

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
12/10/18 (3:30 – 4:59)
Mtg. #1816
SUMMARY MINUTES
Scholar Space (301) Rod Library

Call for Press Identification: No members of the press were present.

Guests: Greg **Bruess**, Dale **Cyphert**, John **Fritch**, David **Grant**, Ana **Kogl**, Jeff **Morgan**, Gabriela **Olivares**, Doug **Shaw**, Jaycie **Vos**, Jennifer **Waldron**.

Courtesy Announcements:

UNI President **Nook** shared thoughts about the UNI budget which was recently presented to the governor. (See pages 4-6)

United Faculty Chair **Hawbaker** stressed the importance of faculty involvement in crafting departmental standards and criteria. Contract negotiations are opening and member participating in encouraged. (See pages 7-8)

NISG Representative Kristin **Ahart** reported about two members of the Board of Regents who recently shadowed her on campus to understand better the lives of UNI students and their concerns. She also shared names of those students who will visit weekly with legislative leaders during the Spring semester, as well as NISG's work on Title IX and Student Accessibility. (See pages 8-12)

Faculty Senate Chair **Petersen** provided an informal update on the work of the Faculty Evaluation and Faculty Handbook Committees who have been working on Chapter 3, especially regarding language, term and adjunct faculty, and the merit system. Additionally, she expressed appreciation for the work done by the Senate, committees, and administrators that are exemplars of true shared governance. (See pages 12-19)

Minutes for Approval: Nov. 26, 2018 (**Skaar/Gould**) One abstention.

Committee Reports: The University Writing Committee (See pages 19-29)

Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing:

**** (Burnight/Gould)** to docket as bundle for Jan. 14 meeting. All aye.

1426 [Emeritus Request for Richard Glockner, Department of Theatre](#)

1427 [Emeritus Request for Frank Kohler, Department of Special Education](#)

1428 [Emeritus Request for Rosalie \(Salli\) Forbes, Jacobsen Center](#)

1429 [Emeritus Request for Darrell Wiens, Biology](#)

1430 [Academic Freedom Policy 6.10](#)

1431 [Emeritus Request for Roy Behrens](#)

Consideration of Docket Items:

1298 1419 [Committee on Committees Procedure Recommendations](#)

**** (Zeitz/Neibert)** to move 1298/1419 to head of the order. All aye.

**** (O’Kane/Burnight)** to approve the recommendations. Passed.

(See pages 29-35)

1286 1407 [General Education Revision Consultation](#)

**** (O’Kane/Burnight)** All aye.

(See pages 35-50)

New Business: None.

Adjournment: (Zeitz/Gould) 4:59 p.m.

Next Meeting:

3:30 p.m. Monday, January 14, 2019

Scholar Space (301) Rod Library

University of Northern Iowa

A complete transcript of 50 pages and 0 addendum follows.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

December 10th, 2018

Present: Senators Imam **Alam**, John **Burnight**, Senator Seong-in **Choi**, Faculty Senate Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Senators Kenneth **Hall**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair James **Mattingly**, Senators Amanda **McCandless**, Peter **Neibert**, Steve **O’Kane**, Faculty Senate Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Mark **Sherrad**, Nicole **Skaar**, Sara **Smith**, Gloria **Stafford**, Andrew **Stollenwerk**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Shahram **Varzavand**, and Leigh **Zeitz**. Also: NISG Vice President Kristin **Ahart**, UNI Faculty Chair Barbara **Cutter**, United Faculty Chair Becky **Hawbaker**, UNI President Mark **Nook**, Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**, Associate Provost John **Vallentine**, and Provost Jim **Wohlpert**.

Not Present: Senator Amanda **McCandless**.

Guests: Greg **Bruess**, Dale **Cyphert**, John **Fritch**, David **Grant**, Ana **Kogl**, Jeff **Morgan**, Gabriela **Olivares**, Doug **Shaw**, Jaycie **Vos**, Jennifer **Waldron**.

Petersen: Let’s go ahead and convene our last Senate meeting of the fall semester—of the year. That’s right. Let me first ask are there any press? We have a number of guests with us today, so I’ll give our guests an opportunity to introduce themselves, and maybe I’ll start with Jennifer (**Waldron**) and Gabby (**Olivares**) and then we can work our way around the room. If you would just share your purpose; who you might be representing in your attendance today.

Olivares: Gabby **Olivares**, the Graduate College. Representing the best interests for the Graduate College.

Wohlpart: I'm Jennifer **Waldron**. I'm Dean of the Graduate College and both Gabby (**Olivares**) and I are here with the PDA potential updates.

Vos: I'm Jaycie **Vos**. I'm in the library. I'm the University Archivist, and I am also on the University Writing Committee.

Grant: David **Grant**, also on the University Writing Committee.

Shaw: I'm Doug **Shaw**. I'm with the Gen Ed Revision Committee.

Kogl: Ana **Kogl**, also with the Gen Ed Revision Committee.

Morgan: Jeff **Morgan**, also with the Gen Ed Revision Committee.

Fritch: John **Fritch**, also with the Gen Ed Revision Committee.

Wohlpart: We decided you're a posse. [Laughter]

Petersen: Welcome, everyone. We will start with our Courtesy Announcements. We'll begin with President **Nook**.

Nook: I've really got one thing I want to mention to you, but I also want to leave you time to ask me any questions that you've got. So I'll give you that fair warning if you want to ask questions, this would be a great time. I've been busy and it will continue for the next several months, with our budget and in particular talking with the governor and the legislature about the state appropriation. We've asked for an increase that's twice as large as the increase we got last year—an

additional \$4 million, so we'll be at just over \$99 million—just short of \$100 million actually, if we get that. Last week I presented that budget to the governor and her staff and then that was early last week. Towards the end of the week I had what was supposed to be a 30-minute meeting with her budget director who's one of our alums, and that turned into an hour and a half. I don't know whether that's good or bad. We talked to him a lot about budgets and other things as well. I've got meetings this next week with a series of legislative leaders—the people that will actually make the decisions even before the Senate and the House start their negotiations and things. So that will keep me busy over the next couple of weeks. And then of course when the session starts, there's just a lot of time sort of trying to continue to manage the discussion, so that's been occupying a lot of my time. It's something that's very important to everyone on this campus. If we can keep our tuition increase as close to zero as possible, if we can get the full \$4 million, certainly keep it under a percent if at all possible and that will be quite different than what we see at Iowa and Iowa State. Questions about that or anything that's going on that you'd like to ask me about, I'd be happy to take questions.

O'Kane: Do you have a feel for how the governor felt about your proposal?

Nook: She smiled a lot and was very happy to hear about what we had done. As part of this, what I try to do is to talk about how we've been good stewards of the dollars that we have, and talked about what we've done again. Reminded them of "Live Like a Student," but also what we've done in the last two decades to raise our four-year graduation rate from 29% to 43% and what that means in terms of efficiency; efficiently using State dollars and tuition dollars. She really appreciated

that. There was comments about that. We talked a little about the savings that came out of the remodel of Schindler. You know, 55% reduction in utility bills there. That's something that when I met individually with Dave **Roederer**, her budget director. He asked about again—exactly what was that. And part of that's because we're asking for additional funds for the ITC—Industrial Technology Center, and how we're continuing to steward those dollars. She's hearing in a week from almost all of the State agencies with their requests and putting them together, and she's pretty good at playing cards and not tipping her hand one way or the other, I think largely because they haven't put it together. I think they gather all this in. They listened pretty attentively; asked a couple of really good questions, but I really don't know how they feel about it at this point. There's some indication that there will be more money available, but Medicaid and Medicare continue to just eat up so much of the public-sector dollars out there that it's not clear what will happen until they figure out what those are going to mean, and what the health care costs—true health care costs are going to be around those.

