

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
01/10/11 (3:19 p.m. - 5:25 p.m.)

SUMMARY

Summary of main points

1. One courtesy announcement from Faculty Chair **Jurgenson**. Provost **Gibson** asked if members of the Senate preferred to postpone the series of informal discussion over lunch with President **Allen** her until President **Allen** returns to his duties or to continue the meetings without President **Allen**. The Senate preferred to postpone. Provost **Gibson** also announced that a new external search is now underway for an Associate Provost for International Programs. Senate Chair **Wurtz** noted that the Senate would move into Executive Session just prior to adjournment. No press present.

2. Minutes were approved for:

12/13/10 (**Smith / Neuhaus**)

11/08/10 (**DeBerg / Hotek**)

09/27/10 (**Smith / Roth**).

3. Quasi-committee of the whole elected a Senate representative to the selection committee for the Veridian Community Engagement Award, Senator **Soneson** by acclamation.

4. Docketed from the calendar:

965 Recommendations for Reorganization of Academic Units
(**DeBerg / Bruess**)

966 Textbook submission process (**Soneson / Neuhaus**)

5. Consideration of docketed items:

1063 961 Receive LAC Capstone Category Review , 20 October 2011 (sic), for 2002-2010 (Chair: Professor **DeBerg**). Passed.

1064 962 Consultative Session, Associate Provost **Arthur**, et al., on UNI Diversity Initiative, for 10 January 2011, from 3:25 p.m. to 3:55 p.m.

1065 963 Approve recommendations from the Educational Policy Commission regarding guidelines for study abroad courses (Commission Chair: Dr. Gayle Rhineberger-Dunn). Motion denied.

1066 964 Approve recommendation from the Educational Policy Commission regarding changes to the university policy on attendance and make-up work (Commission Chair: Dr. Gayle Rhineberger-Dunn). No time remaining to consider. Tabled.

6. Senate went into executive session and adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
January 10, 2011
Mtg. #1690**

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

Absent: Megan Balong

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Wurtz** called the meeting to order at 3:19 p.m.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Press were not in attendance.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost **Gibson's** representative Associate Provost **Licari** had no comments to pass along from the Provost. Senator **Soneson** asked the Associate Provost if he could verify a rumor that the UNI Museum would close. **Licari**

stated that he had not heard that. Provost **Gibson** arrived later and, when asked the same question, stated categorically that the UNI Museum would **not** be closed. (See other comments by Provost **Gibson** following her arrival later in these minutes.)

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JURGENSON

Faculty Chair James **Jurgenson** wished everyone a Happy New Year.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR SUSAN WURTZ

Chair **Wurtz** noted that the Senate would move into Executive Session for the last 5 minutes of the meeting.

BUSINESS

MINUTES

Senators received electronically 3 sets of minutes for approval. Administrative Assistant Nuss received no corrections prior to the meeting from senators for any of the 3 sets of minutes. No senators offered corrections during discussion at this time for any of the 3 sets of minutes. **Smith / Neuhaus** moved/seconded approval of the 12/13/10 minutes. Passed. **DeBerg / Hotek** moved/seconded approval of the 11/08/10 minutes. Passed. **Smith / Roth** moved/seconded approval of the 09/27/10 minutes. Passed with 1 abstention.

QUASI-COMMITEE OF THE WHOLE

Wurtz asked for a motion to move into quasi-committee of the whole. (**DeBerg / Soneson**) Passed. **Wurtz** noted that the Senate has been asked to elect a representative to the selection committee for the Veridian Community Engagement Award. The Senate can choose a senator, can choose another representative, or can choose to respectfully decline to send anyone at all. Senators were asked to come prepared with nominations if they cared to.

Senator **Smith** asked to know more about the award and who else selects members for that committee. **Wurtz** replied that beyond the documentation she sent to senators she remembers only that Veridian wishes to award individuals who are active in engaging with the community and that the administration makes selection of members of the committee along with other entities, such as the Senate. Senator **Soneson** explained that this is a fairly new award meant to reward those who are engaged in outreach which encourages all to become more engaged. He feels the Senate should be supportive of it. No nominations were offered. **Soneson** self-nominated because he made comments in favor of it, and he was elected by acclamation. (**Smith / DeBerg**)

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1067 for Docket #965, Recommendations for Reorganization of Academic Units. **DeBerg** moved and **Bruess** seconded to docket in regular order. Passed with no discussion.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1068 for Docket #966, Textbook Submission Process. **Soneson** moved and **Neuhaus** seconded to docket in regular order. Passed with no discussion. **Soneson** did question the limited information received on this due to the Senate web site being down, and **Wurtz** assured him that all pertinent information will be restored for senators' review as soon as possible

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Consideration of Calendar Item 1064, Docket #962, a Consultative Session with Associate Provost **Arthur**, et al., on the UNI Diversity Initiative for 3:25 to 3:55 p.m.

Associate Provost Virginia **Arthur** thanked the Senate for allowing her and her associates to come to address the Senate. She introduced Laura **Kaplan** and Victoria **DeFrancisco** as the two Diversity Fellows who joined her at this meeting. She explained that this is a program modeled on the Administrative Fellows who serve in the Provost's Office. The Diversity

Fellows will help the Diversity Initiative for Academic Affairs get off the ground.

