese and Japanese Religions): Confucianism, Taoism, Zen, Japanese Buddhism, Shinto.
5. Know the role of religion in the First Amendment.

**COURSES**

**ENGLISH 1120** Introduction to Literature (3 hours)

**RELS 1020** Religions of the World (3 hours)

**PHIL 1020** Philosophy: The Art of Thinking (3 hours)

**FREN 1120** Introduction to Francophone Literature in Translation (3 hours)

**GER 1120** Introduction to German Literature in Translation (3 hours)

**SLAV 1120** Introduction to Russian Literature in Translation (3 hours)

**PORT 1031** Introduction to Portuguese and Hispanic Literatures in Translation (3 hours)

**COMPONENT 6. NATURAL SCIENCES** (7 hours required)

**Proposed Purposes and Goals**

**Purpose:** Enhance knowledge and skills about scientific concepts and processes in order to make informed decisions and participate effectively in civic and cultural affairs.

**Goals:** Students who take these courses will:

1. Develop knowledge and skills about how science is done.
2. Apply scientific understanding to describe, predict, and explain natural phenomena.
3. Demonstrate an understanding of the important ideas in a particular area of scientific inquiry, as well as the ways that these areas of inquiry cross disciplines.

4. Understand how scientific concepts and processes are used to make policy decisions (e.g., NASA funding, NIH recommendations, etc.).

5. Critically read articles about science in the popular press and engage in conversation about the validity of the conclusions.

[Scientific Literacy--(3 hours)--would need to go through curricular processes for LAC inclusion. Such a course would be a three-hour course in either the Life or Physical Sciences. Purpose and goals would align with the goals of the Natural Sciences Component.]

COURSES

Students are required to take a course with a scheduled laboratory from either Life Sciences or Physical Sciences or another laboratory course offered by the College of Natural Sciences. (Only 6 hours are required for students who meet the liberal arts core laboratory requirement with a course other than the one listed in Life or Physical Sciences.) For all courses listed under Life Sciences and Physical Sciences, with the exception of ANTH 1001, a student must have satisfied University entrance requirements in English and Mathematics.

A. Life Sciences (3 or 4 hours required)

SCI ED 1200 Inquiry into Life Sciences (4 hours)
BIOL 1012 Life: The Natural World (3 hours)
BIOL 1013* Life: The Natural World--Lab (1 hour)
BIOL 1014 Life: Continuity and Change (3 hours)
BIOL 1015* Life: Continuity and Change--Lab (1 hour)
BIOL 1033* Principles of Microbiology (3 hours)
BIOL 2051* General Biology: Organismal Diversity (4 hours)
BIOL 2052* General Biology: Cell Structure and Function (4 hours)
BIOL 3101* Anatomy and Physiology I (4 hours)
ANTH 1001 Human Origins (3 hours)

*Lab course

B. Physical Sciences (3 or 4 hours required)

SCI ED 1300* Inquiry into Physical Science (4 hours)
SCI ED 1100* Inquiry into Earth Science (4 hours)
CHEM 1010* Principles of Chemistry (4 hours)
CHEM 1011 Molecules and Life (3 hours)
CHEM 1020* Chemical Technology (4 hours)
CHEM 1110* General Chemistry (4 hours)
CHEM 1030* Applied General Chemistry (4 hours)
CHEM 1130* General Chemistry I-II (5 hours)
EARTHSCI 1100** Astronomy (3-4 hours)
EARTHSCI 1110* Astronomy--Lab (1 hour)
EARTHSCI 1200 Elements of Weather (3 hours)
EARTHSCI 1210* Elements of Weather--Lab (1 hour)
EARTHSCI 1300* Introduction to Geology (3 hours)
EARTHSCI 2230* Fossils and Evolution (3 hours)
PHYSICS 1400* Conceptual Physics (4 hours)
PHYSICS 1000  Physics in Everyday Life (3 hours)
PHYSICS 1511* General Physics (4 hours)
PHYSICS 1701* Physics I for Science and Engineering (4 hours)
GEOG 1210**  Physical Geography (3-4 hours)
*Lab Course
**Lab Course if 4-hour option elected

COMPONENT 7. SOCIAL SCIENCE (6 hours required)

Proposed Purposes and Goals

Purpose: Enhance knowledge and understanding of the economic, environmental, geographical, historical, political, psychological, and socio-cultural influences on human behavior, relationships, and institutions. Develop skills for determining how human behavior can be analyzed from social scientific and historical perspectives.