Wohlpart: And the other piece that will change is with the tax cuts that will take effect January 1st. We'll have to watch the revenue—the State revenue. It has been going up, but we don't know what will happen post-January 1, if that will drop off.

Nook: Other questions? If not. Thank you.

Wohlpart: You all have a lot on your docket so I won't take any of your time. I will offer in my spare time to do any grading for you. [Laughter] If you can find any spare time in my calendar.

Cutter: I echo Provost **Wohlpart's** comments, and I'd also like to add...

Wohlpart: You're going to do some grading too?

Cutter: I have a pile of papers I'll give you some right here if you want to multi-task.

Hawbaker: I have just a couple of quick reminders. One, I'll repeat something I said at the last meeting about encouraging, urging everyone to be very involved with the creation of department standards and criteria, but also to raise a really serious concern that came up at the Faculty Handbook Committee on Friday regarding one college's decision to sort of skip the step of departments creating these and move only to college standards. We have a lot of concerns about this. It is—I hope that concern was communicated, and we hope that there will be a respect for the process that this group has worked so hard to put into place, and a respect for the differences in disciplines. Second, next week we'll begin our contract negotiations. I just sent out a link to a contract negotiations survey that I encourage you all to take to give us some feedback to help us to craft our initial proposal. Also, if we invite you to attend our first bargaining exchange on Monday, December 17th. In the past these have been much more private affairs even if they were open to the public, we never really encouraged people to come. And now we want you there. We want you to be there as a visible reminder that we speak for many people, and that you are all outstanding and deserving and

diverse. So, we will meet at 1 p.m. in the Elm Room in Maucker Union to get ready and we'll have some UF t-shirts for you if you haven't already picked yours up. The first initial exchange will be in the Great Reading Room at 1:30 on Monday. So, hope to see you there. Thank you.

Petersen: I do happen to have a few announcements. First, I want to yield the floor to our NISG Representative, Kristin **Ahart** to give her an opportunity to do some student government announcements.

Ahart: It's been about a month since I presented to you last, and since then I've had two of our Regents come and shadow me, and so I'm going to pass around our two separate agendas which host and origin goals and outline our days together, if you're interested in reviewing those, and then some of my business cards if you ever have any questions or would like to contact me. We had a great day together with both Regent **Dunkel** and Regent **McKibben** came to shadow me. We visited a host of different classes around campus as well as visited different offices, and saw what a typical day in the life of a student here at UNI would be like and we got great remarks from both of them. I've actually had four more Regents reach out to me and ask to shadow me this next coming semester, so I'm really excited to bring that to you all next semester when we come back. Also in regards to the Board of Regents, each Board of Regents meeting our executives from student government from the Regents schools have the opportunity to eat breakfast with the Regents the day of the second meeting, and so each meeting we then set a topic that we wanted to discuss, whether it's concern or something we'd like to discuss in general about our institutions, and this past meeting we brought up tuition, knowing that the Board would be

discussing the Tuition Predictability Model. And so UNI took most of our time on the floor thanking the Board for the release of this model and what that means for our students and their families here in the State. After that breakfast we further planned that Regent Road Trip that I brought to you all in October—that the Regents schools are planning to do to kind of do some more legislative representation of our schools as a whole. So, we're very excited about furthering that plan right now. We're working on getting some demographics of what our students and alumni look like in those counties so we can break out who will be talking to which representatives. You all have also probably heard about the proposed Title IX regulations from the Department of Education. That's something that student government's been looking at closely and working with our Title IX officer on. And we will be working on this a lot over break, talking to Andrew **Morris** & Leah **Gutknecht** about what that means, and what our students can play a role in representing our university throughout that process. Here, this past week I attended a NASPA-hosted webinar with multiple individuals around campus around with our lower cabinet director of gender violence. We're going to partner greatly on this, and see what we can do to have the greatest impact and assist our university students throughout that. Additionally, in regards to Title IX, I have a conference call this next Thursday—this Thursday actually—with my counterpart at the University of Iowa to discuss what their university is doing, and how possibly we could come together with this as a Regent initiative, perhaps with all of our student governments. And so hopefully I'll have updates to come for that once break is over, since the comment period ends on January 28th. That's all I have for Title IX, but a quick update, just in case you have any students ask about Accessibility Services. Student government does fund a majority of the

student programming around campus that student organizations host, and so through that we've had multiple requests for us to fund accessibility requests, such as interpreters and things like that. And so we've been working closely with and have now secured a plan of what we'll do in case those things come up later. And so for one-time events, large events, student government will be hosting any combinations that students need. So if you have a student come to you and ask about what that may look like for them, we'll be funding those. And for those larger requests for perhaps an interpreter in every organization meeting that a student may need in order to participate with that group, that's something that we've worked—that Accessibility Services will be funding, per the request of the student. So in case you have any students in your courses who are looking to get involved and have questions about that, feel free to direct them towards us or Student Accessibility Services. Just to end today, I wanted to announce our legislative liaison team, which is our group of students who will work closely with our Director of Governmental Relations to lobby on behalf of UNI. So, I just wanted to list their names in case you had any of them in courses and you wanted to congratulate them: Ann **Metz**, Joshua **Dausener**, Isaak **Esperson**, Jacob **Levang**, Jacob **Madden**. They are a group of highly professional and organized and poised individuals that I'm excited to have representing UNI about every week at the Capitol in the spring semester. So if you see any of them, feel free to congratulate them on this achievement. They definitely will hold a lot of weight in our representation at the State Capitol.

Nook: Please send me that list of students. I can't tell you how much of a difference the student made last year at the legislature. It was huge. They were

down there once a week, and I've had legislators tell me time and time again we have excellent students. They represented us well and it made a difference with a lot of people. So thank you for continuing that. Both Regent **McKibben** and Regent **Dunkel** had to come to my office immediately following her day on campus with Kristin (**Ahart**) and the students to talk about another issue, and Regent **McKibben** gave me a call the next day after he'd been on campus and both of them wanted to communicate one and only one thing—and that is what an excellent job that Kristin (**Ahart**) in particular did in organizing this, and getting them in front of good people and hearing about the stories. So they sang your praises highly and often and loudly, so thank you for what you've done for our university. It was really appreciated.

Wohlpart: If I could add to that, I got to speak to both of them as well and they sang the praises of the faculty—the classes they went to, and the discussion that was engendered in all of the classes and the students. They were really, really impressed with what's going on with the teaching and learning on this campus. So thank you for showcasing this remarkable faculty.

Ahart: It's probably my favorite part of my position so far. I've learned a lot about our university throughout that process and got to meet a lot of individuals around campus that I would not have met, had I not been for certain connections. And especially thank you to Vice-Chair **Mattingly** for helping me in the initial organization of our collaboration with the College of Business for sure.

O'Kane: Kristin (**Ahart**) could you give us a consensus opinion of what students might have thought of the proposed Title IX changes?

Ahart: So, right now we're working on educating students that this is something that's been released. I don't think a lot of students are cognizant of it yet, and so we will be halving some info sessions as well as our lower cabinet director on gender violence will be compiling a presentation that she'll give to the Senate, and then hopefully to more organizations across campus. Right now it's hard to tell, since we haven't gotten a lot of student feedback on that besides our executives on the team, and we're still learning about what that means for our institution in particular. But I would say that we're concerned about what that would mean for our students and their feeling of safety on campus here. And so we're working to do whatever we can to insure that at any public institution our students would feel safe, and that it would be a process that would justify them throughout the process as well. Hopefully, I can give you more detailed comments once we convene as a team, and I talk to my counterpart this week. But I'd say right now, initially, we're concerned, but we definitely need to learn more.