Arthur continued with some background as to why the initiative came about, how the particular organization for affiliation was chosen, and their upcoming plans. She reminded the Senate body that in April of 2009 and April of 2010 the Senate had various discussions about the issue of diversity in the faculty. A senator had brought up the issue, and then students brought forth a motion last Spring. Discussions began with the new Provost Gibson and others about what might be done to improve the climate on campus for more diverse groups of faculty and students and staff. They considered a number of different kinds of programs and initiatives and ultimately chose the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI). It has been around for over 20 years. It has over 60 formal campus affiliates and programs. It also does community kinds of work. It is a "train-the-trainer model," so they have a well-developed diversity awareness training program. UNI now has 21 trained facilitators who will train other groups throughout the institution. The training is the heart of the model. It is also about changing institutional cultures through changing individuals, bringing awareness of our own biases that we hold and biases that others have and acknowledging them and then building alliances with other people from various groups on campus. Those working with it have experienced it as a very powerful model.

Last June, all Deans and Department Heads were invited to participate in what was called an "Exposure Workshop." This was a trial period for people from NCBI to come to UNI to see whether or not they felt this was a good fit with the campus and an opportunity for **Arthur** and her group to judge the model as appropriate for UNI. After that workshop, they decided to move forward with it and held another Exposure Workshop where they invited faculty and staff from Academic Affairs. Although they only had 35 spaces available, well over 80 expressed interest in attending. Following that one-day workshop, they asked who would like to participate as a trainer in this model. Twenty-one chose to be trained, and the next step is to launch a training program across campus.

Arthur explained the use of the term "training," a term faculty tend to dislike. This is really an educational program, described as both cognitive and affective--both of the brain and of the emotions/feelings. Participants do some self-analysis and self-reflection. The program has research to back up the notion that changing ones self and ones attitudes really helps to change the environment.

Arthur noted that her group sees the NCBI affiliation as a critical piece of their work. They also wanted to incorporate other kinds of diversity initiatives and thus developed the Diversity Fellows program. They have generous support of the Provost and will be announcing an initiative to provide support for people who are willing to work to infuse diversity into the curriculum, including some course development around these issues. Other kinds of initiatives may be undertaken. A group of students and some faculty are receiving support to attend the White Privilege Conference in April.

Arthur assured the Senate that this will not be mandatory. Individuals will need to express interest and then participate fully for change to occur. No force will be applied as it will not work. She believes that when others see what their colleagues or friends or students are getting out of it, they will want to participate. It will never to 100%, but they are aiming high. They have a very positive goal over the next 3 years for participants from Academic Affairs, and they feel they will have a very positive impact on campus culture.

Fellow **Kaplan** noted that the initiative is focusing on Academic Affairs first, although they are also working with Student Government on bringing groups of students to the White Privilege Conference in Minneapolis. They will all work together to think about how to prepare to go and what to bring back to Student Government and students here because there really are a lot of issues to deal with. She also pointed out they know that there is an ongoing Undoing Racism program which has been around for a number of years. The programs are separate and in no way in competition. They each have a separate purpose. The Undoing Racism program works primarily in community and is about racism only. This new program is a much broader perspective of diversity--including other groups who are

marginalized or oppressed, such as those based on race, ethnicity, religion, ability, sexual orientation. All of that is covered in the NCBI training.

Fellow **DeFrancisco** stated that coming to the Senate is a part of their making the rounds across campus to introduce themselves and the program. She encouraged senators to invite them to their Departments or other groups, faculty or faculty-student groups, which might be interested in having training. They want to begin to build alliance with people who want to be a part of this. There will be some formal invitations to various groups they know will be receptive as they build their training of skills. And these group meetings are really not like usual meetings--rather, they are casual and fun where they practice their skills in doing workshops and in continuing to explore their own "isms," because it is a continuous process. So keep them in mind as willing to come to speak and share.

Arthur said they would be very happy to a half-day or even full-day workshop with the Senate, if they want to experience what they are doing. **DeBerg** asked for the name of the national organization once more--the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI). The website is: NCBI.org

Smith asked if he was correct in understanding that their focus is on the individual level and individual behavior, rather than on institutional issues regarding diversity. **Arthur** replied that the philosophy of the organization is that institutional change only occurs when there has been individual attitudinal change. When individuals are brought to a different way of seeing things and understanding their relationships with others and with organizations, then that leads to systemic change that is more long lasting. **Smith** continued that he has been of the opinion that higher education in general, and UNI in particular, were quite good on issues of diversity. So he asked if they see at the institutional level at UNI serious problems regarding diversity that need to be addressed and that they would anticipate at some point addressing? Are there such problems, or is it primarily at the level of individuals, he wondered?

DeFrancisco replied that when they interviewed for the positions, both she and **Kaplan** made sure that this was a long-term investment on the part of everyone, rather than a one-year, hit-and-miss stab at the problem. They

are interested in long-term, systemic cultural change. And that is exactly what NCBI talks about, but they also note that this cannot be addressed only on one level. It has to be a multi-faceted approach. It has to begin with one person at a time. So they are not saying that there are not large, structural problems, but it is more a recognition of how one can live in this culture and not be racist, sexist, etc. Of course, those issues exist, but it is difficult to see them when one is a part of that. The hope is that individual change filters out to committees those individuals serve on and changes the framework and the way in which the committee members look at the issues. **Smith** asked again if they felt that there are institutional level problems here at UNI. **Kaplan** noted that as long as human beings run institutions, there are going to be problems.

Arthur offered an example of a day-to-day kind of thing at the level of men and women being in this institution. The issue involved helping new mothers returning to work feel more comfortable about pumping breast milk during the day. She has argued for a lactation room at UNI for nearly 2 years; yet the people who make allocations of space do not seem to see it as worthy. It is not a matter of cost or a matter of space. Those making the decisions just do not get the issue. An open cubicle for expressing breast milk just does not suffice. This is sexism when clearly looked at; yet most do not see this. She continued that the climate at UNI is not very inclusive for students. The rate of retention difference among various groups is wide. The rate of retention difference between majority students and non-majority students is actually shocking. UNI has gotten national attention for it. The issues are subtle in some ways. We do not see outright awful behavior, but some behavior is so engrained that people do not even realize it, and yet it is very hurtful to others on campus.

Gallagher noted that she attended the workshop and called it "terrific." She agrees that a lot of it is subtle. We feel we all have good will, she said, and want to include others, but the subtlety in her own experience in working with minority graduate students is great. She also has an interest in working with students with disabilities here at UNI. She hears many stories and nobody "means it." It is not intentional and mean spirited. This initiative deals with the more subtle, and powerful because they are subtle, issues. **Arthur** called this unintended bias. Being nice or conservative or

liberal or a particular religion or anything has nothing to do with bias. We all have bias on different levels with different issues. We have reached the intellectual point so now can deal with it. We now know that we need better accessibility. Students are very outspoken about this. She asks students in a class who they think designed the classroom because of the subtle things such as the cord being too high for her to reach for the projector screen. We become used to how things are built and accept them, even when they are not serviceable. Students in wheelchairs in some of her classes sometimes cannot reach the classroom. The one elevator is broken. **Gallagher** told a story of a blind student with gpa problems because the student, when asking for extra time with the professor, was told to get notes from another student with a piece of carbon paper (which does not make sense for a blind student). Some will give extra time to those with disabilities. Some will not.

Arthur stated that it happens with every single subgroup. Our individual experiences are different because we see them through a different lens. This program is about moving the lens a little wider; looking over this way when we are used to looking over that way, and taking in a bigger picture. This is not just about retention of students. It is also about retention of faculty and who we want to recruit and what we have to offer to people when we recruit. **DeFrancisco** agreed that this is a really critical point.

Senator **Neuhaus** wondered if NCBI also has a community aspect. He sees the importance of focusing on ourselves initially. Our wider community is not large, just as UNI is not large, but if UNI is welcoming but the larger community is not, then, particularly for faculty, this is still a bit of an issue. **Kaplan** replied that NCBI works with universities, and they also work with non-profit organizations and communities. UNI is just setting it up first as on campus, so if a faculty person sees that it can be talked about, at least on campus, then they might stay. Little things like truthful disclosure of winter weather can make a big difference in whether a new person's first semester here is what was expected. When subtle factors are communicated better and more openly, then the community changes, too. **Arthur** said that their focus is campus to start with, in a controlled way, because funding is in Academic Affairs, and they have a very high goal for

how many people affiliated with Academic Affairs will eventually participate.

Senator **Terlip** wondered if their efforts would be coordinated with the staff training programs? **Arthur** replied that anyone affiliated with Academic Affairs--faculty, staff, students--would be included. They each clarified that clerical workers are considered staff, and Human Resources already does some diversity training with new hires, **Terlip** thought. **Arthur** said that HR does not really do much in this area. HR has been through the Undoing Racism program, and they do talk in order to coordinate what each is doing, but each program has its own approach. And some outside people, such as the Dean of Students, have been invited so that they are aware, so she can see HR being invited at some point also.

East voiced two points. First of all, he noted that their examples had to do little with what he spends his time doing--teaching and interacting with students. So, does this really apply to Faculty Senate members? If it does, he wanted some examples to illustrate how it does. Secondly, he wondered why he should have an interest in participating because he is already liberal and sensitive and does not see any problems. Or, if he misjudges himself, what can this do to make any difference? The problems so far given, he felt, were just not his job (such as seeing that the elevator get fixed). He stated that if they were going to be speaking to academics and encouraging their participation, then they had better be sure to cover this likely type of thinking. **DeFrancisco** acknowledged the fairness of his bringing forth these likely responses. She noted several in the room who have already undertaken the training and described it as learning a series of skills, such as looking at how we use language and noticing when we should use other language for inclusivity. **Kaplan** brought up her dislike for the term "politically correct" and its overuse/abuse. However, she even found herself describing something as "black humor" and realized it was simply inappropriate. Her immediate awareness has helped her to refrain from its use again. She has to know more about herself and what might slip. Assigning videos was a useless homework exercise for a deaf student when no closed captioning was available with it. She can see when students shut down and has learned to be aware when that is happening and ask herself why they are not coming to talk with her. She has to learn personally how

to present herself because others will not have the same concerns. Her culture is different; her religion is different; her sexual orientation is different. As a middle-aged woman, brought up Jewish, and a lesbian, how does she decide to do this? As everyone's awareness increases, then they can agree that these things affect student evaluations. How does she deal with students baiting her in class or in their papers? Also, how does she protect students who are being challenged in class? Recently, she had students very upset with the newspaper interview with the KKK member. They came to class very angry and needing to discuss it. Another student in the class said, "I don't know what the problem is. My uncle is a member of the KKK, and it's just a club." She, as the instructor, needed to know how to deal with it. **DeFrancisco** added that it is about helping all faculty to know how to deal with those situations when they arise, and it is about building allies. Those who have gone through the training are very committed to student learning and especially to helping to improve the retention and diversity on this campus.

Arthur said that she did not want to give the false impression, however, that the NCBI training itself is about the classroom. It is not. It is about skill building in individual awareness, which is why they created the Diversity Fellows in order to expand that. Academics want to know how these issues impact them and their students and what they might need to examine and readjust. She, herself, has been through the training in one form or another 4 times because of her role, and each time she has learned something new. One is able to go deeper and deeper every time. It is a very powerful model.

Kaplan wanted everyone to know, also, that training is not therapy. It is about thinking and increasing your awareness, and when that is done, there are associated feelings. But they are not out to change anyone's politics--just helping all learn how to communicate better. It is learning how to handle disagreements of all kinds and levels--between Administration and faculty, among faculty, between faculty and students. They do push on the student issues, because UNI loses students when we do not see that this is happening. Students are hesitant to come to faculty, staff, or the Administration to talk about what hurts them.

DeFrancisco added that they in this new initiative have been involved with many of those present with diversity concerns for years here at UNI, and they have been through a lot of different training models. The more she participates in this one, the more she understands why it was chosen for the Midwest and for a predominantly White campus and for an educational setting. She feels the fit is a very good one. The core 20 trainees are not all faculty in Academic Affairs, but they are very committed and have gone through more than 50 hours of training in one semester, and it is all volunteer.

Chair **Wurtz** asked if participating in the training is the only way to really "get it," if anyone at this point feels they do not. And at the same time, if they feel they already "get it," then participating would give them new skills for dealing with issues as they arise. For those who are unsure whether they get it or not, this is a chance to find out. The guests all agreed with this summary and noted that it is a way to make some new friends, too.

Arthur also pointed out that this is a continuing project. They are kicking it off this semester, starting slowly. Last semester they organized the trainings and are building from there. If more trainers are needed at some point, then they will look for new groups to train. Some have suggested the new faculty orientation, hiring committees, search committees. It will include those considered for hiring. How open are they?

Wurtz stated that she felt the Senate now understands the Diversity Initiative and heard the suggestion of possibly training the Senate as a group. She asked for a specific proposal containing what these guests felt would be useful for the Senate as a body--hours, focus, what they would be doing. This would give them something to act upon beyond simply receiving the information presented today. Thanks were expressed all around. (End of Side A of Tape 1)

Moving on with the agenda, **Wurtz** asked Provost **Gibson** who had arrived if she had any comments. She said she had two: 1) President **Allen** wanted to know how the Senate wished to proceed with the lunches where senators would informally chat with him and her. Two were cancelled in the Fall. Two are scheduled in February but can be moved to March when he returns. Or they can be held in February with her alone. She would

prefer waiting until the President returns but will go along with what the Senate wishes. Several senators voiced that March sounded good to them. 2) She offered a point of information in that the search for an Associate Provost for International Programs has been reconvened. This will be an external search, and the search committee has added a few people because now it will involve a lot more work. This will be a tenurable faculty position, and she encouraged any present to offer names of possible applicants they may know. They very much want a successful search with a really qualified hire because International Affairs is very important to this campus. UNI needs great leadership in this area.

Soneson questioned Provost **Gibson** about the possible closing of the UNI Museum, a rumor he had heard today. She replied that the UNI Museum would NOT be closing, and that she would like to speak to that issue at a future date.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1063, Docket #961, LAC Capstone Category Review , 20 October 2011 (sic), for 2002-2010 (Chair: Professor **DeBerg**).

DeBerg spoke first and recognized the presence of Siobahn Morgan who was the LAC Coordinator for several years and who was deeply involved in this study. She also highlighted the presence at the meeting of Deedee **Heistad**, the new LAC Coordinator. **DeBerg** then chose to speak from the Executive Summary on page 3 of the report (which was projected for all senators to review). Regarding the data found, she noted that there are 2 Capstone models--1) The old Environment, Technology, and Society (ETS), the 2-credit option that is offered out of Natural Sciences; and 2) Several years ago a new model of the Capstone was set up which is a series of interdisciplinary topics courses offered across the University. The current Spring semester has 16 ETS sections and 19 sections of the newer model, so that gives a feel where the balance is, she noted. Findings included that the new thematic Capstone courses were viewed more favorably by both students and faculty than the ETS model. The new Capstone courses have a higher percentage of tenure/tenure-track instructors; they have smaller course size; and they have lower average gpa's as compared to ETS. Study Abroad offerings in both ETS and new Capstone courses have increased, particularly in the Summer, and the staffing of the new Capstone is now

distributed across the University to more Colleges and Departments than it used to be.

DeBerg continued by noting that the Committee highlighted several issues of concern that troubled them.

****Not enough Capstone faculty had their students participate in MAPP testing, one of the Liberal Arts Core Student Outcomes Assessment instruments.**

****Syllabi for Capstone courses tend to lack information concerning the course learning outcomes, the purpose of the course, and how it relates to Liberal Arts Education.**

****The percentage of tenure/tenure-track faculty teaching ETS sections has fallen precipitously. A year ago last Spring, only 29% of the ETS sections were taught by regular fulltime faculty.**

****There were no professional development opportunities for Capstone instructors, and there are no regular meetings for Capstone faculty being held.**

Consequently, the Liberal Arts Core Committee made the following 4 recommendations:

1) That the LAC Committee develop a required syllabus template for the use of Capstone instructors. The template will include an official description of Capstone experience and its learning goals, specific learning goals for the course, and a day in the schedule devoted to required Liberal Arts Core Student Outcomes Assessment. This template would not limit the content of the syllabus but would provide categories of information.

2) That failure to comply with the request for LAC student outcomes assessment may result in the removal of any Capstone course from the list of those approved.

3) That the Dean of the College of Natural Sciences increase the number of tenure/tenure-track faculty teaching ETS in order to reach the University's Strategic Plan goal of 75% of courses being taught by tenure/tenure-track faculty. And further that the Dean and/or Provost provide professional development opportunities, especially for instructors of ETS in order to address specific challenges of that course.

4) Lastly, that a Capstone Coordinating Committee be established in order to work with the Liberal Arts Committee Coordinator to manage the category.

DeBerg moved that this report be received and that the action recommended be taken. **Terlip** seconded. Senator **Funderburk** asked if the Dean of the College of Natural Sciences had been questioned as to the change of tenure/tenure-track faculty assignments in ETS sections and if there has been any response. **DeBerg** replied that a meeting has been scheduled in about 1 1/2 weeks with both the Dean and the Provost about this. **East** asked if the Committee has ideas about specific structure and task duties of the Capstone Coordinating Committee? **DeBerg** said that the three main ones should be to review syllabi, to collect data for student outcomes assessment every year, and to perhaps brainstorm with the Dean and Provost on faculty development opportunities. Regarding structure of the Committee, **DeBerg** said that this Spring the LAC Committee will work on recruiting a Coordinating Committee for each LAC Category, and each will consist of a group of the faculty who teach in the Category.

Senator **Soneson**, referring to the last page (33), noted that he was struck, but not surprised, by the disparity in class gpa between the non-tenure track ETS and the new tenure-track courses---2.9 for the new-type course and 3.55 for the non-tenure track ETS. He wondered how the Committee might address this disparity. **DeBerg** replied that professional development training, especially for the non-tenure track instructors for this course, could address things such as standards for the course. Senator **Smith** felt that the Category Coordinator might address the issue. Also, the Senate had passed a motion on grade transparency about a year ago, making sure that faculty would know the average grades of other sections by other faculty. That data provides a basis for peer management to make sure

there is more consistency of grading, he noted. With Coordinating Committees, perhaps they will be more active in making that happen. **DeBerg** agreed that the Coordinating Committees could gather that and disperse it every semester, saying that it is not being dispersed now.

Senator **Gallagher** asked if the Senate were proposing that lower gpa was unquestionably universally a good thing? What about a very good teacher with very high achieving students? **Soneson** agreed that that is a possibility but said that he is more concerned about consistency in grading. When one teacher is consistently way up there and another consistently way down there, then morale among faculty is an issue, and also it is confusing and affects morale among students. He feels that is a very serious problem and that consistency in the LAC courses is a very important thing. **Gallagher** agreed but also knows that some faculty can get students to work very hard and achieve great success, and that is a good thing. Then there are teachers who give away grades easily, and, conversely, there are those who see their role as giving low grades, and this shows it is a complicated issue.

Smith stated that the more common problem than outstanding teachers with outstanding students is grade inflation and more so than grade deflation. Assessment mechanisms are needed that can be applied across common sections of a course to actually get some objective measurement of how students are comparing. Until then, peer pressure showing reasonable expectations must be relied upon. **Gallagher** agreed but just wanted the senators to look at some details of the issue rather than solely the broad marker of gpa comparisons.

East wondered who will implement the recommendations? Will the Senate approve all recommendations and then nothing happen? Does the Senate need to assign some responsibility or at least have an implied understanding of who is responsible for this? Is it the Senate Chair? Is it the Capstone Coordinator or the LAC Committee? Who will ultimately move this forward? **DeBerg** replied that recommendations 1, 2, and 3, are the Liberal Arts Core Committee's recommendations for their own work. The one concerning the Dean of CNS increasing the number of tenure/tenure-track faculty brought about face-to-face meetings with the

Deans and the Provost to discuss the problems. Then the Deans and Provost will have to meet with the faculty who did the review. The Liberal Arts Core Committee has been the people facilitating these meetings with the review team and the Deans and Provost. That is the best thing they could think of to encourage upper administration to be responsive to the recommendations.

Wurtz asked for clarification. The Appendix to the Report is Capstone Management Guidelines approved by the Senate in 2008. Is the Senate being asked to amend the guidelines and incorporate these recommendations and approve a new policy? Or are they being asked to just endorse this as an operational plan? **DeBerg** replied that if those Guidelines are to be revised, then the LAC Committee would send out recommendation for revision. Therefore, **Wurtz** summarized that this Report then is advising the Senate of their operational plans. **DeBerg** agreed and explained that it is data collected about how the Capstone Category is going; it is highlighting things noticed, problems that they feel they see, and what they plan to do about them as a Committee. The recommendations are to the Committee itself. It is pledging an LAC Committee agenda to the Senate, noting the problems they see and their plans of action based on those recommendations.

Soneson, referencing the third recommendation, said he felt that it would be the most difficult one to accomplish and noted that it has to do with a lot of the courses in the LAC. The LAC, he feels, is not a fully-funded mandate so adjuncts are hired to teach many courses. **DeBerg** said the report comes in part to show that this is noticed, especially in ETS with only 29% tenure/tenure-track faculty teaching.

Senator **Funderburk** asked if anyone knows the reason why Math is so low in its inclusion of the MAPP testing? Is it faculty resistance, or maybe there is a lack of communicating clearly that they should be doing outcomes assessment? **Soneson** responded that in his recent experience teaching Capstone twice, he was never informed that he should administer the MAPP. **East** had similar experience, with the notification or request diminishing in recent years as compared to earlier. **Terlip** noted she has been contacted directly every semester about assessment but that in the

last 2 semesters it has been online only rather than having the classroom option. That has created some confusion, and a better system of notification needs to be used. **DeBerg** noted that there are a lot of problems across the LAC with assessment, and this is just one peek at it. **East** noted that part of the problem is that only seniors are to take the MAPP, and that creates disruption in classes of mixed levels.

Hotek asked if there were a significant number of Capstone sections offered during the Summer, and was the Summer data included in this report? The Summer data was included in much of the report but not in the gpa, which was annotated for Fall and Spring only. Dr. **Morgan** noted that the Summer gpa is a bit more artificial because there are almost no non-tenured faculty teaching in the Summer generally. So comparing tenured and non-tenured does not work well. Enrollment data is included. Also, summer Study Abroad Capstones tend to have a higher gpa than on-campus classes. The larger data sets in Fall and Spring were used.

Wurtz summarized that the motion is to receive the report and to endorse the recommendations that are the Capstone Committee's plan of action. **Bruess** asked **DeBerg** if the Committee had a chance to incorporate the information from the upcoming motion to be considered regarding Study Abroad courses from the Educational Policies Commission? The ETS courses, he stated, are being offered in increasingly high numbers as Study Abroad, and they are not Study Abroad courses. They just happen to be offered abroad. **DeBerg** replied that that information came after they had completed their report. Both agreed to delve into this issue when it comes up next on the agenda.

Soneson asked, if the ETS truly are less appreciated than the newer Capstone courses, has that disparity been addressed by the Committee? Does the Committee have any recommendations or has this been discussed? **DeBerg** again cited the call for faculty development around some of these issues. **Soneson** asked if they were thinking of promoting other new courses, and **DeBerg** responded that every semester a handful of new courses come in, so that number is always growing. At the same time, there is no reason to think that ETS is not a good course, if it is taught well. And it is a 2-credit option to the 3-credit other Capstone choices, which

suits some students quite well. An assertive Coordinating Committee and faculty development options, especially around ETS, can make a difference, and because ETS cannot be done without right now, that is what will be done. At the same time, **DeBerg** acknowledged that some current ETS sections are fabulous. **Soneson** offered the name of Lynn **Brandt** as one who has done workshops for the ETS course, and he could assist whoever is interested in organizing this. **DeBerg** appreciated having this name to pass along.

The Senate voted on the motion to receive this report and to endorse what they are doing. Passed, and major thanks were expressed to the Committee for their accomplishment.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1065, Docket #963 Motion to approve recommendations from the Educational Policy Commission regarding guidelines for study abroad courses (Commission Chair: Dr. Gayle Rhineberger-Dunn).

The report was projected for those present to review. Dr. **Rhineberger-Dunn** joined the senators at the table. Motion to receive and approve the report with recommendations from the Educational Policy Commission was made by Senator **Neuhaus** with 2nd by Senator **East**. **Rhineberger-Dunn** began by highlighting certain items from the report. She stated that the Educational Policy Commission was charged by the Senate to consider a letter that the LAC Committee sent to the Senate November of 2009. At the time the EPC was working on the Attendance Policy, next on the agenda, so it was Fall 2010 before they took a look at the Study Abroad issue. The LAC Committee's concern was addressing Study Abroad courses and the differences in credit hours applied and work load applied--the fact that some courses require pre-travel and post-travel work without credit while others do not. Some faculty meet weekly and have assignments for their students pre-travel abroad with no credit assigned to that, so students are not paying for that credit, and some of that time is apparently made up.

The biggest issues were the disparity in the time spent on in-class and out-of-class on Study Abroad. The particular sticky point is the Capstone Study Abroad courses. The LAC Committee gets caught up in trying to assess

what is appropriate and fair in the assigning of credit. So the LAC Committee asked for separate definitions and guidelines to be created for awarding academic credit for Study Abroad classes. The Registrar's Office has published and she has the document that outlines what instruction courses require. There are some 4 or 5 different types of classes--a lecture class versus a discussion-type class, say--that already exist in the Study Abroad Handbook.

The LAC Committee recommended that a set of pre-travel requirements be established for Study Abroad classes. The EPC considered whether or not they should establish those, and they determined that although they agree that the issue of awarding or not awarding credit for pre-travel requirements is unclear, inconsistent, and maybe unfair, that all of those courses, except perhaps the Capstone courses, go through a curriculum review process. They are Departmental courses and therefore go through some kind of a curriculum process. They felt they would be essentially circumventing faculty governance if they were to establish a variety of guidelines for pre- and post-travel, especially because they vary by where the class is going. Some require extensive pre-travel work. Some do not have any pre-travel work but do require the students to have post-travel work to decompress.

The LAC Committee raised the issue of acceptable instruction as it relates to time abroad and number of credit hours assigned to specific courses. Some courses are very short in duration but have a large number of credits attached and vice versa. The EPC is also very concerned with the large number of credit hours awarded for very short courses, but they believe the majority of the Study Abroad courses are located within specific departments, and they have gone through the curriculum review process.

The biggest issue seemed to be the Capstone courses. So the EPC is recommending that perhaps a subcommittee in the LAC should be created that considers these Capstone Abroad courses similar to the subcommittee that currently exists to review Non-Western courses. The new subcommittee would then relieve some of the burden of spending a great deal of time on assessing the appropriateness of the courses.

The EPC also recommends that the Study Abroad Center attach the Registrar's definition of types of instruction document to all new proposals. It is in the Study Abroad Handbook, but that handbook is very hard to find. She had to call over to the office to ask them where it is, and they, instead of pointing her to the web, faxed her the pages of the document that she needed. So there is a problem there in accessibility. The EPC had Yana Cornish come to visit and talk about the process for creating courses. There are guidelines. There is a book that exists. The EPC did not feel it was their place to go about setting these kinds of requirements. It does not seem to be in their purview.

Wurtz sought to clarify whether the new committee they recommended is an LAC Committee. **Rhineberger-Dunn** replied, yes, it would be a subcommittee of the LAC Committee.

Senator **Bruess** stated that one of the EPC's problems in their assignment was that they had 2 separate issues at play. One is something that faculty can actually control, and that through the self-governance procedure that is the Capstone process. Those courses that are offered Abroad--he teaches one of those classes--were specifically designed to be taught as Capstones abroad. The context is that the course needs to be offered in country, and it cannot be offered elsewhere because that is the nature of the course. For instance, his is experiential learning. They go from archeological site to museum to monastic community and so on. That cannot be done in Black Hawk County. So there are those kinds of courses which faculty have control over.

Bruess continued saying that the other issue at play, and the one that has gotten all muddled up because of what Study Abroad has deliberately told the EPC, is that they accept courses already on the books which a professor simply wants to teach abroad. It would be similar to his taking his History of Modern Russia and teaching it in the business building and calling it a business course. He feels this is the confusion that has arisen.

Bruess feels that the EPC can look at Capstone courses, new courses proposed, and so on, but that the EPC cannot handle what Study Abroad has been doing for the past 2 years, which is not providing any kind of gate-

keeping whatsoever--not setting down any criteria as to what exactly constitutes a Study Abroad course. He hopes that the new Associate Provost of International Programs will address this issue. Colleagues in other institutions cannot believe that UNI calls just any course offered in another country "Study Abroad."

Bruess acknowledged that the EPC has addressed the Capstone issue in their recommendations, and that's the one issue the faculty have control over. But the faculty has no control whatsoever over what Study Abroad does as far as non-Capstone-created courses. A faculty advisory committee is needed for that second issue. When asked, he agreed that his concerns did not necessarily mean that this motion could not pass, just that the issues were muddled in their terminology. The language needs to be cleaned up.

Wurtz noted the time and announced the likely need to table the last item on the agenda and a line-up to speak to the current issue prior to going into Executive Session for the final 5 minutes of today's meeting. **DeBerg** stated that she felt faculty has control over all courses offered, no matter what. That is faculty purview. She asked that who wouldn't set up regulations for Study Abroad if not the EPC making recommendations to the Senate. She failed to understand the EPC's understanding of their purview. She feels the Senate has jurisdiction to make any kinds of educational policy about the curriculum. Secondly, in terms of the recommendation regarding the way the LAC Committee operates, it is a false assumption that it was a work load and knowledge issue when in fact the issue is that there are no guidelines for respectable Study Abroad. And relying on the Departmental curricular process is one thing, but a lot of requests come in the form of experimental courses, and that is just an agreement between a faculty member and a department head. It gets no official curricular review except in the LAC. Many Capstone courses are requested in this way. The LAC Committee wants to establish a Coordinating Committee for Capstone, but that is not a subcommittee. It would be external to the LAC, and there is no LAC subcommittee in Non-Western. That is a Coordinating Committee for Non-Western that functions on its own external to the LAC. So there are problems with the assumptions in paragraph 5 on the 2nd page.

Rhineberger-Dunn responded that faculty jurisdiction was discussed quite a bit on the EPC. The Committee is very diverse. Some have taught Study Abroad. Others have no experience of it. It would be like asking the EPC to set policy for the LAC. As a group, the EPC does not have what it needs in order to make policy about Study Abroad courses. She feels it is different from asking them to make policy about attendance for the University or to generate the new grievance procedure, which would seem to be in their purview, but the University just revised that policy and the EPC was not asked to do that. So the Educational Policy Commission does not have the knowledge, the experience, or the institutional history to do so. They make policy, yes. But these are also curriculum issues, and the EPC's job is not to design curriculum.

East responded to Bruess by saying that he could imagine a scenario where his computing class learning in England was a Study Abroad course rather than just holding the class there. He encourages review of courses which might not seem to be Study Abroad courses but not to discount them without looking deeper. He also had a concern in this area due to an experience of his own a few years ago while he served on the LAC Committee where a 1-week trip abroad was offered as a Capstone course for 3 credits. He even questioned then how in 1 week a 3-credit course could be accomplished where they were abroad 5-6 days with a busy sight-seeing schedule. He was very happy to see these issues come up now, yet he is not very happy with the proposed resolution of it. Oversight is needed, and if the EPC does not want to provide it, then perhaps the International Programs Office needs to know that standards must exist for their courses to count for credit. **Rhineberger-Dunn** agreed that definite problems exist in the assignment of credit, but that particular body felt they could not make the decisions necessary to resolve the problems.

Soneson agreed with East stating that he cannot vote for this set of recommendations because he thinks a specific mechanism is needed to deal with Study Abroad courses and their academic credibility. He sees a couple of problems. One is the going abroad and counting that for academic credit that **East** mentioned. Another problem involves courses on the books where someone from one department will teach a course for another department and will expect full credit for the students. He said he

felt it was in the best interest of UNI to not accept this. (End of Side B of Tape 1)

Smith stated that he feels this is something that should be addressed by the Curriculum Committee. **Rhineberger-Dunn** agreed that the EPC saw this very much as curricular in its purview. And why not talk with International Programs? The EPC makes policy, but there are some policies they feel they should not be making. **Smith** noted that the Curriculum Committee is ultimately supposed to review proposals for these kinds of courses that come through should they have guidelines that they apply and use to create some consistency in those reviews. So it seems to him that rather than a subcommittee of the Senate, this should go to a curricular committee. They are currently looking at the standards for Certificate Programs. What counts as a Certificate and other issues? The Senate is waiting to hear back about that.

DeBerg stated that she feels it is unrealistic to think that any committee on campus wouldn't have to seek outside expertise on this. Did the EPC not talk with anyone, just among themselves? The Curriculum Committee is going to have to go to a group of faculty who have offered these courses. The EPC could have done the same. That is one of the jobs of a committee- to seek out outside expertise if they do not have it inside the committee. She stated that she does not care which committee works on these issues, but the University really needs guidelines on the Study Abroad courses, and it should happen either in the EPC or the Curriculum Committee.

Bruess reiterated that the current system works for Capstone Study Abroad, but it does not work for the 75% of the courses that are not controlled. There has to be faculty oversight over in Study Abroad. There are some 7 ETS courses offered next Summer, and only 1 of them has even tried to make it at all relative to their place of study.

DeBerg stated that this proposal does not work for Capstone either, because the problems they have on the LAC Committee is with experimental Capstones which have not gone through the curricular process. The LAC Committee can establish their own internal guidelines for

Study Abroad courses. Perhaps they will have to for this year. She stated that she is willing to have at it.

Wurtz summarized that the motion in front of the Senate is to accept and endorse the recommendations. Because discussion seemed to lead to a voting of the motion down, she wanted **Rhineberger-Dunn** to know that this was not a criticism of the work performed so far. It is that they have discovered that it is more complicated than they had thought. **Soneson** added that the Senate thanks the EPC for their work thus far. Vote called. Motion denied with 1 abstention, **East** feeling the report could have been accepted with the recommendations not approved. However, there was no time left for another motion to accomplish that.

The final item on the agenda was tabled until the next meeting. Two new items were docketed in regular order. This issue will continue to be built upon the foundation that has been provided today by the EPC.

Breuss made the motion to go into Executive Session. Second by **Lowell**. Motion passed. All were dismissed except senators present. Following the Executive Session, the business for the day being accomplished, the chair declared the meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss,
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate