

Regular Meeting #1765  
**UNI Faculty Senate Summary Minutes**  
March 23, 2015  
Oak Room, Maucker Union  
3:30-4:59 p.m.

Call to Order at 3:30

**Courtesy Announcements**

1. **Press Identification:** Alex Kehrli, *Northern Iowan*

2. **Comments from Interim Provost Licari**

Provost **Licari** sent his sympathies to colleague Lynn **Dykstra** on the recent death of her son. He reported that consultants from Pappas Consulting are scheduled on campus Thursday, April 9, although the agenda has not yet been set. He added that recent publicity from the University of Iowa on “A Degree in Three” is really nothing new. Citing research by April Chatham-Carpenter, over 300 UNI students have graduated in three years in the last seven graduations.

3. **Comments from Faculty Chair Peters** (not present)

4. Senate Chair **Kidd** said reports are forthcoming from the Budget Committee and the Curriculum Sustainability Committee for the final Senate meetings.

**Minutes for Approval:** March 9, 2015

Nelson/McNeal All aye

**Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing**

**1276** Receipt of Athletics Report

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/agendas/far2013-14annualreportfinal.pdf>

\*\* Docketed in regular order (**Dolgener/Zeitz**). All aye.

**1277** Receipt of Senate Budget Committee Report

\*\* Docketed for April 27, last meeting of year (**Dolgener/Walter**) All aye.

**1278** Receipt of Curriculum Sustainability Recommendations

\*\* Docketed for April 27, last meeting of year (**McNeal/Nelson**)

**New Business** None

## **Consideration of Docketed Items**

**1258/1153** Revisions to Policy 10.08 University of Northern Iowa Policy on Distributed Learning and Intellectual Property Rights

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/revisions-policy-1008-university-northern-iowa-policy-dist>

\*\*Motion to refer document on to EPC (Educational Policy Committee) for further discussion and report back to Senate. (**Swan/Strauss**) All aye.

**1266/1161** UNI Copyright Policy

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/uni-copyright-policy>

\*\*Motion to refer document on to EPC (Educational Policy Committee) for further discussion and report back to Senate. (**Swan/Strauss**) All aye.

**1269/1164** Proposed Changes to Transfer Credit

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/proposed-changes-policy-transfer-credit>

\*\* Motion to have Chair Kidd discuss the concerns brought forward with Francis Degnin of the EPC, with a reminder that the EPC could create a diverse ad hoc committee to research the issue of GPA calculation and use, and to report back to the Faculty Senate. (**Dunn/Strauss**) All aye.

**1270/1165** Changes to Scheduling of Classes

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/changes-scheduling-classes>

No action taken; Chair Kidd and Registrar's Office will continue discussion with College Senates.

**Adjournment:** 4:59 (**McNeal/Zeitz**) All aye.

**Next meeting:**

3:30 p.m. Monday, April 13

Oak Room, Maucker Union

*Follows is a verbatim transcript of **45 pages** and **0 addenda**.*

**Regular Meeting UNI Faculty Senate #1765**

Full Transcript

March 23, 2015

Oak Room, Maucker Union

**Present:** Senators Karen Couch **Breitbach**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Cyndi **Dunn**, Todd **Evans**, Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Randall **Harlow**, Chair Tim **Kidd**, Ramona **McNeal**, Vice Chair Lauren **Nelson**, Steve **O’Kane**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Gary **Shontz**, Gerald **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Jesse **Swan**, Michael **Walter**, Leigh **Zeitz**. Associate Provost Mike **Licari**, Interim Associate Provost April **Chatham-Carpenter**.

**Not Present:** Senators Jennifer Cooley, Barbara Cutter, Melissa Heston and Secretary Laura **Terlip**, Chair of Faculty Scott Peters, Associate Provost Nancy **Cobb**.

**Guests:** Renae **Beard**, Katherine **Cota-Uyar**, Philip **Patton**, Marissa **Timmerman**, Paul **Torre**.

**Kidd:** I’d like to call the meeting to order. It’s not our last meeting yet. Any press in the room?

**Kehrli:** Alex Kehrli, from the Northern Iowan.

**Kidd:** Alex **Kehrli**, thank you. I think that’s it. Any comments from Mike (**Licari**)?

**Licari:** Sure. Welcome back. Hopefully you had a good spring break. We’ve got a meeting that’s in the process of being scheduled sometime in April, April 7, the consultants from Pappas Consulting who will be doing the academic component of the TIER review will be on campus. April (**Chatham-Carpenter**) is the campus lead for the...

**Chatham-Carpenter:** It’s April 9.

**Licari:** Sorry, It’s April 9. Tuesday, April 9.

**Chatham-Carpenter:** Thursday.

**Licari:** You said Tuesday.

**Chatham-Carpenter:** It was originally Tuesday. It's a moving target.

**Licari:** Sorry. My mistake. It really is. We're not really clear how long the meeting is going to be or even what they're interested in talking to us about and so that will also drive a lot of the interest, the invitations and stuff like that. That's just a head's up. Right before spring break we had a Board of Regents meeting as well. We didn't have very many things on the agenda. You may have heard some bits of information about the University of Iowa's...what they're calling a "Degree in Three" that they supposedly have these three-year degrees now. Really all it is--is just they're regular degrees done in three years instead of four years with 18 credit hours a semester and summer school and things like that. So April (**Chatham-Carpenter**) reviewed our graduation and we've had more than 300 students graduate in three years, over the last seven graduation cohorts, so what the University of Iowa was promoting a week and half ago is just frankly no big deal. There was some press interest in all of that, and so if they call, you can say that there is plenty of UNI students who are doing that as well. Last, I just want to send my sympathies to our colleague Lynn (**Dykstra**) on the loss of her son.

**Kidd:** Thank you. Scott's not here and Lynn's (**Dykstra**) is not here.

**Chatham-Carpenter:** Her son was a management major, I think.

**Licari:** A senior management major here at UNI and he passed away while on spring break just this past Friday.

**Kidd:** Besides that, Scott's (**Peters**) not here. He's taking care of a sick child. As far as for me, I guess we're working through things with various budget

committees and curriculum sustainability committee will have information from those committees to you before the end of the semester. That's all the comments from me. I guess we can start off with approving the minutes of March 9. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes?

**Nelson:** So moved.

**Kidd:** Second by Senator **McNeal**. All in favor? Opposed? Abstain? The motion passes. The minutes are approved. We have a couple of things for docketing. One is the Receipt of the Athletics Report, so I've already got that up on the Senate website. It's a report generated by Lisa **Jepsen** each year. I guess if you want to have a consultation with the department, we could schedule one. I'll leave that up to you. If you don't, we don't have to, we can just receive the report. But we did receive it, so can I have a motion to receive the athletics report?

**Dolgener:** So moved.

**Zeitz:** Second.

**Kidd:** All in favor? That will be docketed. The other two things are the Receipt of the Senate Budget Committee Report. A motion to docket that in regular order-- or last meeting—sorry?

**Swan:** I have a question about that. I was trying to find that in our documents online and I was just having difficulty finding that.

**Kidd:** That's because we don't have it prepared yet.

**Swan:** Oh. So you want us to docket something that we haven't reviewed. Is that right?

**Kidd:** We had scheduled to receive the Senate Budget committee on the last meeting of the Senate. If you'd like, we can put that off. That's fine. We

haven't finished the report yet because we haven't received all the information yet.

**Swan:** Is that the same thing with the next item?

**Kidd:** Absolutely. Yes.

**Swan:** Thanks.

**Kidd:** It basically just puts a placeholder in the schedule, but if you don't want to do that, that's fine. It will be for the last meeting.