Nook: as a follow-up from the University's point of view, you mentioned Andrew **Morris** is really leading—spearheading—the response from the University. He's working closely—Kristin's (**Ahart**) involved, but also Paula **Knudsen**, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and Leah (**Gutknecht**) in the Compliance Office, our Title IX Advisor. We talked about it in Executive Management today. The comments are coming together. If you have a real interest in this, if it's something that you'd like to see and comment on, by all means let me know or Andrew (**Morris**) and we can get it to you. One of the problems here is that the comment period closes January 28th. Right? So we had this 60-day window was all, so it's really a short turnaround, and it's over the semester break too. So if you'd like to

see where we're at, I'd be happy to share that document with anybody. It's still kind of just collecting comments, and we haven't even put together a draft response yet. There's some talk about working with the other universities. Do we put together a Regential response as well—the three presidents coming together and taking those things that are important to all of us and putting that together? Does that mean anything? Does it not mean anything? Those sorts of things are things we're talking through yet. If anybody would like to see it, by all means let me know and we'll get you involved and engaged.

Petersen: Thank you. So I've had many faculty come to me and others who are part of the Faculty Evaluation and Faculty Handbook Committees requesting some type of update. So I wanted to take a moment to provide a somewhat informal update. The Committees plan to return for a consultative session in the spring, but we were not quite ready. But I do want to honor the request to have some type of update around the work of both of those committees. As I get started, for those of you who are also on that committee, feel free to chime in. Both committees continue to meet on a very regular basis. The Evaluation Committee meets every Friday morning for two hours, and then the Handbook Committee meets monthly for two hours on Friday afternoon. And so we are very committed to the work of revising and considering all of the issues that comprise of Chapter 3. We have been spending much of our time working on Chapter 3, listening to all the groups across campus. We've received a tremendous amount of feedback from faculty, from department heads, and now deans are also providing us with very specific, detailed feedback which has been wonderful. But has resulted in a somewhat messy process in that we come together as a

committee and we each week return to the very same paragraph we might have been working on a week or two weeks ago, and we consider the issues at hand and we have conversation about the language. So it's been a slow process, but a good process in that I believe our committee can say with confidence that we have been able to consider very carefully all of the issues and the concerns and the ideas that every group has put forth. At present, we are spending most of our time working on the career ladder for our adjunct and term faculty. That work has entailed considering language around how do we refer to these individuals as well as how do we create an evaluation system for these individuals? And other related issues. We've also spent a great deal of time considering the merit system, hearing feedback from various groups across campus around the proposed formula that originally was shared. We also have spent a tremendous amount of time on language: word choice, things of that nature. John (**Vallentine**) or Barb (**Cutter**) did you wish to add anything, or Becky (**Hawbaker**)?

Vallentine: No. It was a great summary I think. The feedback loop is what is interesting. I told the Faculty Handbook Committee on Friday afternoon if I went to the whiteboard it would be drawing everything coming into the Committee. The feedback has been quite strong, and I mean that in a very positive way. When we're able to get a draft out to you: We're close with about nine pages right now that we could almost send to you. The one day the Faculty Evaluation Committee went from Page 1 to Page 29. When it went to the Handbook Committee that afternoon, it went from 1 to 19. And now, we're back down to Pages 1-9 after receiving feedback from across the campus. So it's a slow process, but we're being very, very careful. So I think we're getting close to being able to send some

things out to you, and certainly that will be another period of getting some feedback back.

Petersen: I know many of you are working very diligently on your department standards, and working toward developing that criteria as a group. Are there any questions that we might be able to answer at this point or comments, concerns either about our work or the work that you're doing at the department level?

Hesse: Regarding the departmental level standards, one concern is that the most recent version of Chapter 3 that has been posted online is date October 19th, and so we're creating department-level standards based off of a document that's two months old. That's a concern in my department, and I assume others as well. I realize it's a messy task, but it seems like we're creating documents on something where the template itself might be changing and we don't know.

Petersen: The Faculty Handbook Committee has approved the Guiding University Standards, so the tables that you all are working off of in order to create your department-level criteria—they have been approved and they will not change.

Hesse: But there are other things that go into those documents than just the tables, and that stuff might change, such as the Contingent Promotion Ladder.

Vallentine: That's a good point, Tom (**Hesse**) and we're cognizant of that, and we're very careful when we're going through things that it's not going to substantially change your work at all, but maybe change small aspects of it perhaps. I think when we send out the draft, we'll certainly identify any of those so it's really clear to you or anyone else that's working on the document.

Wohlpert: I also just want to be careful about language. The Faculty Handbook has approved it, which doesn't mean it's done and approved.

Petersen: Yes.

Wohlpert: It needs to go to the Provost to be approved.

Petersen: The tables?

Wohlpert: Well the whole thing has to be approved by the Provost in the end and it will come here for a consultation and that has happened, but that will happen again. You all will get to consult on it, and then I will receive it. And as I go through it, if I have changes or questions, I go back to the Handbook Committee and there's a conversation, which is how it happened last year. There were things I didn't accept. Think I wanted changed, and we had a conversation and came to an agreement about those things. In the end, it is the Provost who approves the Handbook.

Petersen: Yes. Thank you.

Vallentine: And we did make sure the Provost read the sections you're working on right now, so...

Wohlpert: Several times.

Vallentine: So I think we're okay there.

Choi: In our department we had the discussion about department standards and we had this question. We wanted to allow some room for flexibility, such as this is

our criteria and some other evidence of teaching effectiveness or some other evidence of research productivity. And we had the discussion so how can we know what is “other”? We wanted to discuss with the department head beforehand to see whether our plan matched with other criteria. So if the department head agreed, then we are safe to go ahead with that plan. But the next question is, what if the department head agreed, but later at the end of the year, the dean or Provost disagreed?

Wohlpart: So there is a process in there that these documents will go up the chain in your college for approval. So again, this should be happening between the faculty and the department head, and then it goes to the higher level and up to the dean for final approval. So, I would encourage you all to be consulting and even to be consulting up. There’s no reason why you can’t be talking with the dean now during the process.

Cutter: I would also reiterate something I said a few weeks ago which is that these standards were developed—the concept of the department standards are that these guiding standards are supposed to be flexible enough to suit the needs of all departments. So if you think something’s relevant to your department, you should put it in, and see if these standards are actually flexible enough that they’re doing what they’re supposed to do.

Hawbaker: So, don’t self-censor.

Cutter: Yes.

Petersen: And that really brings me to my last announcement, because I was thinking—as I think many of us do this time of the semester—it’s coming to an

end. The year is coming to an end and we're taking a moment to reflect, and I was thinking about how very appreciative I am of all of the work that we have done as a Senate this semester. I'm incredibly appreciative of our administrators being here at the table and willing to engage in these really messy, hard conversations around evaluation and post-tenure and budget and curriculum. And I'm thankful that United Faculty is here as well, and for all of the work you all are committed to doing. And I know that it's incredibly messy and it's complicated and none of us are quite sure where we might land with all of these various initiatives that are happening on campus. But as I reflect, I'm really excited, and I'm also very hopeful for the future. And if you know me, you know that if you send me something to read I will read it, and I will likely then pay it forward by sharing what I've read with someone else. So Jim (**Valentine**) keeps sending me all of these amazing articles on shared governance, and I've been reading them, and the reason I'm so excited is because it appears that at this campus we truly value shared governance in a way that is different than perhaps it is valued on other campuses. And so the article that I'm referring to here this afternoon talks about shared governance typically being understood as divided governance—meaning administrators do their thing and faculty do their thing and rarely do the two cross paths in an authentic or genuine way. The article in fact argues that such divided governance under the guise of shared governance breeds mistrust and inactivity and lack of shared vision, goals—what have you, and argues that true shared governance is in fact messy, just as I've been talking about in that we certainly have our respective roles, but that those roles cross paths in that we are engaging in conversation and discussion with one another in ways that seek out understanding. And so as I reflect on the semester and all of the work that we've

been doing on various committees that we serve on, the conversations that we have with one another, it feels like genuine shared governance, and so I'm hopeful as we think about what is ahead.