Goals: Students who take these courses will be able to
1. Identify and generate the kinds of questions social scientists and historians ask.
2. Identify major concepts and/or issues within the social sciences and history.
3. Comprehend ways in which human behavior, relationships, and institutions are influenced by economic, environmental, geographical, historical, political, psychological, and socio-cultural structures and processes.
4. Describe and critique scientific methods social scientists use to explore social and behavioral phenomena.

CHANGE: The Social Science Category has been divided into two components, with 9 hours total. The Diversity and Global Issues Category will have goals and outcomes that can be met by the Social Science courses in the category, as well as other courses from other disciplines that meet those goals and outcomes.

COURSES
One course from A & B.

A. Sociocultural and Historical Perspectives (3 hours)

SOC 1000 Introduction to Sociology (3 hours)
SOC SCI 1023 American Civilization (3 hours)
SOC SCI 1020 Women, Men and Society (3 hours)
GEOG 1120 Human Geography (3 hours)
GEOG 1110 World Geography (3 hours)
ANTH 1002 Culture, Nature and Society

B. Individual and Institutional Perspectives (3 hours)

EDPSYCH 2030 Dynamics of Human Development (3 hours)
FAM SERV 1010 Human Identity and Relationships (3 hours)
PSYCH 1001 Introduction to Psychology (3 hours)
ECON 1031* Introduction to Economics (3 hours)
POL AMER 1014 Introduction to American Politics (3 hours)
*Satisfactory completion of BOTH ECON 1041 and ECON 1051 by all non-business majors and Business Teaching majors, through UNI or transfer, may substitute for ECON 1031.

**COMPONENT 8. DIVERSITY AND GLOBAL ISSUES** (3 hours required)

**Proposed Purposes and Goals**

**Purpose:** Develop knowledge and understanding of the diversity of human experience by examining definitions and meanings of “diversity,” recognizing dynamics of power and privilege, and evaluating how to engage positively and productively in an increasingly diverse, global environment.

**Goals:** Students who take these courses will be able to

1. Identify and evaluate concepts of “diversity”.
2. Analyze dynamics of power and privilege in specific contexts and situations.
3. Learn strategies for effective and productive engagement in diverse organizations and communities.

[U.S. Experience (3 hours)–would need to go through curricular processes for LAC inclusion. Purpose and goals would align with the goals of the Diversity and Global Issues Component.]

**Purpose:** To explore the culture—history, politics, arts, literature, contemporary social issues—of the U.S. in a way that illustrates the diversity of human experience.

- This course can be taught from a variety of disciplinary perspectives and fields.
- Whatever the approach or focus of the course, it emphasizes the fact that various social/personal identities and social group memberships affect human experience of and in U.S. culture.

**Goals:** Students who take a U.S. Experience course should be able to:

1. Identify and evaluate how concepts of “diversity” are used in various cultural contexts in the U.S.
2. Analyze U.S. cultural developments in their historical and social contexts, including dynamics of power and privilege.]

**COURSES:**

POL GEN 1020 Contemporary Political Problems (3 hours)
SOC 1060 Social Problems
SW 1041 Social Welfare: A World View (3 hours)
SW 2045/SOC SCI 1045/SOC 1045 American Racial and Ethnic Minorities (3 hours)
WGS 1040 Women’s and Gender Studies: Introduction

**COMPONENT 9: CRITICAL THINKING** (currently Capstone [2 hours required]) (3 hours required)

**Proposed Purposes and Goals**

**Purpose:** Enhance students’ skills in using critical thinking techniques in completing the complex analytical tasks they will encounter throughout their college careers and their lives beyond the university.

- This course can be taught from a variety of disciplinary perspectives and fields
- Whatever the approach or focus of the course, it emphasizes how arguments are developed, evaluated and used to support claims

**Goals:** Students who take this course will be able to:

1. Define and describe the structure and components of different kinds of arguments
2. Examine assumptions, assess evidence and weigh the conclusions of different kinds of arguments
3. Evaluate the reliability of information sources.
4. Identify and avoid common errors in thinking, including logical fallacies.

The Capstone Component would remain in place, as it currently is, until such time that courses on Critical Thinking are piloted and approved. Many Capstone courses may be easily revised to become Critical Thinking courses, though the LACRSC envisions Critical Thinking courses to be taken earlier in a student’s career—preferably in the sophomore year—than the Capstone.

COURSES
CAP 3120/TECH 3120 Living in Our Techno-Social World (3 hours)
CA 3101 Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Genocide: Case Studies (3 hours)
CAP 3105 Sacred Space (3 hours)
CAP 3106/THEATRE 3100 Theatre in Education (3 hours)
CAP 3110/BIOL 3110 Obesity and Diabetes: Science, Sociology and Economics (2 hours)
CAP 3121 Creativity and the Evolution of Culture (3 hours)
CAP 3122 Building Communities: Developing Intentional Family Spaces (3 hours)
CAP 3123 Greece: From the "Cradle of Democracy" to Today (3 hours)
CAP 3124 Democracies (3 hours)
CAP 3125 Globalization, Cultural Pluralism and International Security (3 hours)
CAP 3128/COMM 4236 Ethics in Communication (3 hours)
CAP 3129 Being National (3 hours)
CAP 3130 Science and Pseudoscience: Critiquing the World Around You (3 hours)
CAP 3131 Analysis of Social Issues (3 hours)
CAP 3132 Medicine, Morality, and Society (3 hours)
CAP 3134 Back in the Valley: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the 21st Century (3 hours)
CAP 3140 Environment, Technology, and Society (3 hours)
CAP 3148 The Holocaust in Literature and Film (3 hours).
CAP 3151 Money, Sex and Power: Theories of Race, Class and Gender (3 hours)
CAP 3152 Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Health (3 hours)
CAP 3155 Socio-Economic Reality of Central America (3 hours)
CAP 3158 The Water Planet -- 3 hrs. (3 hours)
CAP 3160/HPE 3160 Community and Public Health (3 hours)
CAP 3173 Bio-Medical Ethics (3 hours)
CAP 3187 Blues and Jazz in African American Film and Literature (3 hours)
CAP 3194 Perspectives on Death and Dying (3 hours)

CHANGE: Personal Wellness (HPELS 1010) has been removed from the LAC

2. EXPLANATION: SUMMARIZE HOW THE PROPOSED REVISION DIFFERS FROM THE CURRENT LAC STRUCTURE OF CATEGORIES AND REQUIREMENTS
The entire number of hours in the LAC would be 43-46 (46 for those required to take Transfer Cornerstone).

To reduce territorialism and college/departmental “ownership” of categories/courses, while at the same time acknowledging disciplinary specificities, “Category” structure has been replaced by COMPONENTS. This restructuring serves a number of important functions:

1) This restructuring recognizes that there are academic disciplines and fields that approach similar ideas from different perspectives. For example, many disciplines could contribute to the Component, “Diversity and Global Awareness,” including social science disciplines like anthropology, sociology, social work and history; indeed, the courses currently in the category are primarily Social Science courses. But “Diversity and Global Awareness” can also be addressed by humanities disciplines, as well, including Art, Music, Religion, Languages and Literatures, and Communication Studies, to name a few.

2) This restructuring the LAC into Components recommendation also enhances the possibility of clear and straightforward Student Outcomes Assessment, which will be a necessary part of the LAC. The Component structure allows courses with similar outcomes to be grouped together so that the effectiveness of Component can be easily assessed.

All Components of the LAC will need to have a clear Student Outcomes Assessment plan that includes continual annual assessment. UNI is committed to effective teaching and learning. Student Outcomes Assessment (SOA) allows us to know whether or not what we are doing as educators meets the goals and outcomes we have set, as an institution, for student learning. Additionally, assessing the Liberal Arts Core, specifically, is a requirement of UNI’s participation in HLC’s Assessment Academy; we must have, in place, a process for assessing the effectiveness of the Liberal Arts Core by fall 2014. To achieve this goal all categories will need to review and, if necessary, revise its goals and outcomes in fall 2012. Furthermore, each category will also need to have in place an assessment plan, approved by the LACC, by spring 2013.

Personal Wellness has been removed.

First-Year Cornerstone, a year-long course that combines writing, oral communication, civility and student success is being piloted as an experimental course for the first time in the 2011-2012 school year. This course will be piloted for two more years and then reviewed by the LACC for inclusion in the LAC.

A new Component, DIVERSITY AND GLOBAL ISSUES, has been recommended. Courses in this component are those that currently make up Category 5C, though others that meet
the goals and outcomes of this Component would be encouraged. It is in this category that the LACRSC recommended course, “U.S. Experience” could be developed as an option.

- A new Component, CRITICAL THINKING, has been recommended. The current CAPSTONE category would remain in place until such time that the Critical Thinking component can be piloted and assessed. Critical Thinking courses would be topical and come from a variety of different departments/colleges. The courses in this component would be required to define and foreground critical thinking strategies as they would be applied to various topics and disciplines. Many of the current Capstone courses could be revised for inclusion in this category.

Timeline: Faculty development summer 2015; Pilot in fall 2015
In addition to the CHANGE notes made within the PROPOSED STATEMENT OF THE LIBERAL ARTS CORE, the following additional changes are recommended with the implementation of the 2014-2016 catalog.
1) A 3-hour required Cornerstone course that can only be taken at UNI be developed for transfer students and first-year students who have already fulfilled writing and oral communication requirements. Such a course could be focused on particular topics of interest to faculty as well as focus on the UNI college experience. It would be highly desirable that this course also emphasize writing and oral communication skills.

Timeline: Faculty development summer 2014; Pilot in fall 2014
There are other changes that would be more incremental, and require the LACC to develop processes for implementation.
2) Create an exit requirement of two additional writing-intensive courses, either within the LAC or within a student’s major/minor. Comment: In the 2010 survey, 53.1% (strongly) favored students taking these courses within the LAC, while 58.3% of faculty (strongly) favored the idea of requiring additional writing-intensive courses in the LAC or within a student’s major and/or minor. 48.6% of faculty (strongly) favored students taking at least two additional writing-intensive LAC courses, or be enrolled in a major that is certified to be writing-intensive. We like the idea of the writing-intensive major, and would encourage the development of a process whereby majors could be certified as such (see University of Wisconsin—LaCrosse “Writing-in-the-Major” Programs). The LACRSC recommends that the University Writing Committee (UWC) should be charged in fall 2012 with developing a plan for how this recommendation could be implemented. The UWC should then forward the recommendation on to the Educational Policy Committee so that it could be added as a UNI exit requirement.

Faculty development needs: Work with writing faculty to develop faculty workshops on teaching writing-intensive courses.

3) Develop Courses in U.S Experience, Scientific Literacy and Global Humanities. We envision a process similar to the piloting of the Cornerstone course for developing these courses: approval by the LACC for a pilot course, a summer workshop for interested faculty, and pilots for
experimental courses in the LAC. If there are no interested faculty, the option will not be put in place.

3. **JUSTIFICATION A, B, C:**
   A. **SUMMARIZE FINDINGS OF STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES AND ANY OTHER ASSESSMENT RESULTS THAT SUPPORT CHANGING LAC REQUIREMENTS AND, SPECIFICALLY, SUPPORT THIS PROPOSED REVISION.**
   B. **IDENTIFY AND SUMMARIZE RESEARCH RESULTS THAT SUPPORT THE PROPOSED REVISION (FOR EXAMPLE, REPORTS AND POSITION STATEMENTS ON BEST PRACTICES FROM ACCREDITATION COMMISSIONS; EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS.**

From fall 2009-spring 2011, the Liberal Arts Core Review Steering Committee reviewed the current LAC and studied best practices in general education. In the LACRSC Recommendations Report (see revised report, attached as an Appendix), we recount the work that we did to gather information from faculty and students about the LAC, and the ways in which we fostered conversation about the LAC. In addition, the LACRSC reviewed the extensive work on general education from AAC&U ([http://www.aacu.org/resources/generaleducation/index.cfm](http://www.aacu.org/resources/generaleducation/index.cfm)) on general education, including the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative. We studied quantitative and writing requirements from other institution and reviewed general education programs from our peer institutions. We were also attentive to the goals of UNI’s strategic plan, and to the recommendations made from the Foundations of Excellence Self-Study. From our conversations with faculty, and from our studies, we made modest recommendations for changes to the liberal arts core that we believe will

- enhance students’ ability to think critically and write effectively, therefore improving their capacity for engaging meaningfully with ideas and people in both professional and personal contexts.
- enhance students’ education with regard to issues of diversity and global awareness, therefore preparing them to work and live more productively in an increasingly diverse world.
- improve our ability to assess the Liberal Arts Core to ascertain that students are achieving the desired outcomes for the LAC program.

More radical changes are desired by many faculty, while many other faculty insisted on maintaining the status quo. The LACRSC believes that these modest changes, supported by many faculty, will improve UNI students’ education.

C. **EXPLAIN HOW THE PROPOSED REVISION STRENGTHENS THE LIBERAL ARTS CORE**

This proposed revisions strengthen the liberal arts core by

1. aligning LAC goals and outcomes with categories, thereby enhancing our ability to gauge whether or not our students are learning.
2. enhancing a focus on diversity and global issues, a goal of UNI’s Strategic Plan, and a necessity for preparing students to negotiate the increasingly diverse world that we live in.

3. emphasizing the acquisition of critical thinking skills in a specific course that would be complementary to the overall goal of critical thinking throughout a student’s education at UNI.

4. emphasizing the importance of writing skills in two additional writing-enhanced courses in the LAC or in a student’s major/minor.

5. CURRICULAR IMPACT: SUMMARIZE THE ANTICIPATED IMPACT ON CURRICULAR OFFERINGS AND PROGRAMS (MAJORS, MINORS) OF DEPARTMENTS AND COLLEGES THAT WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED REVISION

The proposed revisions will impact curricular offerings and programs by

- Encouraging course development in a number of different areas, including Global Humanities, Scientific Literacy, U.S. Experience, Critical Thinking, and Diversity and Global Awareness. Presumably, such offerings would substitute for other courses faculty were currently teaching in the LAC, resulting in low curricular impact in terms of faculty resources, and high curricular impact in terms of student learning.
- Aligning course offerings with Student Outcomes Assessment purposes and goals. Faculty will need to develop specific outcomes for all LAC courses that can be easily assessed.

6. RESOURCES NEEDED

A. SUMMARIZE THE NEEDS IN INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES INCLUDING ESTIMATE OF THE NUMBER OF SECTIONS NEEDED EACH SEMESTER.

A proposal for the Cornerstone course is also being forwarded to the LACC. This proposal is accompanied by a budget plan.

We do not anticipate that this proposal changes the number of students who need to be served by the LAC, and hence, should not change the number of faculty or courses needed for the LAC.

What will be needed, if these recommendations are put in place, is faculty development for proposed courses. Costs for faculty development are unknown at this time: many of the recommendations require interested faculty, and if there are no interested faculty, we will maintain the current LAC.

B. SUMMARIZE ANY ADDITIONAL NEEDS FOR COMPUTER RESOURCES AND FACILITIES
None anticipated.

C. **SUMMARIZE ANY ADDITIONAL NEEDS FOR LIBRARY RESOURCES AND SERVICES**

None anticipated.

D. **SUMMARIZE ANY OTHER ADDITIONAL NEEDS INCLUDING, FOR EXAMPLE, SPECIFIC WAYS IN WHICH STUDENT SERVICES MIGHT BE AFFECTED**

None anticipated.

7. **CONSULTATIONS**

A. **PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL**: SUMMARIZE PLAN FOR DISCUSSIONS TO BE HELD WITH INTERESTED LAC CONSTITUENCIES INCLUDING (1) FACULTY IN ALL UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGES; (2) STUDENTS; (3) STUDENT SERVICES STAFF

Initial conversations with faculty, staff, and students were held in fall 2011. The LACRSC Recommendations Report was accepted by the LACC. In fall 2012 this document, along with Consultation Forms for specific Components/Courses, will be sent to all departments for consultation and formal feedback. Consultation forms will be reviewed and returned by December 1, 2012. Consultations with college faculty senates and the Council on Teacher Education will occur in spring 2013. Further discussions/changes in the proposal will be made by the end of spring 2013.

B. **FINAL PROPOSAL**: SUMMARIZE DISCUSSIONS HELD WITH LAC CONSTITUENCIES

C. **FINAL PROPOSAL**: REPORT ON FORMAL CONSULTATIONS (FORM J) WITH ALL COLLEGE FACULTY SENATES, COUNCIL ON TEACHER EDUCATION AND THE LIBRARY (FORM J-L)