**Zeitz:** So then we'll on the last meeting? We will receive copies of this beforehand so we could read it?

**Kidd:** Yes. That's what would happen. Absolutely. We intend to have this to you before the next meeting.

**Nelson:** We have a motion to docket on the floor, so we need a secon.

**Kidd:** Moved by Senator **Dolgener**, second by Senator **Walters**. All in favor? Any opposed? Abstain? Okay, the motion passes, docketed for the last meeting of the Senate this semester. The same goes for the receipt of the Curriculum Sustainability Recommendations. This is just to get a list of metrics that's what the committee had e been assigned to do. Could I have a motion to docket this for the last meeting of the Senate? So moved by Senator **McNeal**.

**Nelson:** Second.

**Kidd:** Second by Vice-Chair **Nelson**. All in favor? Any opposed? Okay, so that will be docketed for the last meeting of the Senate also. I apologize as I do have a fever so just correct me if I'm more wrong than usual. So I think we should jump right in to the copyright issue. We have two things on the docket that Catherine (**Cota-Uyar**) will be helping us out with. One is Policy 10.08, on online courses and distributed learning, and then UNI Copyright policy. You

should have the documents before you; these are the same ones that I sent out. Katherine, (**Cota-Uyar**) would you like to introduce the topic?

**Cota-Uyar:** Sure. I'm you're Intellectual Property Officer. I'm here on behalf of Lynn **Dykstra** today as she is having a personal situation. My colleague, Paul **Torre**, who is also a member of the Intellectual Property Committee, is here. We're going to be addressing 10.08 for you and the Copyright policy. I thought it prudent to give you a very condensed and very short history of what has happened and why both of these issues have come up and why they're being combined together. Four years ago, the Intellectual Property Committee realized that the Copyright Policy, which is part of the Intellectual Property Policy, was woefully insufficient in that it was one paragraph long, and did not address things such as staff-creators or numerous other situations with regard to copyrights around the University, and did not address appropriately the policy with regard to faculty-creators, and so we decided four years ago that we should develop a full copyright policy. In the process of working on the full copyright policy, which you do have a copy of in front of you as it currently stands—in the process of doing that, we realized that it also tied to 10.08, the Distributed Learning Property (Policy) in conversations with the folks that administer distributed learning, and so it-- we then had to look at 10.08 and Kent Johnson and make revisions to 10.08 that would also pair with the revisions that we were making in to the copyright policy, so that the two policies said the same thing, which is why both policies are coming to you today. The biggest issue that was encountered from the last time that these policies came to this meeting was the concept of substantial use. This is something that we have dealt with for four years, and struggled with for four

years, and tried to figure out for four years what the definition of substantial use should be, and it seemed almost easier to define what it was not, as opposed to what it is, but that's never a good way to define something. So, we have taken in both 10.08 and the Intellectual Property Policy that you have in front of you, a stab at the definition of defining substantial use. That is the major change that is here in front of you today, would be what substantial use is, and if this comes per your request that we address this, if this comes then as an acceptable change to both 10.08 and the Copyright Policy, and addresses your concerns and issues. The two places in the Copyright Policy, that's the stapled document, should be consistent between the two places that those are listed, and you will find them both in red. And then in 10.08, that's just a single page, front-and-back copy, there is now a whole section under the definitions at the back that is in fact defining what substantial use is and is not.

**O'Kane:** I just have a question about 10.08. Top of the second page, right at the end of the second one: the word 'all' shouldn't that be 'any'-- any materials, because otherwise it could be misconstrued that you could use some but not all?

**Cota-Uyar:** That's an acceptable catch. Thank you very much. We've noted that.

**Kidd:** Any other comments or questions? I did have a question to relay from Scott **Peters**. He was confused about why the University would retain ownership in the case of—you know, when faculty go through the Quality Matters training, they sign a contract that the University would own that course. When there are lots of other means by which faculty could be developing online courses and are paid by the University, for example, when



they develop a new course, or PDA assignment, or things like this, so why is this a different case than other events where the University would pay someone to develop a course?

**Cota-Uyar:** The distributive learning situation, specifically?

**Kidd:** Specifically there, yes.

**Cota-Uyar:** And forgive me; I'm much less versed in 10.08. So I apologize, I have not been part of Lynn's (**Dykstra**) and Kent's (**Johnson**) ongoing conversations for the past three years. The Distributed Learning Policy was developed in 2001, before most of this technology that we currently have existed, and so the thought of updating 10.08 is to bring it as close as we can to current policy –sorry, as current technology--which is the reason for making the change. With regard to...they were then, I think there's a section here where it addresses being paid to develop a course and so clarify for me Tim again...?

**Tim:** Again, this is from Scott (**Peters**). So basically, traditionally, for normal courses that people have had course release or could develop a course as part of a professional development assignment, and so for those courses, the University would not have ownership of the course after the faculty has developed it. Why is this be case, for online courses, should it be different?

**Cota-Uyar:** I have no answer for that.

**Kidd:** That's quite all right.

**Zeitz:** Isn't it just considered work-for-hire? In reality, when you write books, you can either write it for a royalty or for hire. I've done both. If I write a book that's work-for-hire, they're going to pay me 'X' number of dollars and then they get the book. I get to show it off and that sort of thing, but I'm not going

to see any more money out of it. If I've got something in royalty, then that's something else. Now in this situation, as an online teacher, I have the right to put together my class and do all that sort of thing and then when I'm done, it's just there. What happens to it, I won't get into it right now. I also have the option of Continuing Ed. paying me a \$1000 a credit to actually put that online. They'll also provide me with help. If I don't know much about putting things online, they have a specialist there, who I can actually just give them –I don't, but I can actually just give them my Word documents and things like that and my videos and stuff and they'll put it all up online for me. If something goes wrong, they'll fix it for me. I mean in that case, I think what we have is a work-for-hire situation, and they own it. And in all reality, if I am inspired by what I did and I want to do it someplace else, you know the old joke about "How many professors does it take to screw in a light bulb? Only one, but he'll get three papers out of it." Well, it's the same thing. You have the background for it. There's nothing here that says you can't create something else. You may not be able to use the same stuff that you use someplace else. There's nothing that says you can't create something else that's the same sort of inspiration. So I think that as far as commission-course development, that makes a lot of sense.

**Kidd:** Yes. If you take a look at what's under B, it doesn't say that you lose the ownership of the copyright, only that the University can also use the materials.

**Zeitz:** Right.

**Kidd:** And from discussions, it wasn't clear if it was work-for-hire. Its more an issue of 'does the Senate or the Faculty' have an issue with this?

**Zeitz:** Right.

**Nelson:** Just to follow up. Scott **Peters** also indicated that in discussions he'd had with faculty, that some people did not want to go through the process-- the Quality Matters process, or offer an online course, because they didn't want the University to retain the copyright and be able to offer the course after they left. So the question he had is that limiting the University's online offerings because some people don't want to give up the copyright? And so I think that's an open question. I don't know how many people are making that decision not to participate because of concerns about copyright issues.

**Dunn:** If I'm understanding this correctly, a faculty member who wanted to retain all of the rights to his or her course could choose to decline the \$1000 for creating or moving it to online (course) so that would sort of be your option: If you want \$1000 you are also giving the University the rights. If you say, 'Hey, this is my course. I don't want them using that 15-minute lecture that I recorded,' then you would say, "No, thank you," to the \$1000 stipend. My understanding is that this is the current situation. Now I do believe that one of the things that we've said with the BAS degree is that all of those online courses MUST use the Quality Matters rubric. But, presumably they could use the Quality Matters rubric and waive the \$3000 and still retain their own rights to the course.

**Kidd:** Yes. I've gone through that training, and so they have a Quality Matters Training, they'll pay you \$1000 to undertake. But that does not imply anything about University ownership at all, or exclusivity. After that it's \$1000 per credit, and if you take then they would have, I guess, joint right to the course material. It's a matter of faculty choice. They could still take the training without giving up their exclusive rights.

**Zeitz:** I have a question on Policy Statement II B, 1c, which is underneath Commissioned Course Development. It says, “An online course that is commercialized, (I’m assuming that means sold) relying substantially on University resources, shall be subject to a negotiated contract prior to commercialization.” It doesn’t say whom the contract is between. Is that between the University and the faculty member?

**Cota-Uyar:** I’m sorry—side conversation.

**Zeitz:** Right down here on ‘c’. (Refers to Policy 10.08, IIB, 1c.) By the way, Tim, this is the one I rewrote.

**Kidd:** Gotcha. That was given to the committee.

**Zeitz:** On ‘c’ it says, “An online course that is commercialized, relying substantially on University resources shall be subject to a negotiated contract (and possibly licensing).” Is that contract between the faculty member and University?

**Torre:** I think that’s implied.

**Zeitz:** Could you please include that there so we know specifically that? I mean it could be a contract between a commercial entity and the University.

**Cota-Uyar:** Okay.

**Zeitz:** That way we’d know that as a professor—you like my stuff, you paid for my stuff, and now we want to sell it to somebody, and we’ll give you your piece of the pie.

**Cota-Uyar:** Thank you.

**O’Kane:** I have a question about the Copyright Policy. It would be on the third page at the bottom: Joint Ownership of Copyrights, “The creative work will be classified as joint ownership between the creator or author and the

University:” I assume the colon means ‘given.’ “In cases when university administrators, faculty, et cetera et cetera...choose to create copyrightable works.” My first question is how-- I don’t see how that differs from individual ownership, because you’re purposefully creating something that will be copyrighted. My real questions comes with after that, the little ‘i.’ (Refers to Copyright Policy IV C, 1a, i) I’m not sure what all of that means. “When the works are in the course of educational pursuits or outside of assigned duties,” that sounds like every moment of your life. I’m not sure what it means.

**Cota-Uyar:** So that particular part comes from procedural listing. We’ve got Professional & Scientific members, we’ve got Merit employees we’ve got doctoral students and other students who have jobs. Your ‘a’ part is to be parallel with the individuals and we have a preface there that’s the small ‘i’s. That’s why that ‘a’ part is there. Then with regard to the first small “i” “When the works are in the course of education pursuits,” that would be for the students. We’re not claiming the copyrights of students that are doing something as part of a class, or part of an independent study or something along those lines. “Or outside of assigned duties,” that would be for example, we’ve got a student working for us, and we’ve assigned, or some merit person working for us and we’ve assigned that merit person to write something for the job.

**O’Kane:** Okay. Can that be clarified? It doesn’t say exactly what you just said, I don’t think. The way it’s worded, I’m having trouble separating little ‘a, number 1” from “individual copyright.”

**Cota-Uyar:** The rest of this, also, and I’m looking at the ‘for example’ part here. For example, when a Professional & Scientific might write a paper and present

it at a conference or something like that, then they are again...It is a work that they're creating outside of their assigned duties, they're choosing to do that.

**O'Kane:** Okay, so if I write a paper and present it at a conference, which is something we probably all do, you're saying that the University owns the joint copyright?

**Cota-Uyar:** Right now, the reason part of this came about is as a P&S, when I create a work, if I write or create a workshop or create teaching materials that I have created, technically under the current policy, I don't own any of that, even though it's my creative expression that has gone into this, and so that is in part why we have tried to clarify that P&S people are creatives also; Merit people are creatives also, and should have the right at least to jointly own some of what they're doing through the University.

**O'Kane:** I couldn't agree more. But it does say "faculty" under 'a'. I can't see what I'm missing. If I write a paper, this says the University owns half of it.

**Dunn:** I have a possible clarification, if I may. I think that part of the answer is actually in the second part of 'i': "to share best practices which may add to the body of knowledge for themselves, their departments or divisions, and the University;" (refers to Copyright Policy IV C, 1a. i). To me, that's very different than if I write about a linguistic anthropology of Japanese honorifics. That wouldn't be covered by this. On the other hand, if I'm presenting a paper that has to do with say, a new teaching technique, or the best way that we should follow some federal law, that might potentially be covered by this "best practices" stuff.

**O'Kane:** I noticed there the 'and/or.'

**Dunn:** Or something that might be of commercial value, which again...

**O’Kane:** Given that’s and/or...I still think it says that if I write a paper and present it at a conference, that the University owns half of it.

**Kidd:** I would have to agree with Steve (**O’Kane**) because it says, “add to the body of knowledge for themselves.” That would be a scientific paper in your own field.

**O’Kane:** Anyhow, I’m questioning how this differs from individual copyright.

**Zeitz:** Does this mean that if I write a book, that half the copyright belongs to the University? And if I write it during the summer when I’m not employed?

**Cota-Uyar:** That was not the intent.

**Zeitz:** I’m just asking. Where would my writing a book when I’m not employed or in off-hours? Where would that fit in to copyright? And I know you’re standing in, so I don’t mean to put you on the spot. Sorry.

**Cota-Uyar:** Wow. I really wish I had really gone through this with a fine-toothed comb, is all I have to say, and not try to prepare in 20 minutes before coming over here.

**O’Kane:** I don’t know that we need an answer to this.

**Kidd:** Right. We don’t need an answer.

**Zeitz:** But if you put a note down on that, I’d like to see something specifically like this laid out, where it says, “If a faculty member writes a commercial product, that it is outside of their work hours or whatever (because we work 24/7)...”

**Licari:** Outside of their normally assigned duties.

**Zeitz:** Exactly.

**Licari:** I'm putting the finishing touches on a book right now. That's well outside my normally understood duties as the Interim Provost, I suppose. So who owns that?

**Zeitz:** Of course we run into the issue that the only way I'm going to move up in my position is through publishing...

**Licari:** Correct.

**Zeitz:** So does that mean that if I publish something commercially, that half of it belongs to the University?

**Licari:** These are questions we need to have answered.

**Swan:** This discussion that we've been having really should go on in committee. Faculty Chair **Peters** made something of that point, that instead of trying to handle it in the Senate as if we were a committee that's researched all the possibilities and looked into everything, we would send it to a committee, such as the EPC (Educational Policy Committee), to do this work, on behalf of the faculty, with a view to the faculty. There are other interests on campus, but we are primarily concerned with the faculty perspective. I recommend that we send this to the EPC to work this out.

**Cota-Uyar:** Senator **Zeitz**, your answer is actually under A 1, under Section IV. I believe that is where we had tried to address that faculty normally write creative works, at least in my quick skimming of it.

**Zeitz:** Claim ownership of copyright...?

**Licari:** "The University claims no ownership of copyright in any work created outside the scope of any employment," in the summertime, when you're not being paid.



**Cota-Uyar:** IV A 1, and IV A 2 are addressing those particular issues of individual development.

**Dunn:** Yes. It seems like what IV A 1 says, “Except as specified in 4B and C,” and what seems to be going on here is that IV A 1 basically contradicts IV C.

**Licari:** Right.

**Dunn:** It’s presumably IV C, 1 A is meant to cover something specific that is not being well articulated.

**Kidd:** Any other questions or comments? I think Senator **Swan** has a good proposal. We could send this on to the EPC with our own comments, as raised here. They would do a more thorough job than we can here. In fact, I’ve already forwarded documents on to Francis (**Degnin**) in anticipation that this might eventually occur. Was there anything else that anyone would like to bring up for consideration? Alright, so if anyone has a motion to ...Senator **Swan**, did you have a motion to ...

**Swan:** I’m getting caught up that it’s on the docket. We can send this to the EPC and have a report back from them that we would calendar and receive such report from them. Yes, that’s what I move and what he (**Strauss**) seconds.

**Kidd:** So we’ll have the EPC look at this and get back with their recommendations. All in favor? Opposed? Abstain? Alright, motion passes. Thank you for coming.

**Cota-Uyar:** Could you clarify for me now with whom Lynn (**Dykstra**) now needs to speak?

**Kidd:** It’s totally fine. Francis **Degnin**, and I’ll email her as well. Okay?

**Cota-Uyar:** Thank you.

**Kidd:** They already have the documents, because I kind of thought this might be occurring, so, they'll look over these things and if any senators have comments that they would like to send me along with documents, please do so, and I'll forward this on to Francis and committee. I think as a committee they can do a better job than the Senate in refining this. Thank you very much for coming.

**Cota-Uyar:** Thank you.

**Kidd:** So the next item up on the agenda are Proposed Changes to Transfer Credit, and you can blame me for this one. Just to give background, so when students come to UNI and they take courses at the community college, they receive both a grade and credit. That grade is part of their cumulative GPA. In my experience working with students, I have found that sometimes this does not have a good effect. For example, I've had many students who have come to UNI with extremely poor records at community college. They've worked for a few years and then they come here and do fine, but their GPA is terrible. That's because of classes they failed at community college or Iowa or Iowa State. I've found that to be unfair, to burden them with this GPA. The other aspect of this that I find troubling was that some students take a lot of (courses for) credit in high school and they do so (college credit) and they might receive very high marks. When they come to GPA, they might not so I've seen students who are receiving University scholarships who are not getting a 3.0 GPA at UNI, but they continue to maintain those scholarships, Presidential scholarships, based on the GPA they earned in high school from community college credit. I didn't think that was fair, either. The third aspect which troubles me about receiving grade instead of just credit when you transfer

courses to UNI is that the faculty at UNI are supposed to be responsible for the quality of the course that we offer, and we have no control over the quality of the course at other institutions be they Harvard or Hawkeye. Whatever, we have no control. So in my mind it seemed inappropriate to accept the grades from other institutions, as we have no knowledge of them and instead we should accept these courses on a credit basis or no-credit basis, and thus they would have no impact on the overall student's GPA. I'm not sure this is a Board of Regents issue or if it's University policy that should be changed at our level. That's just my thoughts.

**O'Kane:** Do we know what other schools do?

**Kidd:** Depends on which school.

**O'Kane:** They'd be different.

**Kidd:** They'd be different.

**Patton:** I could give you a little bit of history if you want.

**Kidd:** Sure.

**Patton:** Our sister institutions do the same thing we do. I'm Phil **Patton**, the University Registrar, for those of you who don't happen to know me.

**Kidd:** We do have a nametag for you.

**Patton:** Thank you for this opportunity. In looking over the information, I think part of what your major concern is, is the impact of the transfer work GPA on the total GPA. Please remember we keep three GPAs for all students: The Transfer-only GPA, the UNI-only GPA, and a Combined Total GPA. I believe that some of the concerns you have could be solved by simply changing your internal policies or procedures to not using the cumulative GPA, but using the UNI-only GPA. So if it's a scholarship issue, as an example, graduation with

honors at UNI is based only on UNI work, and that's what I would advocate if you have issues with scholarships or some other things. There was another issue that was brought up about poor grades in the past being carried forward in the future. Well, part of that depends on two things: One, if you believe an academic transcript is actually a history of all academic work achieved, or not. I'm a very old registrar and I was raised that an academic transcript is a complete and accurate history of everything attempted. But, there are policies called Academic Renewal Policies. UNI does not have one. Our two sister institutions do. That does not relate to transfer work, but it does relate to internal work, where work in the past can be removed. The grades can be removed and not calculated in the GPA. So, what I'm trying to point out: There's several different tentacles or issues or concepts that are statewide agreements on grading and grading practices, that you would have to open up and deal with. So, if you're really interested in this as a concept, I would kind of advocate what Jesse (**Swan**) did with the last item, and that is probably take it to EPC to do the discovery, do the history, do the investigation, because it is a rather complicated issue. With that, I'll answer any questions you might have.

**Kidd:** Questions or comments?

**Dunn:** Just to clarify what you said about the three different GPAs, do all of those then appear on the student's official transcript?

**Patton:** They do, both as a semester and as a total graduate.

**Nelson:** I think my general reaction to the proposal goes along with your suggestion that we have it further studied by an appropriate body, because I just felt that the proposal didn't have sufficient information to do any action

on it at this point, so I would certainly suggest that as a good procedure, to refer it to the appropriate committee and have much further- even perhaps taking it to College Senates and things like that, to get much further input on it.

**Kidd:** Sure.

**Hakes:** Are you familiar with how Iowa and Iowa State do it? Do they do it similarly as far as their Academic Restart within their own institutions?

**Patton:** Within their own institutions? Generally, the work has to be five years in the past. Their policies do not have to have a specific cause or reason, just that the student wishes that to be no longer calculated. It's a one-time shot.

**Hakes:** Do they also lose the credits? If they had a number of 'D's', and were gaining credit, is that wiped out?

**Patton:** That is correct.

**Hakes:** You lose the grade, but you also lose the credit.

**Patton:** The credit is gone.

**Hakes:** And both of their systems are similar?

**Patton:** They both have forgiveness policies. They're different, but they do have forgiveness policies, and that has come here at UNI in the past. It hasn't come up in quite a few years. It's certainly something that can be revisited now.

**Hakes:** Especially if we have more non-traditional students, with credit that would accrue over longer periods of time.

**Dunn:** I move that we ask the Educational Policies Committee to look into the whole thing of how we calculate our GPA and whether we want to make any changes to that.

**Strauss:** Second.

**Dunn:** And will give them this to start with and how we felt.

**Patton:** I'm an ex officio on EPC, so...

**Swan:** I'm discussing the motion on the floor. Registrar **Patton**, you feel that the EPC would be—or do you not have an opinion—about which committee it goes to? Do you feel that EPC is the appropriate committee? That's what I thought I heard you say. That's why I'm asking it right now, and the reason I'm asking is because I'm not sure that we want to send it to the EPC because I'm not sure of the faculty interest in this. The EPC has a lot of very important work in front of it and is always on call. This seems like something that might be special, that an ad hoc committee to look into it, especially composed of people interested in this, knowledgeable in this area, who could work with the Registrar ably, would be better than tasking the standing EPC with this. I am worried about sending it to the EPC, unless for some reason Registrar **Patton** feels that the composition of that committee is appropriate.

**Patton:** If I could respond? I mentioned the EPC because it is historically the working committee, so I used that. If you wish to establish a special committee, task force or whatever, the only recommendation, the only request I would ask is that you do have appointed student members in this special committee.

**Swan:** Very good. We have committees, standing committees, who do a lot of work, and it's onerous work, and we've discussed difficulties we've had in getting people to volunteer for these committees, and this could be another one of the reasons, is that they're given extraordinary work, on top of their

already major work, when perhaps the Faculty Senate would be better to establish an ad hoc committee for special cases such as this.

**Nelson:** I support your idea in spirit, but I do see value in selecting a standing committee, like EPC in the sense that it has membership elected and it doesn't have a vested interest in the proposal either way, and it would be nice to have a more neutral vetting of it.

**Patton:** If I may also add, whatever you decide is fine, but to your point, EPC tends to be people who have been on the committee for a few years. They have some consistency, have also reviewed other academic policy as this may relate to it as well. There's some knowledge base there that might be beneficial.

**Walter:** It might make the whole task go easier if we're more specific about exactly what we're asking them to do. What is the problem here that we're trying to solve? And how will they know when they have sufficient enlightenment for us to ask for a report? Something a little more specific in terms of a question.

**Kidd:** Sure.

**Swan:** I very much like and endorse that recommendation. If we send this to EPC we might remind them that they can solicit other members; they can form a subcommittee from other members across campus. I think it's good for us to remind ourselves of possibilities at hand. I wanted to say that in the minutes, please: Remind the EPC of those possibilities.

**Kidd:** Absolutely.

**Dunn:** Since I put forward the motion, what I'm thinking here is that actually, I think Tim (**Kidd**) did a nice job in sort of laying out the issue. What I would be

thinking is they would look at the question of ‘How do we calculate GPA, given these sorts of problems?’ others they may think about. Do they recommend any changes? And, they might recommend changes they might, as Phil (**Patton**) said, well the scholarships should all look at their criteria and be clear. I was on the scholarship committee, and they have to have a GPA of 3.0, but which GPA? We’ve never really written that down anywhere. Or, they might look at it and think about it and look at other schools and say, “We don’t recommend any changes.” I’d sort of like to leave it open to the committee to say, “These are some issues that we found.” And I guess I respectfully disagree and I’m comfortable leaving it fairly open to what they want to do with it.

**Kidd:** Sure.

**Swan:** So in what we have before us is a recommendation that would change practice incredibly and affect many students. It’s not at all clear to me why we would want to do that. Giving it to colleagues that don’t even have the little background that we have with it could be frustrating for them, it seems to me, and I don’t know why we couldn’t tell them what it is we think we want, and I think we should want something more specific than, “What do you think about these general perceived problems?” So I’d ask Senate Chair **Kidd** to maybe try to hone specific issues. I believe it was your issue, right? What is that you want? What problem is it that you want to solve? Because if I read this, it seems like a solution to a problem and I’m in search of the problem.

**Kidd:** My problem, again, this is just speaking as a faculty working with students is that student’s GPA is ... How students view their GPA is not so refined. They have a GPA, and the GPA they use generally, is their overall GPA which combines UNI and transfer classes. And they do not have a choice as to



which classes transfer; they're all transferred in with a grade. So the problem that I see is when students are coming from a different institution...I see two problems: One is inflated grades, and one is poor performance in the past which although should be considered upon admission, I'm not so sure it should define their GPA for the rest of their lives. I came from a school where they did not have...if you transferred in a class at the university, you got credit or no credit and that was it. You did not get an "A" or a "B". So that's just my own history. So the problem I see again is two-fold: One, students can easily take class they perceive as easy at another institution, and get an "A" on it and their GPA at UNI is inflated. That happens a lot anecdotally, especially with students taking online courses especially to replace core classes. That happens quite frequently. They'll take the easiest path possible. Or two, students who I believe are struggling in the GPA, have to retake courses at UNI, because they have had poor performance. Typically, well in the past, or maybe a couple of years in the past, I don't see why they should be burdened by this forever in the future. I'm not saying...I think in the proposal I did say that, yes, the transcripts should be included; your academic record is your academic record. But I don't see why the UNI GPA should be impacted one way or the other by a class you take at a different institution. We have not control over the quality of those courses. That's why I believe in this policy. Of course, that's my own personal opinion, not as Chair of the Senate, as faculty.

**Patton:** If I may say as a sidelight, as an example of another dynamic here, you mentioned online courses. You could establish a policy for example, that you cannot repeat a UNI course taken in residence by a transfer course taken online. A policy change: It doesn't change the grading it changes the transfer

policy. I'm just pointing that out as another aspect of this whole kind of change.

**Kidd:** We do have articulation agreements in place, so if a student takes a class from a community college, it must transfer as credit to UNI. It must. We have these exchanges in place.

**Patton:** Residentially, that would certainly be true.

**Kidd:** Yes.

**Patton:** I know we have policies on our books that say you cannot repeat a course taken residentially by a guided independent study. And as long as we have that, I'm assuming they could have a logical extension of online. The difficulty with that is identification of the course. That's the difficulty.

**Kidd:** What would, even if a student perceives a course to be easier at a community college and taking it to...to get out of taking a more rigorous course at UNI? Again it's a personal...I'm trying to present this as something to the Senate.

**Nelson:** I think there are so many pros and cons to a change like this that it needs to be very thoroughly vetted. I'm not sure 100% what the appropriate body is for that vetting, but I could imagine motivating students then to not start at UNI because they know that if they have difficulty starting their college career, that when they transfer to UNI they'll have a grade reset, and they don't have to worry about those early, poor grades, and to me that's an unintended negative consequence of a policy change. I don't know if that would occur, but I think a major change like this really needs to be thoroughly discussed at multiple levels of the University before we even go forward with it. It's not something we can do quickly and easily.

**Shaw:** So, I think our two questions are: High school course inflation grades coming into...

**Kidd:** Inflation, yes.

**Shaw:** ...and that may not necessarily be just high school, and low performance due to past institutional grades. So we have those two to look at. I would agree with that. I'm not certain that the credit/no credit part--a lot of things to look at how they move those grades into us, I think would possibly affect our enrollment totally. Would we find students NOT wanting to come because they can't get the grades they can get somewhere else? And then, they would have more ability to get scholarships somewhere else. So I think we have to look at it from a broader view, totally.

**Patton:** If I may as look at another example of an issue there: If you were to bring things in as ungraded, then you probably have to look at ending the policy you have now of how many hours of ungraded credit can be applied to a degree. It's just another tentacle wherever this goes into.

**Shaw:** And my other question was, if we bring it in as graded/ungraded, is there a particular grade that they need to achieve in that graded/ungraded (course) to bring it in? So let's just say, if I got a "D" and we're bringing it in, that doesn't mean I have mastered the information that's required. There are so many things to think about.

**Kidd:** I thought it was a "C-" or something like that. I don't remember. But yes, there are. If you bring in a grade of "D" it does count maybe not in your given major, but it does count. So if you get a "D" in your Liberal Arts Core course, which is not required for your major, it does count as credit toward your degree.

**Dolgener:** Question for Phil. You also have a plan GPA.

**Patton:** Yes. You do.

**Dolgener:** Which is, I'm assuming it's your major GPA.

**Patton:** If I could interrupt you, it's actually a potential of two. It's a major GPA at the undergraduate level; it's a plan GPA at the graduate level.

**Dolgener:** Okay. And so on those GPA's if they bring in a course that is transferred into your major, that's transferred as a grade?

**Patton:** Correct.

**Dolgener:** It becomes part of your plan, even though it's coming from the outside, correct?

**Patton:** Basically true across the board at the undergraduate level. At the graduate level of course the courses are individually picked as they apply to the program, so the difference is between the undergrad and grad.

**Kidd:** This would restrict only undergraduate because they're a lot different on aspects on graduates. The motion is to basically send this to the EPC. I'm not sure if I refined the problems that I personally wish to right in any way.

**Walters:** We haven't really boxed it in, maybe a little bit for the standards of grading for specific transfers.

**Kidd:** I could try to refine it, or we could ask the EPC what they think, if they would prefer to have it in an ad hoc committee.

**Walter:** That's a great idea.

**Dunn:** Could I amend my motion basically that the Senate Chair request a meeting with the EPC and bring this and discuss with them what we discussed here, what you had in mind in terms of what you'd like them to look at with, together with what people said. You could do that?

**Kidd:** I'm fine with that, and again the Senate is free to reject the offer.

**Dunn:** And again, the committee can always look at and say, "Anything else would be worse."

**Kidd:** Absolutely. So we have an amended motion on the table that I will bring this to meet with the EPC and discuss this and I'll be happy to listen to recommendations: If they want to consider it, or if they want to make an ad hoc committee, if they want to toss it, great. Any more discussion? All in favor? Any opposed? Abstain? Okay. I'll go talk with Francis (**Degnin**). Thank you, and Phil (**Patton**) since you're here, thank you for coming. And yes, we do have time, so Changes to Scheduling of Classes. I'm glad you could be here. I didn't know you were coming. I wasn't sure if you were coming to stay or not. So some people brought this to the attention of the Senate at the end of last fall. Basically the deadlines for scheduling courses have advanced for over a year now. But I think people have just realized it this last fall and the issues that were raised, and we had extensive email communication about this, was that especially for scheduling classes for the following fall, you had to basically have your class schedule done by Christmas break, or Winter break, and this was presenting difficulty for people to kind of organize what they were going to be doing. I didn't see many comments about the summer scheduling, or maybe the spring, I'm not sure, but definitely for the fall scheduling. I was wondering if you can discuss some reason for why the deadlines were moved up for the fall, summer and spring.

**Patton:** Sure. I'd be happy to.

**Kidd:** Thank you.

**Patton:** If I may, Marissa, would you come up please and sit next to me? This is Marissa **Timmerman** who is an Assistant Registrar in the Registrar's Office. and Marissa is in charge of the schedule of classes and the registration process, so she has all of the history and so forth. I think what we want to look at to start off with, and Marissa can provide some of the background detail. A year and a half ago, maybe two years ago, the concept was thought of, of merging summer and fall registration at the same time. This is a very common move across the country. Our sister institutions do it, and have done it, and we thought there were some positive benefits in doing that. So we went with the Council of Academic Department Heads brought that proposal to them and they were agreeable to it. What's called the "call for classes," that's the term for it, historically goes out immediately after January 1; sometime in that two-week period. The call really is the time when departments can enter data into the system. Marissa (**Timmerman**) sent out an email earlier-- you'll have to remind me of the dates and so forth, alerting departments that the call would be coming out shortly after January. And that was just to remind them that you're going to have this three-week entry period of time to get your classes entered into the system for that whole process to work. So that email was an attempt to get departments thinking about what you might be offering. You could have done nothing at all prior to January. That would have been fine. Or, you could have theoretically mapped out on a piece of paper your entire fall schedule and just been waiting to give it to your departmental office to enter into the system after the system was open for you, which was after January. The call on that whole process is up about one week earlier than it has been in the past. Marissa (**Timmerman**) can give you some dates there. We do have a

little bit of flexibility in there if we want to maneuver some of these dates a little bit. We probably would have to do it at the expense of the amount of time for entry into the system. Right now we give departments three weeks to actually enter the data. That means that the decisions of what's going to be offered should have been done before that. Now you have a period of entry. We could reduce that period of entry and give that more time for departmental consideration. I want to turn it over to Marissa (**Timmerman**) and she can give you some of the historical dates and times so you have that information.

**Timmerman:** Sure. The communication Phil (**Patton**) referred to was by the request of department heads. We sent that out early November, just letting them know some upcoming schedule of classes and registration dates, and it was just purely communication and giving them the heads-up. Historically, the fall call and the summer calls were sent out at different times. So the summer call would go out the beginning of January and would be available until the end of January. The fall call, late January to late February. So in moving the registration for both summer and fall classes to be at the same time, we had to have those things be in line with each other as well. So we bumped them up to both follow the summer schedule of things. That reduced the...usually the fall entry period would be four weeks, it's now been condensed to three weeks and within that also summer, allowing us our four weeks to get our...to review every class that's been entered and make sure everything is correct before it's released to students. Am I missing anything that needs to be covered there?

**Patton:** No. The process takes simply so many weeks to get done, and so really, one of your driving forces is, "When do I want students to register?"

and you can just back it up. It's going to take us so many weeks back from that to meet that registration date. We have tried, this is the second year we've tried, to get this combined registration around spring break. Last year it was actually before spring break, and that was an issue with some areas. We moved it after spring break. In fact, we're starting today with advanced registration, as you all know, which by the way does match Iowa State. This year they're opening theirs today, too. The concept is we're trying to get students registered and committed into summer and fall classes and commit to the institution, at the same time or before competitive institutions are doing the same thing. There's a little bit of a retention philosophy in why at this time of the year as well. I can tell you, you can pick any date you want to, and I can tell you, it will take so many weeks before that, it will take us to get the whole process done. With that, we'll open it up to questions.

**Dunn:** I have one question, just for clarification. My understanding is this year you sent out something in late November, early December, sort of warning people, "Hey, these are your three weeks in January." Do you know, compared to the previous year, were those three entry weeks actually the same weeks or the cutoff deadline, did that change at all? Or was it purely that you had decided to let people know earlier than usual and therefore panicked people?

**Timmerman:** The summer or fall of '14 is the first year we put things together and therefore moved it up a little. The call would have went out on January 6<sup>th</sup>, due back to our office on January 24<sup>th</sup>. This year, the call went out on the 5<sup>th</sup> and it was due back on the 23<sup>th</sup>. So...

**Dunn:** So not very different?



**Patton:** Just depends where the Monday fell.

**Dunn:** What I observed, and it sounds like I'm not the only one, was that even though, from what you're saying, the deadlines were only different by one day, rather than being told, "Your requests are due the first week of the spring semester," we were told they have to be in by like December 14<sup>th</sup> or something like that. That's obviously not something you folks are doing, and it sounds like it was just that somehow because departments learned about this earlier, a number of department heads seem to have decided, "Oh my God, everybody will be gone. We've got to get everything ready before break."

**Nelson:** I think that for practical purposes, that departments did have to have everything ready before the break, because if you consider the January 23/24, wherever the closing date was, and then you move that back to when the first department meeting could occur, after we actually come back to school, there may be a week or two in there where you could actually have any discussion, and there certainly wouldn't be any time for revision.

**Dunn:** That would have been true before as well.

**Nelson:** I think it was bad the year before and maybe now people scrambled to get through it the year before, and then it was still occurring this year and they finally brought it...it basically came to the Faculty Senate's attention this year. I'm not arguing for or against the idea, but I do think if we stick with these earlier dates, that we must accept that December-- that departments have to meet prior to the end of the semester, late November or early December in order to actually have discussion about their schedules

**Dunn:** Also just to add in that I think there's slippage happening on several levels that we've moved up the date of registration, which forces the Registrar

to have earlier dates, but anecdotally, in my experience, it also seems like it takes more and more time for things to get approved at more and more levels. I don't know how it works in other colleges, but in my college, that date that you guys actually need to schedule by—that's way far from our deadline, because our department head has to approve everything, and then it has to go to the dean, who requires-- I don't know how many days to approve everything, and in my department...if it's an experimental course it has to go to the Provost, and do you even read those one-paragraph things...

**Licari:** They do.

**Dunn:**... and how do you tell from one paragraph whether it's a course worth offering or not? (laughter)

**Licari:** Mainly they're just interesting.

**Dunn:** Every stage of the approval is getting a little bit longer and a little bit longer, so everything is shoving things earlier, so it's not purely the Registrar's Office, it's a number of different ...I don't know what we do about that.

**Swan:** Registrar **Patton**, from what you said, you have moved, by at least a week, maybe more, the fall call deadline to then match the summer deadline.

**Patton:** Correct.

**Swan:** Couldn't you have moved the summer deadline a week later to match the fall deadline, thereby achieving the unification you were after?

**Patton:** Yes. I'll tell you how we tried to do it though. I have to give you a little bit of history. As you remember, fall registration prior to the last two years was done in April. It was done fairly late in April, maybe mid-April so it ran right up to, and sometimes included finals week. We wanted to move it back and get out of that because there were concerns about from advisors, faculty and

students about, “We don’t want to do all this stuff while we’re preparing for the end of the semester.” To accomplish what you’re saying right now, I think we could easily do, by simply-- and I don’t think this is a problem, departments would have to let me know--if we took that entry period of three weeks and made it two.

**Swan:** Yes. Yes.

**Patton:** And add that week to the departments, so that you had time after the first of the year as well as before the first of the year, to do faculty conversations and whatever.

**Swan:** I want to respond to that, to continue with that, in that I think this is correct, that’s why I want you to tell me if it’s wrong. The entry is really for standard courses that you repetitively offer. The entry is really going in and taking out sections, isn’t that correct? Doesn’t the system generate the same schedule this fall as last fall? So the department needs to know which sections its going to take out, if any, right? So they’re not entering all of the sections all of the time. It’s certainly for any new classes that needs to be entered or ones you’re working up. It seems like I agree with you. It seems like departments, the clerical activity of entering the classes could be reduced to two weeks instead of three. Again, that’s not really a curricular matter, that’s not a faculty governance matter that really is more of a clerical and/or administrative matter. Do we have the resources for staff to enter it, because it’s a matter of time, right? You reach your 40-hour week, and you stop working. So maybe that’s why we have the three weeks because we need the 120 hours. So that’s part of what we would have to address. But we could do it, and I do know that it would help faculty governance of deciding on what classes to offer in the

fall, it makes it much more responsive to the actual student population that we have and that we're going to be serving again next year; understanding where they're at closer to when they're going to need another set of courses in the fall.

**Licari:** I just want to mention one specific thing about moving the summer registration time period. There you start to intersect with items that are in the master agreement with United Faculty. There are some dates in there about contracting with faculty for summer work. So my preference would be to leave the summer registration alone.

**Swan:** Or maybe have two dates again.

**Licari:** If you do change the summer registration then you really do start to mess with the dates that have been set carefully in the contract.

**Dunn:** Two things: One in response to Jesse's (**Swan**) comment. And again, different departments are different. The problem is it's not just that we have three sections of Anth. 101, it's that well 'last fall, someone taught it on Tuesday/Thursday at 9:00 and this fall someone else is teaching it and they want to do it at 2:00 on Tuesday/Thursday in a different room'. So at least in my department, there's not much that just carries over every year or every semester. They pretty much have to do it from scratch, and from what I understand it from our secretaries it is a complicated, time consuming process. I would certainly urge us to check with the clerical staff before we simply say, "We can do it in two weeks."

**Swan:** That's not what I said.

**Dunn:** But also on the summer thing, we're already running into problems this year because it's the week after spring break, at least in my college, we're

being told that if you don't have your 10 students by April 1, your May course, you're not going to get to teach, and that's a very short time period to have students signing up for summer. Some of them might well sign up later in April, but the course will already have been deleted, so that's the problem with moving those summer dates around.

**Patton:** I was going to say I think there's another tool out there that's just been launched in January that will hopefully help departments. It's called Force Demand and hopefully we can update that as many times as you want, but it will really tell you the number of students that need a particular course on majors and minors, by classification, so you can really see when you go to look and say, "How many do I need to account for this fall?" It will tell you to the last student that you need 24 students in this course for this fall. So hopefully that all helps in the scheduling process too as you have your deliberations.

**Zeitz:** Would you clarify that please?

**Patton:** It's called Course Demand.

**Zeitz:** And what it will say is these students are in this position in their program and there's 24 of them, therefore that's a potential number for you to get.

**Patton:** By major by minor...

**Zeitz:** Really?

**Patton:** ...and classification level.

**Zeitz:** And when was this released?

**Patton:** That was released the first week of January. Probably not as early as we wanted it to be helpful for fall, but it's out there now.

**Zeitz:** One issue we run into when we're doing the fall so soon is that things such as textbooks and those sorts of things, we're planning a year ahead. I know that we're now at the point, at least for the last five years, we've been asking to submit the textbook as well. Is it possible so we can set up so that the textbook selection will be later in the year?

**Patton:** I'd have to do one checking of the law for that. If my memory serves me, the law, this is a federal law that comes out of the Higher Education Authorization Act, specifies a time when students have to be notified of the textbook, but I think it's much later than what we're talking about.

**Zeitz:** I'm thinking for the fall semester, if I had until April to find that, because there are new books coming out, and the problem is that I end up-- I've put in the seventh edition, and by the time fall comes around, they have the eighth edition, and I haven't seen that yet.

**Patton:** I don't think that is a problem. We'd obviously like to have that in prior to students actually starting to register, just so they don't buy the seventh edition and then the eighth edition comes out. We update on a nightly basis all the textbook information to UBS. So that's real-time information. So you can make that change anytime then.

**Timmerman:** I see a lot of departments putting it in as 'pending' and then whoever the scheduler is in the department can go in on their own and update the information.

**Zeitz:** As I understood it, once it's in there, it's in there. But, you're allowing for updates?

**Patton:** Oh yes.

**Zeitz:** My mistake.

**Patton:** An original entry of pending is just fine.

**Zeitz:** Thanks.

**Kidd:** Any other questions or discussion? Again this issue was raised because lots of people had comments about the issues with the scheduling. My department didn't have these issues because we roll classes over; we pretty much schedule in the spring for the entire year, except for experimental courses. I don't know if there's any action to be taken by the Senate at this point. I did have one more question though. So has the enrollment for spring moved up?

**Patton:** Can I look it up and get you back?

**Kidd:** Yeah. Absolutely.

**Patton:** Then we'll be able to talk about it.

**Dunn:** Part of the problem here, and it may be unfixable, is that the way the timeline seemed to work—the problem here wasn't that faculty had to do everything a week earlier than they did in a previous year, it was that it was a month earlier.

**Patton:** Right.

**Dunn:** ...and suddenly, "Your stuff is due next week while you're also grading finals." So part of it is we know this and we know that faculty meeting at the end of November, start of December needs to be course scheduling maybe. But the problem is we've got that month and nothing happens, when everything grinds to a halt because you can't be sure who's here, and it's the same problem in the fall. We get here and we've barely gotten our rosters and suddenly, "Oh, we need your stuff for spring," and from the faculty's perspective, "Couldn't this just be two weeks later?" and yet it sounds like it's

that two weeks that's killing us on both ends. It's designed exactly wrong with our semesters and I don't know if there's anything we can do about that?

**Zeitz:** Are these dates pretty standard, I mean, other universities?

**Patton:** I don't know, but I could ask when their calls are. I could do that.

**Swan:** It sounds like there is something that could be done, I don't know that you and I could do it, but it could be done. Working with the entry period, it seems like...how we can manage the three-week entry period, to squeeze time out of there. It seems like that's something we could ask administration to look into, that that would be very helpful from a faculty perspective, designing, developing the curriculum for the students, and trying to be as responsive to the current student's needs as possible.

**Patton:** Also if we can leave it with academic schedulers of course. Their request was, "If we can have it over break, we have time," so you can see all of the conflicting, competing interests as...no time is exactly right for anyone.

**Swan.** That's right. That's right.

**Kidd:** One of the things that came up was that there was a deadline within the three-week period, and I'm not sure exactly how that works. Like a draft deadline if it goes back to department for review and that's why people were considering that the three week entry period...was more like you had have to have your stuff in the first week, as opposed to the full three weeks.

**Timmerman:** That's not true. One thing we added in, we generate a pdf copy, which basically takes everything that's in the system and puts it in pdf form so that it can be printed out and looked at. So we added another, we call it the preliminary, but a first draft copy essentially, while schedulers still have the ability to go in change things themselves. So we send that out. Some people



ignore it completely. They don't bother with it. Others, it's really helpful to them. So, just something we added.

**Kidd:** Okay.

**Zeitz:** So the preliminary proof, I think I remember receiving it, was what we did last year?

**Timmerman:** Yeah. I think it's been happening a couple of years now.

**Zeitz:** What I'm saying is that what we're receiving in that pdf is the schedule from last year then modified to fit for this year?

**Timmerman:** Each term we roll the classes from the previous term, so if there was a department that hadn't gone in and maintained anything yet, that's what you would see. But some departments are done day 1 or 2 of the system being open.

**Zeitz:** Okay. Is it preliminary approval came out on the 12<sup>th</sup>, the week of the 12<sup>th</sup>.

**Dunn:** it sounds like in that case, it's what ever is currently in the system and if your particular secretary had not yet started entering things, you got last year's. What I'm also wondering and Mike (**Licari**) might be able to look into this, is what the schedule is for the dean's approval? I suspect it may vary by college. But, my sense at least is that three weeks from the viewpoint of the department, isn't a full three weeks. Because I suspect that within that three weeks it has to go the dean, who then takes a few days to approve it and then goes back to the department and potentially says "You've got too many Tuesday/Thursday classes. You need to change this," And they need a few days to change it so again. It's not really three weeks for the department, either. It's

three weeks from when you can first enter things into the system until the dean has approved it and this is the final, official thing we're entering.

**Licari:** That is some of the challenge. You're exactly right, Senator **Dunn**, that there's a fair amount of work that needs to happen in that three-week period and it's not all done by just one person. It's done by a set of people: the department secretary or whoever is entering scheduling material, the dean, the provost's office reviewing courses to be scheduled at their times. All of those kinds--the deans to make sure that there's a distribution of classes across the instructional time or to make sure there isn't overlap so that majors are competing with each other and things like that. As we kind of alluded to before, it's just a lot of work that needs to be done. There might be...but-- it's an open question, is that really three weeks worth of work? Is it 15 work days? Is it 12? 10? I don't know, so we could ask.

**Dunn:** Actually, could we lengthen that three-week period, and make it a four or five-week period? That would move things up, but that might actually, potentially be better.

**Patton:** Which way are you going? Earlier or later?

**Dunn:** We would start earlier. I mean suppose our people couldn't enter things the 15<sup>th</sup> of December if they had their...

**Licari:** If you go earlier, sure. I don't know if we could go any later.

**Dunn:** Right.

**Licari:** At the end of the day, right now if we don't change that three-week period, it would just be that there would just have to be an awareness that your last department meeting of the fall semester will be a class scheduling meeting. If it happens the last week of November or the first week of

December, it would just have to be the scheduling meeting. At the end of the day, this is just me talking. I don't know that it would substantively change the nature of the discussion if I as a faculty member was thinking about my fall offerings in the last week or the first week of December versus the second week of January. I don't know what materially changes when I have that thought process other than maybe I some information about available textbooks and things like that.

**Dunn:** That could be moved later.

**Licari:** Sure. We've got flexibility on that. The basic rotation of courses that I might be offering and when I'm going to teach it, I don't know what magically changes between the beginning of December and the middle of January.

**Swan:** So the things that I've been hearing that happen in that three-week period between the department head or the deans and other administrators--much of that to me sounds like could happen over breaks: Summer breaks, Christmas breaks, Winter breaks, anticipating departments that are always having weird times. We know who they are, and you work with that over the break, and you don't wait for the three-week period. You say, you have these weird times to work with, so the only thing that's left to have to be done is the faculty consultation about the specific distinct courses that are going to be offered in the spring term and in the fall term and the summer, to a much lesser degree. So we could do, or things could be done, over these other kinds of breaks when the administrators of course are here and faculty aren't here. I would recommend that—not to have administrative activity going on in that three-week period that could be handled in other periods where faculty aren't here.

**Licari:** I think a lot of that three-week period, and least over the January time is exactly taking place when you suggest it.

**Swan:** I think a lot does happened.

**Licari:** That already is taking place.

**Swan:** But reviewing it, seeing if there could be more taken out of the three-week period perhaps. And perhaps there are some departments that might....

**Licari:** Possibly. The only challenge there of course is that's also a very interactive three-week period when a department head needs to go back to the faculty members who had some ideas about course rotation or a dean has to consult with a department head who then has to talk to faculty, and so its not just a purely administrative function. There's a lot of communication that needs to happen. From that perspective, I would hate to have just some administrative fiat put into place and then you get back for the spring semester, and "Surprise, you're course rotation is all changed," and you're set with a bunch of classes at 8:00 and noon.

**Swan:** No. That should never happen.

**Patton:** I'll admit--I hate to admit it, going to a one-year catalog, but a one-year curriculum cycle will actually make courses available to you sooner. Part of what drives this process too is us having to create degree audits, programs of study, new courses into the catalog, dropping courses out of catalog, that we have to do ahead of time before you get to the scheduling system with the annual cycle, it will actually be done a little earlier, which should be helpful.

**Kidd:** It sounds like this issue is somewhat departmental-based or college-based. I'm wondering because I've had that communication, if I could talk with the people that most affected by this, and find out where is this issue. It

sounds like there's a whole month somewhere else. So maybe I could work with that and...

**Dunn:** The College Senates might actually be the place for those discussions to happen.

**Kidd:** Yeah, we're running out of time here.

**Patton:** I just volunteer. We're happy go wherever we're invited. If the College Senates want to visit with us, we'll be happy to go.

**Swan:** In defense of the College of Humanities Arts & Sciences Senate, it's a very large, large, Senate with lots of different people. The other colleges, with much smaller communities to serve—that can work a lot easier. So just to be alert, that if you're going to the College of Humanities, Arts & Sciences Senate, necessarily is going to be much more complex and not immediately helpful.

**Kidd:** Your College had the most...

**Dunn:**...Had the most complaints, yes.

**Kidd:** I'll try to work this issue further and see please if you have more comments... and thank you for coming.

**Patton:** Thank you.

**Kidd:** Motion to adjourn?

**McNeal:** So moved.

**Kidd:** Seconded by Senator **Zeitz**.

#### **4:59 Adjourn**

Respectfully Submitted,  
Kathy Sundstedt  
Transcriptionist and Administrative Assistant  
Faculty Senate  
University of Northern Iowa  
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614