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Petersen: That brings us to our Minutes for Approval. And you all have received a copy of the minutes from November 26th. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Thank you, senator **Skaar**. A second, Senator **Gould**. Any discussion needed? All in favor of approving the minutes from November 26th, please indicate by saying 'aye.' And any opposed? Any abstentions--Senator **O'Kane**.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Petersen: The University Writing Committee is here with their Committee Report. I distributed their report via email on Friday. I think we also have a digital copy of it, so I'll invite them to stand or come to the front to share your committee report with us.

Grant: I want to thank everybody for giving us the opportunity to be here, especially at the request of Senator **Mattingly** to come and give a report on what we've been up to. I'll echo some of the earlier things about Kristin **Ahart** and NISG reps have throughout the years have been a very consistent, active presence and I really value that. Our committee has been able to get faculty, students and get everybody kind of on the same page. Thanks to everyone for allowing us to do that. A few months ago, like I said, Senator **Mattingly** asked us to come and share with you all where we were in our process. And of course there are several things

going on that precipitated that, and so it behooved everyone to kind of say okay let's try to get all of these wheels that are in motion, and understand just what's happening so we can make an informed decision. We took seriously his charge to request to say that any recommendations that you might have regarding the committee and he sent us a few points to talk about what's our past, what was our charge; let's get everybody up to speed here. So that is pretty much contained in the report. You have the original charge that we gave the Faculty Senate that was approved in 2010, something like that. [Phone ringtone sounds. Laughter.]

Cyphert: It was in a dark Italian restaurant years ago...Oh no, that was a different story.

Grant: So, an update on the work. You can see again the timeline we've given you on the major projects that we've accomplished throughout the years; some of them mundane things such as the website, some of them much more substantive, such as conducting numerous assessments, given some data. What is the state of writing on our campus, what does it look like, what do other universities do, how do we compare? And then of course, I think one of the larger ones out of that is that we did have a moment to talk with you guys earlier--a couple of years ago—a version of this body to say, yes, we need more writing. It needs not to be just a freshman course, kind of inoculation and then go on. But we need to vertically integrate writing instruction throughout the curricula. Overall, we've identified still that we need some consistent support. It's not an easy thing to say, "A couple of other credits here and there," especially under tight times and we're concerned about graduation rates. We're concerned about retention. We're

concerned about the General Education Revision—all of these things are part of our sight, and where we're trying to fit in so that our students can have the best experience, and come out really top notch compared to other universities and their programs. I won't go into so much the theory. We can talk about that graph a little bit, but generally, I just want to say that given everything that we've done—given the conversation that we've had and our charge, we know that writing is a high-impact practice. We know it's a high-impact practice that often wraps in so many other ones related to diversity, related to small class sizes, even relating to service learning. So as a composition person doing service learning at the University of Wisconsin, we know that there's a lot of benefit here and there's lots of ways to do it, but that not everybody is always thinking about or always has the requisite tools in order to understand how do you ask these things? How do you get the right kind of writing back out of a student or out of a group of students? Right? So there is a lot of work that can be done to improve what we're doing, and to improve the quality of responses we get from students and how they really work and manage and understand their work within their disciplines; their majors. Writing is the stuff by which we not only ask the students, but we also understand their learning. Since we know that this is a high-impact practice and it has very much a bearing on what we get as well as what we give, we recommended that two very basic changes there: those are the recommendations. Instead of constantly coming here year after year and saying we would like to do more. We need resources in order to do it, to really figure out what we're doing. Instead of constantly doing that, we recommend that we not be a committee that is just advisory to the Senate, but that we actually have a place in the Provost's Office so that we can at least be closer to some of those

resources; that we can do the kind of work that we need to do. These recommendations basically fall out under two broad things. The first is a curricular change, so that we can have some effort to help you all do the curriculum for writing that needs to happen in your areas. That's the biggest kind of thing. This isn't something to say, "This is what the outcomes must be for all. But so that administration has a tool to say, "Here's how we lift you up because you're faculty. You're the one who's doing this curricular oversight. You're the one who's doing a lot of the curriculum planning and designing it." It's going to look a lot different in philosophy than it does in biology, I guarantee you. How do you do that—across all these different things? And the second one is of course pedagogical. By that I mean, a lot more than just do we count comma splices and grammar, but what do we really do pedagogically in order to craft a really good assignment? How do we craft a response or some prompt that provides us with the response that we really want, rather than relying on some things that we've maybe have worked out for a long time, but may not be aimed exactly at what we want. That's the long and the short of it. Dale **Cyphert** here did a lot of work on this report, so if you have anything to add, or Jaycie (**Vohs**) if you have anything to add from the Library's perspective?

Cyphert: Well I just think that we have been asked by every incoming Faculty Senate Chair to do a project of some sort, so Jim (**Mattingly**) was not any different. But really we have felt like we are just kind of an advisory group with a fair amount of frustration because every year we take it back to the Faculty Senate and everybody agrees—yes, yes we need more writing, and everybody says 'Yup, that's something we need resources for.'" So it seems like it's time to

sort of make an adjustment, which Jim (**Mattingly**) was pretty frank about saying, let's think about what this really needs to be. But, the other things that has come up over the last few years is the University-wide Learning Goals, which we were very excited to see that communication was identified, obviously. I'm an oral comm. person and there's a lot of other non-writing people in the group, but we traditionally have been called the writing group. We were quick to say, "That's not a problem." Oral and graphic (visual) communication is equally important. But some of the conversation at that point becomes well how does that actually fit in with University-wide goals? And as David (**Grant**) mentioned, writing in biology is very different from writing in pre-law or some other field, and I think one of the on-going thrusts of what we've been trying to say is that there really—I will refer to the little chart—because you see that place where it says 'appropriate discourse' in the middle? We recognize that appropriate discourse for academic work at the freshman level is very different, besides the fact that they're 17, by the way. But that's a different issue. But that academic writing discourse is very appropriate in certain fields and in certain areas, but as a learning goal, I think every college probably means communication somewhat differently. So, trying to get a handle on where's the balance between academic communication and discipline-specific communication and civic communication, which is a different animal altogether, are very complicated questions. And so to just say well, "Yup, we need more writing or more communication," doesn't really do anybody any good. At this point we really need to start to get serious about how do we actually put those learning goals together in a way that is meaningful? And we're all real excited about the potential for that. You know that middle of the circle—this is where we live. We're rhetoric people. (I used the 'R' word)

Grant: Ah, good.

Cyphert: We talked about using the ‘R’ word, because we are all disciplinary specialists in discourse, in what this really means, and it’s a very complicated, worth a PhD-kind of topic. So we all are excited about the potential. But it’s not something you can do with a committee of advisors.

Mattingly: Is it a fair observation that an important frustration for the committee has been finding an entry point into actually influencing the curriculum?

Grant: I think so.

Cyphert: Yeah. The closest we got to an entry point was to say, “You know, faculty can propose curriculum changes. Well sure. Yeah. But we’re talking about a cross-disciplinary, cross-college understanding of how to integrate discourse in with content across various areas. That’s not a simple thing to do. So curriculum-- somehow affecting the curriculum would be the obvious thing that we’re looking for, which is why we suggested something in the Provost’s Office. We’re not taking a stand on what that would look like, or what that means because who knows what it could mean.

Grant: The appendix shows too, that most of our peer institutions—most universities even of our size and stature—we’re not talking big R 1’s here, we’re talking regional public universities—they already have a concrete institutional mechanism for this. Right?

Cyphert: And they’re very different.

Grant: Yeah, they look very different, but there is usually something—some sort of purchase in this is a good-for-all, and really supporting faculty in their work.

Cutter: Yeah, I did notice that. It doesn't say it specifically in here, but what about, how do you feel about just having a University Writing Program?

Cyphert: That's one model.

Cutter: A very common model.

Cyphert: Yes, and the project two, three years ago was to look at best practices across our comp institutions—like you said, we're not looking at R 1's. We're looking at comparable institutions. And writing programs or communication programs—now many of them have switched to a communication designation—that's a pretty common model. There are resource and infrastructure issues that have to be contended with. And one of the things that we were charged for doing was to say, "What's the best version of the best practices here?" And we could see that kind of a two-tiered approach where the colleges or disciplines would have some input in what their particular type of communication needed to be, was probably more pragmatic for a school our size and for our sort of the way we run things. So, instead of having a single writing center—what I'm saying across the whole University, we would probably be better off here—and this is again guessing because we haven't tried to figure out how this would work—but to have some sort of synergy between writing resources—maybe faculty development; maybe professional development, maybe various kinds of support for disciplinary writing at the—at least at the upper levels. And that was a model that we came up with—with this kind of two-phased writing.

Grant: And to also speak to you, it was noted in the report, that Provost **Wohlpart** did send myself and Kim **Baker** off to an institute in the spring. So again, I want to keep everyone abreast. The wheels are moving, and so as we're talking, keep in mind that many of these things are in the air. There's lots actually going on.

Cutter: I was just going to say I think I've seen a lot of writing programs where it can organize whatever if you have a version of first-year comp, but also it can be a support for writing across the curriculum.

Cyphert: Or disciplinary-specific writing.

Cutter: And that's what I mean by writing across the curriculum. They can be a resource for—and they don't just have to be communication or language and literature faculty.

Cyphert: Exactly. But, recognizing that a biology professor who has no training in pedagogy might struggle to teach a course in writing. That's the issue. So it's fine to say we have discipline-specific writing needs, but that doesn't mean we have—we have some departments with very strong writing programs within the department. We have others that really don't have any internal infrastructure to do writing in their own field, although maybe there's other departments in the college where there would be some synergies. That's kind of where we left the last proposal because we recognize that even getting a map of what's available and what's out there, and what sorts of support would be needed, would be a research project that we are not in a position to take on. That was one of our resource issues. We used to all have release time for the various things that we—

the reason we got on to the committee—we basically don't have any of that anymore. So, we're just a committee now. We don't even have disciplinary jobs. I kinda sorta have one.

Mattingly: A committee with a big huge, huge charge.

Cyphert: Yes. And we're just a bunch people in our little service projects.

Grant: But we keep asking for work.

Cyphert: Yeah, we do. We keep saying, 'Yes,' when faculty chairs come and say, "Can you do this?"

Cutter: So, my other question, that I want to ask while you're still here because it to me brings up the Gen Ed committee, it seems like if you look at your figure, it seems like you're suggesting a slightly different model of looking at learning outcomes than the proposal that we're talking about with Gen Ed. I read this as suggesting that it's hard to talk about a communication learning outcome separate from critical thinking and content knowledge. Am I...

Cyphert: I think that would be true of all three, actually.

Cutter: That's what I mean.

Grant: That's not to say you can't look at it. If you look at it in that certain way, you have to understand the pros and cons. Right? What are you measuring and how are you measuring it becomes a really key question because you're probably using language to measure language, and so how you go about that becomes a dicey issue. Things like the AAUP rubrics are fine as kind of a thumbnail kind of

sketch, right? But there's nothing that says that you can't add more to that, to get a slightly different take on it that suits your purposes in your department or your curriculum. There's nothing that says that you shouldn't understand how those questions and measures came to be, and how they are done on a national kind of level. There's lots of ways in which to kind of say, "Yeah, those are good as one piece." But there's no one-size fits all here. Right? So that's going to take some collaboration and some resources.

Wohlpart: If I can just add real quickly: This is not in any kind of way at odds what Gen Ed is doing. There's nothing in the Gen Ed Proposal that says critical thinking must be separate from content.

Grant: Right.

Wohlpart: There's nothing in the Gen Ed proposal that says communication is separate from content. Those things absolutely can and should be dovetailed. I want to be real clear that this is not at odds with what the Gen Ed Committee has done. In fact, it fits very nicely.

Cyphert: In fact, the issues are the same. Whether you consider it integrated across disciplines or whatever, you would still run into the Biology department might define communication differently from Economics, or even define critical thinking differently. So then you've still got apples and oranges across disciplines, whether they're integrated or not is sort of beside the point.

Petersen: Our desire I think to invite you here at this time in particular was somewhat strategic in that we are thinking about the General Ed Revisions. Two

weeks ago we talked about the Interdisciplinary Committee, so it seems timely in that the University Writing Committee might also be re-evaluated and perhaps overlap, or there may be opportunities that emerge in the General Ed Revision work as well as the Interdisciplinary Committee work, that might get at some of these recommendations that you're putting forth.

Grant: And certainly Associate Provost **Pease** here has guided me quite well in saying get in touch with Dean **Bass** and get on the docket for the Gen Ed Revision Committee, so that's something—a further step we have yet to take. But we're excited to do that and keep the conversation going.

Petersen: Any other questions or comments? Thank you very much.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Petersen: We have five emeritus request for docketing and the Academic Freedom Policy has come back to the Senate. So I suggest that we go ahead and docket these items in a bundle. Is there a motion to docket the five emeritus requests and the Academic Freedom Policy 6.10? Thank you Senator **Burnight**. Seconded by Senator **Gould**. Is there any discussion or conversation needed? All in favor then of docketing the five emeritus requests and the Academic Freedom Policy for our meeting January 14th, please indicate by saying, 'aye.' And any opposed? And any abstentions? Excellent. The motion passes.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKET ITEMS

Petersen: We have two items for consideration today and I would like to suggest that we move the Committee on Committees Procedure Recommendations to the

head of the docket because I believe it might be a shorter conversation, and then our two guests that are here to represent those recommendations can leave. Is there a motion to move the Committee on Committees Procedure Recommendations to the head of the docket? Thank you, Senator **Zeitz**, and seconded by Senator **Neibert**. All in favor, please indicate by saying 'aye.' And any opposed? Any abstentions? Alright, the motion to move the Committee on Committees Procedure Recommendations to the head of the docket passes, so we can take that item on first, and I'll let Senator **Mattingly** as well as our two guests introduce these three recommendations.

Mattingly: There are two faculty committees that work with the Graduate College to receive our proposals for research awards, as I'm sure you all know. The PDA Committee, that is the Professional Development Assignment Committee and then also the University Research Committee, which reviews applications for summer research fellowship, or proposals for summer research fellowships. In their work with these committees, the Graduate College has, and the committees have run across some difficulties, and as a result have made some recommendations for changes to committee structure and arrangements, and they are the three changes that you see before you. The first one, involving the PDA Committee is that the terms for seats on the committee would be reduced from three to two years, and this is simply to reduce the likelihood that someone would resign their seat during their term, which has been an issue even this year. The second proposal is that the seats of the Summer Research Fellowship Committee would be elected by faculty instead of appointed by deans, which would then also be consistent with what's done with the PDA Committee as well.

The Summer Research Fellowship Committee also has two-year appointments, so that would also make both of the committees consistent as well. And then finally, item Number 3 is that when there are a great, great number of applications or proposals as there were this year, the Graduate College would like our support for bringing in some overload help to review some of those proposals and rate the proposals, so that they can spread the work around a little bit. That's my understanding. Did I miss anything?

Olivares: Well, there's another aspect to that, but our dean is here. A resignation in the last minute has happened this year. There were overwhelming resignations because people really wanted to apply for the summer fellowships. I need to reach out to the Committee on Committees for—to find another person since the funds of the summer fellowship stems from the funding of the budget that the Graduate College has. We're requesting that in a last-minute situation, our dean could be able to fill that position.

Mattingly: Also you should know that the Committee on Committees has heard these proposals and actually has voted to approve them as well. And so they are coming from the Committee on Committees to you, the Faculty Senate.

Petersen: I just want to clarify the process as well. So, our role here would be to vote to approve to recommend, and then with regard to item Number 1, that's a policy, and so we would move it through the typical policy process. With regard to Item 2, that would be a Provost approval, and Number 3 would be a recommendation that would go to the Provost as well.

Waldron: And Amy (**Petersen**) Policy 4.08 is already open—it's already in the process of being updated, and it's open for comment right now.

Mattingly: That's the PDA?

Waldron: That's the PDA, Policy 4.08, and so that's already...

Mattingly: It would have to go through again, wouldn't it? I think it would be a separate...

Wohlpart: Even if it has gone through that process, it's a non-substantive change, so I'm not sure it would need to go through that process.

Petersen: I could check with Tim **McKenna**.

Mattingly: Thank you.

Petersen: Are there questions, comments with regard to any three of these items?

Cutter: I guess I have a question about the third one. So is the—I was a little confused. Would this only be to assign administrative staff when somebody quits at the last minute, or would this be in general?

Waldron: I think there are two separate issues. So, one is that really when we reach about 60 applications for the summer fellowships, that's about the capacity of the committee without having undue burden on that particular workload. And so that's one situation. The other situation that happened particularly this year is that we had a lot of people who were on the committee, but then decided that

they wanted to apply for a summer fellowship, and so they backed out and then Gabby (**Olivares**) worked very hard with James (**Mattingly**) to find another member from that particular college, and then that happened three, four different times and then that slows up the progress of being able to review them in a timely manner, and is a lot of inefficient work for both Gabby (**Olivares**) and who's ever the Chair of the Committee on Committees in terms of finding new members. So it's two issues. I'd say probably the latter one is more likely to happen, because if you look at the number of applications we've had, we've been typically between 50 and 60, and so with the committee structure we're able to handle that. But, if it gets beyond 60, then it's a lot.

Olivares: Maybe we could rephrase the situation like this: That when there is a resignation and without a possibility of finding a college representative, then the dean could determine the next member of the committee—a unit person or someone.

Mattingly: The Committee on Committees can already under current arrangements—can already vote to approve an appointee in the meantime, so that can cover that circumstance, but it takes time to do that, and so in the meantime it would be good if you or someone else in the office that has experience can fill in in the meantime.

Olivares: So it would be some similar with the PDA because the PDA guidelines included a member that was not from the colleges, so it would be somehow similar to that.

Mattingly: So you would like to expand this proposal to include PDA proposals as well as summer research fellowship proposals?

Olivares: No.

Mattingly: No?

Olivares: Maybe I was misunderstood. The PDA composition of the committee does include a member of a non-unit, so if our dean were to appoint someone because of a resignation, it would be consistent.

Mattingly: Understood.

Olivares: It would not be dissimilar.

Mattingly: Okay.

Petersen: So, both committees then would be—would have very similar membership timeline.

Mattingly: Okay. Good.

Stollenwerk: Maybe it would help you with resignations if you were to have instead of a two-year term, a four-year term where half of them serve year 1 and 3, and the other half serve on 2 and 4.

Wohlpert: To give you a year off in between? Interesting.

Stollenwerk: Yeah. Then you can take that year off to apply because you can only apply every other—well you can only get it every other year.

Mattingly: It might be hard to recruit someone.

Nook: It's going to be hard to remember who's on it.

Petersen: I was just thinking about how you'd keep track of that. [Laughter]

Nook: It seems like we need to require anybody who gets one of these to serve on the committee the next year.

Petersen: Yes.

Wohlpart: That's actually a good idea. [Murmurs of agreement]

Mattingly: That's a good point. Do we have a motion?

Petersen: Is there a motion to approve these three items and forward these recommendations?

O'Kane: I move that we approve these three recommendations.

Petersen: Is there a second? Seconded by Senator **Burnight**. All in favor of approving these three recommendations, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Anyone opposed? Any abstentions? Excellent. The motion to approve and send these recommendations forward passes. Thank you very much.

Petersen: That brings us to the General Education Revision Consultation. I just want to begin by thanking you all for coming, and for sharing with us so much documentation and the survey results. It truly is impressive how much data and feedback you all have collected and have gone through. Again, the level of transparency, your willingness to share those results with us, the summary comments; I'm very appreciative. We'll let you get us started.

Wohlpart: Why don't you all come up? This is important conversation.

Petersen: Is there a document that you would like us to load?

Kogl: The draft of the items. I'm not going to start with that right away. I am going to...You certainly don't want to start with the big stack of survey responses. We did have to discuss whether or not to share those in their entirety. We weren't sure if people would want to read them all, but we thought, well better to share them all. People can read them if they want. People who are likely to teach in particular areas or who have an interest in particular outcomes should certainly look very closely at those comments, which is sort of the way we on the committee did it as well—reading all the comments. For the consultations with the college senates, and I won't list all of them because I think you also had that in a document with the UCC, the Library, the Advising Network, NISG, Upper Cabinet, Philosophy & World Religions: I will try to summarize the themes that leapt out at us, although I think you also have all of those notes, which I wouldn't blame you if you wouldn't want to read all of them. I would say that the themes were these: A couple of positive things—people seemed excited about an outcomes approach, which was good news for us. People seemed excited about creating something that students won't see as a hurdle. So those were unambiguously good things that we heard repeatedly. And then there were a number of questions. Some of these are just sort of neutral questions of how is this going to work? And then I'll get to some concerns after that. So there were questions about the length; about shortening it. Are we really going to make it only 36 hours? But we heard both good things and concerns about that and enthusiasm for it. So, it kind of depended on your perspective. There were folks

who thought this is going to be a way to cut staff. Or, this is going to hurt departments—which I'll get back to in a little bit. And then there were folks that said, "That's great. Students can add more majors. They add more minors. They can add certificates." So we heard feedback on both sides. We also heard repeatedly that it seems that we might be moving toward a model where there will be 6,000 different classes that will count for the LAC. What would that look like? Will that mean there's not enough of a core experience that all students share? Or, will that be good for flexibility? We also heard from majors that consider themselves 'found majors.' Will students find those majors still? How will those departments make sure that they still are teaching the students that they are teaching now? And then more kind of technical or process questions, like how will we include new courses? Or how will new courses enter this new system? How will assessment work? And then there were just a number of questions about structure and about timeline, and about how structure and outcomes and assessment all kind of go together. And we got the feeling that a lot of people would like to see a complete edifice presented. But we can't really do that. That's actually not our charge. Our charge was to start with outcomes and then do the structure, although in the timeline of doing it one at a time was something that this body approved, we suppose that we could try to do structure and outcomes at the same time. But, the committee has always been operating under the assumption that we're going to start with the outcomes as the foundation. I would say those are all questions that are not necessarily concerns. Not necessarily negative or worries. I would say for concerns, that the big ones are that people, especially in service departments, are worried that there just won't be as many demands for those department's services; that student demand for

those courses will decline, and that's a genuine concern. And that of course impacts faculty, particularly term and adjunct faculty. But not only term and adjunct faculty. So the committee—we get that. We've heard it repeatedly and we understand it. And then—I'm going to talk quickly because I know we're running out of time, so feel free to ask questions as they come up for you, or when I'm done. Whatever works. And then a couple of requests that we had: More transparency, which is partly why we said, "Please, just look at the documents if you want to see them." We're not trying to hide anything. We're only a little concerned that maybe on the survey people thought their responses were anonymous, but I guess we decided that we hadn't told them they were, so... The Supreme Court standard is a reasonable expectation of privacy. So, I guess we decided that people didn't have a reasonable expectation of privacy. So, more transparency. We've heard that, and also time for feedback was another theme we heard repeatedly, is that nobody wants to have something sprung on them. Not this body. Not the faculty as a whole. Nobody wants to be told, "So here's what we've got. You've got three days over winter break to figure out what you think about it." We get that. Some of us have been around a long time and we understand that time and timing matter, and a slow pace matters. So, those are the themes as we saw them that leapt out from our meetings with various bodies. We are still thinking about all the feedback we've gotten. We are still reflecting. It is difficult to sort through what the feedback means when you've got people saying, "This is an absolutely great idea." And on the other hand, "This is asinine. Why are you even thinking about that?"--about the same thing. So, we're having to make some judgements, and we're still thinking about it. And so, with no further ado, this is what we've got right now. Notice it says "draft" in all

caps twice because we wanted to present you with something. We have been discussing measurable outcomes for all of these, but we haven't yet narrowed down a list of measurable outcomes, which of course would be more specific than this. There's a few things we want to make really clear. I want to reiterate what Jim (**Wohlpart**) said, to clarify—in no way do we see these as stand-alone courses. In no way do we see any of these things as divorced from content. Just as an example, I can't really imagine the writing piece of communication for myself, for my own LAC class—the writing piece divorced from critical thinking, or divorced from content knowledge. It's going to look different for every class. But for us, we just needed to come down with measurable outcomes. So we have to kind of slice them up in this way, which I realize for many of us in teaching—that's a little bit artificial. Certainly for me it's a little bit artificial to think all of these would be separate, and then they'd be even more specific measurable outcomes. And there are still some areas where we are wrestling with as a committee. And if you are curious, we can talk about that. Again—not a list of courses. Not a structure, just the goals that will then define specific measurable outcomes. And then, the structure and the courses are two further steps that need to come after this. We still need to meet with the LACC. We're still willing to meet with anyone who wants to, but we also understand that we need to keep moving. So, at this point, we would like to hear what your questions and comments are. And I apologize for sending this out so late, but we were only willing to settle on a draft last week sometime.

Zeit: How are you defining quantitative reasoning?

Kogl: So, that's one of the areas that we've struggled with, because there have been some folks who think quantitative reasoning really could be part of critical thinking. It could be math. Some of us have said, "Well really the quantitative reasoning we want students to be able to do is to understand—as we happened to be discussing on our way over here—we want students to understand what does margin of error in a political poll look like? So we haven't quite figured out if that is just math. If it's math with a certain leaning toward critical thinking. Doug, do you want to say anything?"

Shaw: I would say it's definitely broader than mathematics. That it's, the way we're envisioning it—I believe we have a consensus that it's basically when you're viewing the world, there are several different approaches to it. Quantitative reasoning is scientific. Basically look at a set of data or information—how are you going to make it make sense? If I dump a 100 by 100 spread sheet on you, I could say, "Here, I've given you my data. I've done my job." But in the real world nobody does that because it's not useful. So how do you make that sort of thing make sense? I don't know if that answers your question or not.

Zeitz: But you would be using math to make sense out of it, wouldn't you?

Shaw: Because I'm a mathematician, I define math more narrowly. So, is it math if I have to decide whether or not I am going to put a whole bunch of stem and leaf plots together looking like **Tai** fighters, or if I'm going to give you a bunch of means and medians. I would say that's not actually math. I would say that's quantitative reasoning, but other people could disagree with me.

Zeitz: Okay. Sounds good.

Cutter: I think one of the things that gets a little confusing is that critical thinking is very general as a concept, but then you have things like ethical reasoning, quantitative reasoning, that seem like they're not discipline-specific, but sort of more area-specific versions of it. So it seems like in one place it's a sort of generic critical thinking, and in other places it's a specific-type.

Kogl: Yes. And I would say that figuring out the outcomes for critical thinking is one of the major areas that we still need to figure out. We're still talking. Just at our last meeting—we were still trying to figure out—are we really talking about problem solving when we say critical thinking? So what we actually decide on to present you with for the outcomes for critical thinking will really matter. Yeah. I think the way some of us are thinking of critical thinking is its logic, it's analysis. It might even involve information literacy, and I think we wanted ethical reasoning in there to bring more normative perspectives in. Critical thinking needs to be certainly specified much more carefully than that. The challenge with critical thinking is that it so different in different fields and in different areas. So using evidence effectively might be really an important piece of it. Certainly, I don't think any of us want to reduce it to logic, but yeah, I agree with you.

Shaw: Just to reiterate, it's not like we're going to have—This is not a list of the seven courses that will be the LAC. So, it isn't like we're thinking, "That will be one course in critical thinking. This is what it covers." Critical thinking, I would say was the number one when we did get the feedback—I think that's the one thing everybody agreed on. The two things that people agreed on were critical thinking and communication.

Nook: Unless you ask them to define it, right? [Laughter]

Kogl: Yes. Although communication is relatively—there's more of a consensus, but critical thinking means so many different things.

Shaw: But I would say there is an intersection there. I don't think people are that far apart on the definition.

Nook: Definitions really come about when you get these learning outcomes specified, right? That's when the definitions become evident?

Kogl: Yeah.

Fritch: Other questions or thoughts about the categories?

Zeitz: Is your charge to do the learning outcomes, or just the goals? How are you even going to begin with that? That seems huge.

Kogl: Well, we've already been trying to do it. So we had three subcommittees that met that came up with really similar lists of these goals, and the outcomes were a little bit more different, but at least the goals were kind of similar.

Zeitz: Are you going to be referencing multiple standards out there that do these sorts of things? Are you going to be referencing those to try to get ideas?

Kogl: Yes, We've looked at best practices and we've looked at the AAC&U rubrics which are great for some of these and pretty terrible for others. They're not as useful for others. So, ultimately there too, we'll be making judgements, and also

turning to the survey. For example, for #4, which is the area that I personally teach in, or I'd like to think I teach in #3 and #5 and several of them, and #1—it was very, very clear that many people thought diversity was extremely important, but it seemed like an equal number of people thought this is just politically correct left-wing, trendy sort of jargon. So that's one where we have to do some careful thinking and make some careful judgements as well as referring to the research that we've already been doing.

Mattingly: Are there any of these that surprise you, or anything that surprised you about what the faculty would support as being your goal areas relative to what the committee had been thinking?

Kogl: Not me personally. When we called #5 ethics, which was a little bit of a glitch—I'm not sure how that happened, but we certainly learned that it was not wise to call it ethics, because people thought it meant professional ethics, and so they were so like, "If you're not in a certain field that has a code of ethics, then that doesn't matter." So that was a little bit surprising, but it was more surprising in the nature of miscommunication. I personally didn't anticipate. I certainly thought that there would be conflict around diversity and how to think about it. And honestly, I'm still—once some version of this makes it out to the faculty and there's something related to diversity or inclusion in it, I have a feeling that there could be some conflict, but I guess that's not a surprise.

Shaw: I was surprised—and again I'm not speaking for the committee, but for myself, I was surprised that—I thought there would be more resistance to change in principal than there was.

O’Kane: I agree.

Shaw: I think the cause of that, and once again this isn’t scientific, but the cause of that is how eloquent I was when [Laughter] I ...

Kogl: You did say, “Mom and dad are making us.”

Shaw: But that was something that surprised me. I thought there would be a lot more resistance just to the whole project in principal than it turned out there was when we spoke to our constituent groups.

Koch: Was there any surprises or—your comments about the groupings that was available at the end of the survey? I found that interesting to put the different things...or was that just another mess?

Shaw: Yes.

Kogl: Yes, because there are so many ways that so many of these overlap. As Barbara (**Cutter**) said—yeah, and we’re still having conversations about is creativity really a kind of problem solving? Is it all critical thinking, right? So there weren’t so much surprises as there were, “That’s a really good idea.” “Oh, but so is that.” It was interesting to see the way people saw them connecting. Maybe not surprising.

Fritch: I also thought some of those got more to the notion of structure often. Like, “Here are classes that could really do this.” So I think that’s where we’ll go back to those and at that point go, “How do these play out in the structure; things that fit together?”

Koch: The Longwood article I thought was pretty interesting. They've taken six years to revamp. They certainly have patience or the resources to do that. And their ability to listen to skeptics, but not cynics.

Kogl: And knowing the difference.

Koch: Cynics just want to put sand in the gears for the fun of it.

Kogl: Yeah. Actually, that's a surprise. I think we might have anticipated more ire or hostility. I think maybe because we haven't presented anything very concrete yet, we haven't had any mud slung at us. But maybe I'm being cynical in anticipating that. My college senate was probably the roughest of the various meetings that I went to. I'm in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. We teach kind of a lot of these classes, and there were some tough questions, but not real cynicism which was a little surprising.

Morgan: In a couple of bodies, we got the feedback even though Doug (**Shaw**) eloquently told us about mommy and daddy—quit selling it for that, and try to sell it in, “Don't you want to be excited about what you're teaching to college freshmen?”

Wohlpart: Don't you want freshmen to be excited about what they're taking?

Petersen: What are your next steps?

Kogl: We have to decide on actual outcomes. I didn't mention the Mission Statement at all. We have been kind of...The Mission Statement is the place we put the stuff we can't measure. Which is not to say it's unimportant, because

obviously things we can't measure can be extremely important—so we have to do that. But I think actually agreeing on some outcomes. And we're going to have—I think we're going to have some challenging conversations around what I think of as the content question. So, if you look at this list, you'll see the human world and the natural world, which implies some content in the humanities and social sciences and natural sciences. And how does one specify content that's general enough that it's measurable at the level of the entire LAC? So, that's why civic competence is in #4, is that some of us thought—okay it was mostly me—I'm the political scientist on the committee, but some of us thought that might be a way to frame some content in the humanities and social sciences. But every time I say that I apologize and I say, "Full disclosure. I'm a political scientist, so of course that's what I'm going to argue for." But that's really, as John (**Fritch**) has said a couple of times, these things are not all alike. Some of them are more like fruit and some of them are more like fish—I think was the analogy. And so we need to make them all recognizable as food. [Laughter]

Fritch: She took my analogy and ran with it.

Kogl: So that's going to be I think a deep and challenging conversation that we really have to have. The other thing I think which is more of an institutions perspective on this is that we are trying to think about how will rubrics to measure—this goes back to the outcomes question that Leigh (**Zeitz**) asked—how will we actually measure the outcomes? So that entails coming up with rubrics. Well who should come up with the rubrics? Should it be our committee? Not just are we going to be tired, but also it should maybe be the faculty that teach in those areas. So that's going to be an issue. Are there ways to build flexibility into

this, so that the rubrics can change so that even outcomes maybe—there's a process for outcomes changing that don't require this process of completely... As one of my colleagues in my college said, "completely demolishing" what we've got. So is there a way to build in a process for...

Wohlpart: Refreshment?

Kogl: Refreshment. That's a nice word for it.

Fritch: Our goal still remains to get the outcomes to you early in the spring semester and still to have a structure ready by the end of the spring semester.

Morgan: And from a pragmatic level, we realize the conversation probably didn't move fast enough this fall in our committee, so now we're meeting every week, including every other Friday at 8 a.m.

Fritch: And every other Friday...

Morgan: Yeah and every other Friday like at 2 or 3 p.m.

Wohlpart: Have you all talked about a philosophical framework for the Gen Ed program?

Fritch: What do you mean by that?

Wohlpart: That's one of the things the HLC requires is that every Gen Ed program is contextualized around a philosophical frame

.

Morgan: Is this different than the mission statement, Jim (**Wohlpart**)?

Wohlpart: It probably would be something broader and bigger, and I would not ask you all to spend time on that, but that is something that we should come back to. It can be a much broader context, and generally it is a context that states as strongly as possible the value of a liberal arts education. And so that's something that we can work on later. But that is something we need to do for HLC.

Nook: One of the ways to think about this is what's the purpose of Gen Ed/LAC? Why do we have it in the first place, right? One of the things that faculty at universities often get caught up in is, "We know we need it." But they never take the time to articulate why they need it. It's a given, right? Your 18-year old doesn't know that. Their parents don't know that. Just creating a purpose statement of that context that's maybe like a Mission Statement, but broader also helps everybody get some buy-in around it. Right? You can if you get it constructed in a way that everybody buys in, get away from this comment that you need to take this class to "get it out of the way," because it's in the LAC or the Gen Ed. Right? You can actually get faculty to talk about the purpose—oh this fits in this way. But many of the universities I've looked at don't—they never talk about a purpose; they never have sort of one over-arching outcome. What do you really want to come out of a general education—a liberal arts education? So, writing a purpose statement or one over-arching outcome that is big, is often very helpful.

Kogl: I think that would be for us. I think we've had conversations that point toward that. I think some of those conversations have been one-on-one or in subcommittees, but I think those of us that are on the committee are mostly

there because we have pretty strong philosophical senses of why it matters. But getting us all to come up with a statement...

Fritch: So one of the things we've talked about with that is to try to develop language that people can use in those situations. The other thing we talked about way at the beginning is once the structure starts to become apparent, to even invite the students to try and help provide a name for structure; to help identify part of that purpose; to get more of their understanding and involvement in what it is; what it would look like. Some schools have done this already. Some of them are better than others at doing that, but I think that's one of the things we've talked about—to try to get the students to understand the change, and almost some branding and marketing of it from their perspective.

Nook: You probably ought to take a look at purpose before we get too far down the goals.

Wohlpart: Part of what you all have been doing is a whole lot of reading. You all have a philosophical framework within which you've been operating. You just need to step back and catch your breath.

Petersen: Any other comments or questions? Thank you so much and for all the hard work.

Kogl: Thank you for having us again.

Petersen: That brings us to the end of our meeting. Is there a motion to adjourn? Thank you Senator **Zeitz**, and second Senator **Gould**. All in favor of adjournment?

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Sundstedt
Transcriptionist & Administrative Assistant
Faculty Senate
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

Next Meeting:

3:30 p.m. January 14, 2019
301 Rod Library (Scholar Space)
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa