

**Minutes of the University Faculty Senate  
14 October 2019**

**Senators in attendance were:** James Mattingly (Chair), John Burnight (Vice-Chair), Amy Petersen (Former Chair), Gretchen Gould (Secretary), Barbara Cutter (Chair of the Faculty), Imam Alam, Megan Balong, Kenneth Hall, Thomas Hesse, Donna Hoffman, Charles Holcombe, Syed Kirmani, William Koch, Amanda McCandless, Qingli Meng, Mark Sherrard, Nicole Skaar, Andrew Stollenwerk, and Shahram Varzavand.

**Guests in attendance were:** Mark Nook (President), Jim Wohlpart (Provost), Patrick Pease (Associate Provost), Becky Hawbaker (United Faculty President), Jacob Levang (Student Government President), Ana Kogl (Co-Chair, General Education Revision Committee), Joyce Morrow (Registrar), Brenda Bass (Co-Chair, General Education Revision Committee).

[00:02:12] James Mattingly: Good afternoon. We'll go ahead and get started. I'll call the meeting to order. Are there any press in the room? I don't see any, I don't think there are any. We'll assume there are none. I would like to introduce our guest. I believe we only have one, unless I'm missing someone. Ana, could you let people know who you are?

[00:02:36] Ana Kogl: I'm Ana Kogl. I'm from the Department of Political Science, but I'm here in my capacity as the co-chair of the general education revision committee.

[00:02:45] James Mattingly: Great, thank you. And if you want to make your way to this chair next to Patrick at some point, that would be great. Okay, good. Now, we have courtesy announcements. We'll begin with President Nook.

[00:03:01] Mark Nook: Well, thank you. I have something else I have to get to after this. So, when I finish my remarks and it's clear that we're moving on, I'll step out but I have something sort of big to talk about. We've been working with DMACC on a relationship, the Des Moines Area Community College for a little over a year, and we've talked with faculty leadership about this off and on.

But, we're getting to the point where we've got an agreement worked out, and that will be going to the board of regents, and it will become public. So, I want to make sure the Senate knows about it before it just pops up out there in the public space. But, getting to this point has been -- taken a lot of work back and forth behind the scenes.

Over a year ago, probably about a year and a half ago, the president at DMACC approached me about an opportunity. They wanted us to bring an academic program down to DMACC, and cite it at DMACC, and in particular, what they were looking for was our teacher development program. So, Jim and I worked with teacher development and it became obvious, pretty quickly, that that wasn't going to work out and that it would probably damage what we were doing with our two plus two cooperative arrangement with DMACC at Boone.

And so we said, "Not interested." We continued to work with them and we've worked out, now, what we think is a viable plan. What is really going on kind of behind this is DMACC, at their urban campus, is building a new building there, and the DMACC urban campus is growing. It's unique in that it is now 52%, 55% minority students. It's the first majority minority campus in the state of Iowa. The average age of the students are 28, so it's a very diverse, in a lot of ways, region.

The urban campus is located just north of I-235 in the downtown Des Moines area. If you're familiar, it's just north of Mercy Hospital. Excuse me, not north. West of Mercy Hospital. It's to the east of Drake by several blocks, but it's right in that quarter where you turn off to go to the capital or the downtown business district.

In building this building, what they'd like us to do is help them pay for it with private funds. And the foundation board's on board. They think this will be great. They like this because it's an opportunity for us to increase and have an ability to reach out to donors in the Des Moines area that might not otherwise be interested in us.

In return for us helping DMACC build this building, they're going to guarantee us space for 20 years at the site, up to 10,000 square feet, something like that. They're actually building two buildings. One is mostly classrooms, the science labs, those sorts of things, and another one will have classrooms on the first floor and residential space above it. And we'll have access to space in either of those buildings and any other building on their campus. They'll have to work out exactly where we're sited.

But, we've got space, we've got a place. The question is how will we use it. What we've set up is, initially, what we'll do is site someone down there from continuing education that will help us recruit into and manage students who are interested in our bachelor's of liberal studies program. I say program because it's a degree but it's not a major.

The BLS, for those that aren't as familiar with it, it's set up as a two plus two program. You have to have your two-year degree done and be coming in with it, and then you complete two more years. It's very flexible in that the student can kind of create their major within sort of some broad -- create their academic program within some broad guidelines. They have to take, at least, I think, it's 12 credits in three out of five academic areas, broadly-defined academic areas. They have to complete at least 30 of the credits with us. I think at least 45 of the credits have to be at the upper division. But, they can continue to take credits from other institutions and transfer them in. They can take all these courses online from us. There are plenty of courses so that they can complete a BLS from us completely online.

This option already exists for all the students in Des Moines. What will be different is to site somebody on their campus to help recruit into this and to help them with the transition issues that always come up, "How do I get signed up for classes, how does financial aid work, how do I get ahold of a tutor? I have to take an exam. How do I go about doing that?" It's also the opportunity, then, for this person, if they know that there are five or six students in this and taking the same class at a time, to pull them together into study groups, to pull them together for when they do need to take an exam and monitor that exam, those sorts of things.

So, it is a unique opportunity for us to get a footprint in Des Moines. DMACC is going to label the building "UNI at DMACC." It will be a partnership. It will be in their literature. We will have a group of students, especially on the urban campus, that we can recruit on, more or less, a daily basis from the

first day they get there. There's some discussions about whether or not we would actually recruit students before they get -- help DMACC recruit students before they get to DMACC.

Many of these students are place-bound. They're not coming here out of the urban campus. When we look at the students that come to us from DMACC, urban isn't where they're coming from. It's Ankeny, it's Boone, but especially Ankeny. This person, however though, isn't walled in to just urban. They can certainly go up to Ankeny, spend a day at Ankeny on that campus, recruiting students talking to them not just about the BLS, but how to transfer to UNI, courses that are available here, programs that are available here so they can be a recruiter for us. They could help students with the issues of actually transferring up here. "What's the financial aid going to be like, what scholarships are available, who do I need to talk to if I'm interested in this major or that major?"

We have an opportunity to add, if we see this thing is working, other positions down there. So, at some point, maybe we have a full-time financial aid office/admissions person down there as well as this coordinator of the BLS, it's a place where we currently have a person that works down there with all of our student teachers. It's a place they can office if they wanted to. We've got a full-time development officer that lives in Des Moines. It's a place -- they work out of their house now. It's a place they could office as well.

So, there's a lot of opportunities. There's no general fund money involved in this. It's a continuing ed operation. The funding for the building will all be raised privately. Already spoken to donors in the Des Moines area and they think that 2.5 million we have to raise is easy. Not a problem at all for this kind of a project. I trust them. I think it has got to be really easy to raise this 2.5.

And we get access, then, for at least 20 years. Until we get more than 80 students, we don't pay anything for the space, not even maintenance, not even maintenance. They'll clean it. DMACC's very interested in partnering with us, finding ways that their faculty might be able to be involved, ways their staff could help us support these students, opening their tutoring labs, all of that to us and to these students as they transfer from being DMACC students into being students -- really, UNI students taking our BLS.

The one question that comes up from time to time, it came up when I was meeting with faculty leadership is is there a plan, long-term, to actually site a program there? There's not a plan. There is, clearly, an opportunity if we want it, and if it looks like the BLS is leading us down that direction. That's a much bigger question. That has to be generated from faculty. It has to move through our faculty process, which would include the senate processes. It'd have to go to the board of regents, and it would have to be approved by the HLC.

Our BLS is already out there, it's already operating, and it's not actually physically offered at that site. It's largely still an online program. Students in this, though, could come up here and take a class. They could take a class from Drake, or Grand View, or any institution and transfer it in as part of this, and some students do that. So, there's lots of opportunities for us to kind of get an idea of how this might work, how things in Des Moines would go, give us an opportunity to better reach the Des Moines market and recruiting high school students as well as transfer students from DMACC.

As I said, the agreement, it's an MOU, will be on the board of regents agenda in November the 13th, I think, is when it's voted on. So, the time it will be there. So, with that, I'm going to stop and let you ask me questions. Yes?

[00:13:13] Tom Hesse: What would be the completion date for the building?

[00:13:16] Mark Nook: It's about two years out, but we can put somebody down there starting January if we want to. They want to break ground this spring. They may have already had their official groundbreaking. I'm going to think about that a little bit, but yeah. They don't need legislative support for the building. They'll do this off of bonds. They're a lot different than we are in the way they fund their buildings and things. So, they have access to [mill levees? [00:13:48] and things of that sort that we don't.

[00:13:59] James Mattingly: Are there other questions? I think the president has a little more time.

[00:14:02] Mark Nook: I do, and I seldom leave groups this speechless, especially this group.

[00:14:11] James Mattingly: Senator Kirmani?

[00:14:11] Syed Kirmani: Yeah, I think this is a very good development, and it has a lot of prospects of expanding, and it should also help students on this campus to obtain internships and other things in the Des Moines area.

[00:14:27] Mark Nook: Correct.

[00:14:27] Syed Kirmani: And maybe, later on, we can start executive MBA programs in the Des Moines area. There's definitely a score for that analysis, and data science courses at Des Moines that campaigns are needing that. So, I think there's a lot of potential here. I think it's a very good development.

[00:14:48] Mark Nook: There's a couple things about this that the one question that a couple people have asked me is about, "Gee, is this the right time, given what Iowa went through with AIB?" and I think we need to be cognizant of the differences. AIB was a campus in a pretty bad location, and it was also an empty set of buildings where a school had already failed. By partnering with DMACC, we've got a large number of students already there, and they're students ready to transition into this particular program.

So, we've got a pretty good feed here. It's a lot different than what was done with AIB. Graduate programs, on-site programs, we're going to have to think a lot about that, and what that means, and how we would -- what do the departments look like? Are those people still members of the department here or does this become a separate department? There's just a lot of things that have to be looked at.

This does give us access to the market, first of all. It helps us, I think -- I think we can grow our BLS this way. How much, we'll see. It does give us the opportunity to -- we know we've got an admissions officer now that works the Des Moines market. Almost exclusively, it's Polk and Dallas county. This would give them an opportunity to have an office down there full time and not have to kind of work out of their car or whatever corner closet one of the schools gives them.

The possibility that we could actually make this their work site location so that they might choose to live in Des Moines and be there full-time and have more opportunity to be out in the schools than living here and driving down there, staying in a hotel a night, and then coming back, but just permanently live down there and work sort of central Iowa, Des Moines aims those areas.

So, some opportunities besides just the BLS open up with this sort of arrangement. Plus, I think it gives us a lot more -- a lot better way to reach into that Ankeny campus as well and recruit students who will actually transfer here from that market.

[00:16:59] Jacob Levang: This is an SG President, Jake Levang. So, first and foremost, I grew up on the same street as AIB, so I know about that disaster, and I think you're very right in the fact that school is already failing and they tried to come and fix it. But, going into a school, and I've shared this information many times, but I went to a class of 425, and only seven kids only came to UNI. Many low-income, many students of color, but about 40 to 50 went to DMACC because it was right down the road, it was cheap, and they could live at home with their parents.

But, when they're looking to transfer, I've not seen anyone transfer to UNI. So, I think this is a huge opportunity to get some of those students, especially diverse students, students from different backgrounds that come to UNI. So, I applaud that. But, I will ask, though, my question is, essentially, when is this information going to be public to students and I'm just thinking about how students will think about this, studying in a new campus and how that might impact things.

[00:18:00] Mark Nook: What we know is that about a week before the regents' meeting, the MLU will appear on their docket. We want to hold an official announcement sometime -- and this is going to sound stupid, either before or after that. What we haven't worked out with DMACC and the board of regents is whether it can be before or not. We put the board in a very odd situation. If we have a formal announcement, and cameras are rolling, and the Des Moines Register writes an article, and then they have to vote on it.

So, this is one that's going to kind of slip out of the bag, and there isn't any way kind of around that because it has to be on the board docket. There'll be an MLU there, whether anybody really sees it and says, "What's really going on?" we don't know. We certainly want to do a big sort of event around this in Des Moines, because it's in Des Moines that we will get the most press coverage. We'll get the most bang out of the announcement.

And most of the people that are going to be affected and look to this will be Des Moines area residents. So, it's a way to get it in the register to get it on WHL, and KCCI, and those sorts of things. So, we want to do it there. The only question is, exactly, when can we do that? And I'm hoping to hear tomorrow about whether it's before or we have to wait until after. Sometime in November, before Thanksgiving, I would say, we'll do something, for sure. Other questions or comments? If not, thank you, and we'll keep you posted on how things go with the board. Thanks very much. Yeah, thanks.

[00:20:08] James Mattingly: Next is Provost Wohlpart.

[00:20:10] Jim Wohlpart: I yield my time to the president. No comments.

[00:20:14] James Mattingly: Thank you. Faculty Chair Cutter, any comments?

[00:20:18] Barbara Cutter: Just a very brief one. So, I just want to say thank you to everyone here and who reads the minutes who came to the fall faculty meeting, which was quite successful. The vote to amend the constitution to extend faculty voting rights passed overwhelmingly. We needed a two-thirds majority, and we got much more than that, so much more that I didn't have to calculate the fraction.

So, anyway, what this means is, starting with the spring roster, the term, term renewable, and some adjunct faculty, the ones who meet the requirements of the halftime remorph or six out of the preceding eight semesters will be voting faculty. And we have ways to determine everyone who we think should be voting faculty, but I just want to make sure everyone knows that when a draft of the spring roster comes out, I'll be sending out an email with some of the details. We'll try to get everyone, but we may miss somebody, and then please let me know if this happens.

So, it's a new process, so I'm sure there will be a few bumps, but it's an exciting expansion of voting. And please let me know if you have any questions, and if you have any now, you can ask them now, or email.

[00:22:05] James Mattingly: Are there any questions for Faculty Chair Cutter? Or comments? Okay. United Faculty President Hawbaker, any comments today?

[00:22:23] Becky Hawbaker: Yes, just a few. So, as one of your faculty representatives to the university benefits committee, I just wanted to share a few quick things about that and to also make the observation that this committee, to me, encapsulates something we're on the right track about, that this is pulling together a diverse group of staff and many employee groups to transparently look at data about our benefit usage, our costs, our revenues, our usage, how we can contain costs, and working together for the benefit of everyone, and trying to figure out how we can avoid major increases in the future.

I'm happy to report we do continue to have a healthy reserve, and that will help us in moving forward, but our costs do continue to rise, and some things that all of us can do to help contain those are some simple things that we've talked about before about remembering that the emergency room is for emergencies and urgent care is for when you need something like after business hours, that we should all get our flu shots and do things like go to the doctor for preventative care, including dental care and just for the benefit of all of you, I made a dentist appointment to make sure, because there are important health things you can catch that way.

Thanks to everyone who went to the wellness fair, and I'm also letting you know that the open enrollment period is coming up. So, that's November 1st to the 30th, so watch for more information. The rates and the premiums will be announced at that time. I don't anticipate -- we've worked really hard to try to avoid any major increases. I'm not allowed to say anything about anything specific, but it's very modest. How about that?

So, open enrollment is that's when you can make changes to the two health insurance policies that we have, so you can kind of right-size that policy to what you need, and if you'd like me or anyone else to sit down with you and try to decide that, also there'll be workshops that HR puts on. But, most importantly, you need to re-enroll in your flexible spending, so if you're not already doing that for your unreimbursed medical expenses or childcare, you have to re-enroll in that every year.

So, all of that, again, is something I feel like we're on the right track with. But, as I was listening to and marveling about some of the really nice benefits we have as faculty, I was juxtaposing that with the recent announcement about the counseling center policy change for students. And I just want to add my voice to those who have already voiced concerns about cutting or limiting the number of visits to five before forcing students to try to bill that to insurance, because as we all know, there are students on our campus that do not have insurance or who have complicated family situations that make it difficult for

them to ask their families to cover, or to reveal things for their family, or to put that into place. And those are our neediest and most vulnerable and most diverse students.

So, as we talk about diversity and inclusion, talk about reaching out to other parts of the state, I want to voice that those needy students, we need to have a process so uninsured students can seek a waiver of some sort, that we need to make counseling accessible for all of our students. Not only for them, but also for the impact on all of us. Because, as we know, I know that all of you get the overflow, and when we have students that are crying in our office, and we see the mental health issue right in our classrooms. So, for the good of the cause, and if there might be something that we could do as a senate, in that regard.

[00:26:13] James Mattingly: Jacob Levang.

[00:26:15] Jacob Levang: I just want to add on to that, I completely agree. This is issues I've heard from several students and a huge concern to campus right now, and we're trying to have several meetings to combat that. So, in the gaps that we found that might help, a few things. One, there's a new training out, a mental health ally training where you can learn how to be an ally to those struggling with mental health. Brian Nissen just developed that.

We're going to work with Provost Wohlpert and get an email sent out here soon. We're going to the training ourselves first to get a feeling of what it's like and seeing how that will benefit faculty. I would encourage you all to be some of the leaders and sign up for that training. If you just look up UNI Mental Health Ally, there's links to sign up for times there. There's a part 1 and a part 2.

I think, overall, it takes about three hours. But, just knowing how to talk to a student who is struggling with mental health is key and amazing. A little language, little words can be life-changing to a person, and I know how much some students look up to faculty such as yourselves, and they'll be the first people that they want to talk to is you.

So, that's one place I would look at right now. Outside of that, another one I don't think a lot of students really seem to recognize is about 10% of our students see the mental health center at some point. So, about a thousand-plus students every year. But, only 1.8% of students on campus, about 150, 180 will receive an accommodation in their classrooms.

So, there's a gap right now between the amount of students that are going to the counseling center receiving mental health treatment and then getting an absence accommodation or a test accommodation through student accessibility services. Students remembering that resource is available for students not only for physical health, but for mental health as well is something that I think you can pass on in that we're trying to change the notion about -- but, I definitely agree with you that something needs to be done, but these are things that we're trying to work on in the meantime.

[00:28:13] James Mattingly: Thank you, Jacob. Very well said. Okay, this is Chair Mattingly again, and I actually do have a couple of announcements of my own today. First, the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence is coming up, and we are going to need a faculty senate representative on that committee. It doesn't start meeting until February. It will meet this spring. I don't know how many meetings it usually takes to determine that.

[00:28:43] Barbara Cutter: Chair Cutter. One meeting.

[00:28:45] James Mattingly: One meeting? Okay.

[00:28:46] Barbara Cutter: And it's a really fun committee.

[00:28:49] James Mattingly: That's what I've heard. So, we will need a representative for that one meeting from the senate. So, whoever would like to volunteer, please contact Vice Chair Burnight to get signed up for that, and we would both appreciate that very much.

My second announcement has to do with the disposition of senate calendar items. There are -- for anything that's on the calendar, we actually have alternatives to docketing those items. Not everything, necessarily, needs to go to the docket. It almost always does. There are some alternatives. We can, instead of putting something on the docket, if we don't think it's ready to be heard, or if we think somebody else needs to hear it, we can refer those items to a standing committee to the appropriate officer of administration, or we can set up an ad hoc committee to find out facts, to do some background work, and then to make the recommendation to us so things can be referred to other parties.

We can also return a petition to other parties. We can return it back to the petitioner asking that there be a more concrete proposal for action, that there be better evidence or documentation attached to it, or we can even tell a petitioner this isn't something that the senate would like to hear at this time. So, we can refer things instead of docketing them. We can return them to petitioners.

And then there's the catch-all other category. We can decide some other alternative approach to a particular petition. And as you can see, even if we're going to docket something, the norm would be to docket any resolution in regular order. But sometimes we will put something at the head of the docket. For example, that's what we've been doing with curriculum items. We docket them at the head of the docket, or for a different date and time, for another meeting that may not necessarily be the next meeting for whatever reason.

The person, the petitioner can only be here at a certain time, or date, or whatever. So, I just wanted you to feel empowered to know that there are other things that we can do with petitions than docket them. Now, this is something that we meet between every other Monday between senate meetings, and we send things back and we refer things if we need to. So, we try to do this for you, but if I bring something to the calendar and you think it doesn't belong there, you should feel empowered to say so.

Are there any questions or comments about that? Does anyone want to volunteer right away for the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence committee? It's one meeting, and I hear it's really fun. Okay, then we'll move on to approving the minutes. We've had another guest join us. Joyce, would you like to announce your --?

[00:32:41] Joyce Morrow: Joyce Morrow, university registrar. I'm not with the press.

[00:32:45] James Mattingly: Thank you. Okay, so the minutes from September 23, 2019, not 2018, as I've been told. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Senator Skaar? Second? Is there a second? Senator Burnight. Vice Chair Burnight, excuse me. Are there any changes to the minutes? I've got them here ready to mark them up. No changes. We must have done a really good job. Okay, so then is there a -- I guess I'll take a vote then. All in favor of approving, of accepting the minutes, say aye.



[00:33:41] Aye.

[00:33:42] James Mattingly: Opposed? Same sign? And any abstaining? Okay, then the motion is passed. The minutes are accepted. Our first calendar item is the consultation for senate feedback on the academic positioning initiative. That's something that Patrick Pease is bringing forward. Would you like to say a few words about that?

[00:34:16] Patrick Pease: Sure, this is the process that I'm sure you've all heard about. We've gone through a series of consultations. The document that's being docketed is the byproduct of three retreats that were held through the spring semester and into the end of the summer. Some of the folks in here were actually in a couple of those retreats. So, we've crafted what we think from hearing, and the document, we started the document for the retreat and evolved each time afterwards, really trying to incorporate what we've heard from the campus community.

This has also been reviewed by dean's council, it's been reviewed by faculty leadership, and in each of those cases, additional edits and revisions were made. So, what we think what we have here is pretty close to a final document ready to launch. What we like to do is start this process a little bit later this fall with something of a kickoff and get going with some of the preliminary work of staffing some of the committee structures and things that need to get started. So, it's really...we see this as a last consultation before we launch it out and really start the work of the process.

[00:35:31] James Mattingly: Thank you.

[00:35:32] Patrick Pease: So, this document largely lays out the goals and some of the ground rules associated with the work.

[00:35:40] James Mattingly: Is there a motion to move this item to the docket?

[00:35:45] Syed Kirmani: So moved.

[00:35:46] James Mattingly: Thank you, Senator Kirmani. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator Skaar. Does it require any conversation? Does anyone have a question or a comment? Of course, we will discuss it when it comes to docket. Okay, then I'll take a vote. All in favor of putting item 1471, the consultation for the academic positioning initiative onto the docket, please say aye.

[00:36:22] Aye.

[00:36:24] James Mattingly: Any opposed? Any abstaining? The motion passes. Item 1471 will go to the docket. Calendar item 1472 are the college of social and behavioral sciences curriculum changes. Is there a motion to put these on the docket at the top of the order?

[00:36:54] Donna Hoffman: So moved.

[00:36:56] James Mattingly: Senator Hoffman. Is there a second? Senator Holcombe, thank you. Does this require any conversation or discussion? You did receive an update from me. There was a clerical error. One item has been added. If there's no discussion required, there are no questions or comments, I will take a vote. All in favor of moving this item to the top of the docket, please say aye.

[00:37:34] Aye.

[00:37:35] James Mattingly: Any opposed or abstaining? The motion has passed. 1472 will move to the top of the docket for next time. Item 1473 is an emeritus request for Charlotte Wells in the history department. Is there a motion to put that item on the docket?

[00:37:58] Charles Holcombe: So moved.

[00:37:59] James Mattingly: Senator Holcombe, thank you. A second? Senator Koch, thank you. Is there any discussion required about this? Then, I will call the vote. All in favor of putting item 1473 on the docket, please say aye.

[00:38:20] Aye.

[00:38:21] James Mattingly: Are there any opposed? Or abstaining? The motion is passed. Item 1473 goes onto the docket. Item 1474 is an update from the EPC, a consultation from the EPC on the scholarly misconduct policy that we referred to them about this time last year, and they'd like to tell us where they are with that and about some new developments. Is there a motion to put that item on the docket? Senator Burnight. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator Balong. Is there any discussion required before we put the item on the docket? Then, I'll call a vote. All those in favor of docketing the EPC update, item 1474, please say aye.

[00:39:36] Aye.

[00:39:38] James Mattingly: Any opposed? And any abstaining? The vote passes. Item 1474 is on the docket. We have two items on today's docket. The curriculum changes proposed for the college of business administration and the consultation from the Gen Ed revision committee. Is there a motion to approve the CBA curriculum changes on docketed item 1348?

[00:40:16] Syed Kirmani: So moved.

[00:40:17] James Mattingly: Thank you, Senator Kirmani. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator Alam. What discussion is required on this before we vote? Anyone have any questions for the UCC on what you saw on the package before you can vote? Is there anything you wanted to say about these? They look pretty straightforward.

[00:40:54] Patrick Pease: This is Patrick Pease. This was a pretty straightforward package. There was nothing particularly noteworthy in here other than the change itself. There's a couple new programs. Those are certificate programs, fairly typical edits and new courses, deleted courses, and there really is nothing in this package that stands out as unusual or noteworthy. They're all excellent changes by [00:41:18] administration, but nothing out of the ordinary.

[00:41:27] James Mattingly: There's not too much here. It's nothing like the COE, the college of education package this year.

[00:41:32] Patrick Pease: No, UCC usually starts with CBA because it's short and it's clean. So, it's a nice way to get the semester started.

[00:41:39] James Mattingly: Okay, okay. Alright.

[00:41:45] Barbara Cutter: I guess I do have sort of an informational question. I was wondering about the new certificates. Has there been any conversation about when things are certificates and when things are minors, and does that relate to length? Because, I thought that a 1920 credit item could be a minor if people wanted it to be a minor.

[00:42:12] James Mattingly: And this is Barbara Cutter.

[00:42:13] Barbara Cutter: Sorry.

[00:42:14] Patrick Pease: Yeah, that discussion has come up. Although, I cannot recall that was with this particular certificate or not. But, minors are fine by length. Certificates are only defined in the curriculum handbook as the language is generally shorter than a minor. And so, it's not -- they're actually not very well-defined. There's a little bit of a misnomer that exists on campus, and in UCC meetings we try to let programs know in case they're unaware. But, there seems to be a belief that it's easier to create a certificate than it is to create a minor, but the process is exactly the same. There's no difference between those two, and so, really, there functionally isn't any difference between them.

A couple of years ago, the registrar's office started tracking certificates as well, so there's not that much of a difference between those. And you're right, at 19 hours, you could start looking at a minor. Programs want certificates for various reasons though, and that's, speaking for these in particular, I'm not sure what the rationale was. I think we did actually bring this up with this group and they wanted them to be certificates. They wanted the professional certification rather than a minor. But, generally certificates are most programs come in around 15 hours per certificate.

[00:43:39] James Mattingly: Are there other questions? Thank you, Chair Cutter, for that question. Then, I'll call the vote to accept the CBA curriculum changes. All of those in favor, please say aye.

[00:44:02] Aye.

[00:44:03] James Mattingly: Are there any opposed? And any abstaining? The vote has passed. The CBA curriculum changes have been accepted. The last item of business today is item 1349, the consultation from the general education committee on their structure proposal.

[00:44:25] Ana Kogl: Thank you, Jim. This is Ana Kogl. So, thank you for inviting me back again. Jim has asked me to give just a really brief update and maybe starting with a little bit of a big picture sort of presentation of what we've been doing because my understanding is that there's quite a few of you that are new to the senate. But, I will try to be very brief and mostly just listen to your thoughts and comments and thank all of you that attended the listening sessions.

So, our charge on this committee was to redesign the LSC to be assessable and to be coherent, and that was coming from the HLC. And so, assessable means outcomes-based. But, I want to be really clear with this body, and I said this in the listening session too that the committee has not been motivated to spend hours, and hours, and hours on this because we love outcomes assessment, and my former department had this here again. And she can attest that that's certainly not what motivates me.

What motivates me on this committee is to make sure that we have not only what the HLC is asking us to have, that is an assessable and coherent LAC, but one also that enables us to honor the excellent work that we do with students and that enables us to continue working with students to expand their perceptions of what is possible to enable them to be thoughtful and critical members of a society that we hope is democratic, and to enable students to develop their capacities to live meaningful lives.

So, we really are aiming, big picture, to create an LAC that faculty members look at and can see where their passions for teaching, especially for teaching in the LAC, for teaching students, perhaps, outside their major, that they can see the intersection between their passions and students' needs to fulfill these outcomes. And again, these outcomes have already been voted on this body, and that's especially for new senators who maybe weren't here for that.

So, again, we don't have any interest in forcing this on anybody. We really do want to hear what people think about it. We need to hear what people really like about this as well as your questions. Our hope is that, rather than looking at this and figuring out how will I shoehorn my existing class in, people will look at it and say, "Okay, how can this area that I'm really passionate about somehow enable me to connect with students?" So, we hope, too, that faculty will ask the bigger question, "What will serve students best?"

Let me make a couple of practical points and maybe just review what this is about for people that didn't study and memorize the email that we sent out a couple of weeks ago, because we got the impression from the listening session that maybe people hadn't committed that to memory, whatever, for some reason.

One thing that we've said before and we're going to keep saying is that the LAC should be a living program. I know that Provost Wohlpart has encouraged us to think that way. We have wanted to think that way that we don't want to establish something that remains set in stone for 30 years. We would like for it to be revisable or amendable. We'd like it to be a living document.

And the other thing is this is very much a rough sketch, very, very rough sketch. Not at all a detailed draft. Not even a first draft. Just a sketch so you get a sense of the general shape of it.

So, one thing the listening session has made very clear to us is that people want a lot more information than this. So, let me just really quickly, again, refresh your memory or maybe for the first time you're hearing this, and that will help our discussion. So, our thinking was to begin students with what we see is foundational skills: writing, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning that they begin in their first year before they move onto more content-oriented outcomes. An outcomes-based model is not a distribution model, and yet this, we think, is kind of the best of both possible worlds in that if you -- and that little key down below certainly does not give you complete information about what those outcomes are. That was on a separate sheet in that email that you got.

So, that blue tier, that middle tier, it's the most distribution-ey that this model gets. And then the certificate, the idea of the certificate, which is not a professional certification, and it's true that it's only 12 hours, and we can call it something else if we want. We're not married to that name. The idea is that that will enable students to do a couple of things: one to revisit outcomes like writing and critical-thinking, oral comm, maybe quantitative. Although, we sure heard a lot of people didn't like quantitative being revisited.

And, again, that's all up in the air. But, the idea is there are certain liberal arts outcomes that students are not going to develop in just one class their first year. And those of us in the liberal arts majors, like my own political science, or history, or sociology, or people that are teaching writing, they do get to revisit those outcomes with their majors all the time. But, a student in a non-liberal arts major does not revisit those liberal outcomes throughout their four years.

So, that was the idea is for this to be a bit more developmental, to revisit certain outcomes. We've heard a lot of feedback about the certificate. We've heard people say, "How about we don't specify any of what those outcomes are." We're open to all of that. So, I'm happy to answer questions about that. Let me just say something quickly about our kind of timeline and process. We also heard from the listening session that we are, perhaps, unreasonable to think that we could have a draft to this body and have you vote on it this semester.

We knew, going into this semester, I think, that that was an unrealistic goal, but people need deadlines. We're now aiming for what we hope is maybe a slightly more realistic deadline of having this in more of a draft form by the end of the semester, that this body that we then look at in the spring, but after we conduct more listening sessions in a survey to see what people think when this is transformed into more of a draft.

So, there are many, many details that are just not filled in here. Some of those details are things that the committee has talked and thought a lot about. Some of them are details that the committee, honestly, hasn't really thought about, like why are you calling it a certificate? Why not something else?

But, right now, we just wanted to gather input about the broad shape of it, the general sketch to see what people thought. From the listening session, we got kind of tentative. But, on the -- I would say the bulk of it was relatively positive feedback. It's hard to love something when it's just so sketchy. I keep saying it's a sketch, just enough so you can see it's a bowl of fruit and not a horse.

People want to know, "Well, what's in the fruit bowl?" so we need to figure out what's in the fruit bowl. And some people are looking at it like, "That doesn't even look like a bowl of fruit." That's a bowl of something. But, generally, people were fairly positive, and so we feel like we are ready to turn this sketch into a draft, but only after we get feedback from this body, after we get feedback from all of the college senates, departments that have requested to meet with us, advising, etcetera, etcetera, essentially anybody that wants to meet with us.

So, what questions do you have for us? I have been joined by Brenda Bass, one of the other co-chairs.

[00:52:04] James Mattingly: Senator Kirmani.

[00:52:06] Syed Kirmani: Yeah, one question which I have is that computational reasoning is now very important. It is separate from quantitative reasoning. Computational sciences are playing an extremely important role from drug discovery to everything. This is the age of computing. AI is coming, driverless cars, personal medicine, everything. None of that is reflected here. So, I think this is the oldest-looking. It is good, it's alright, what it has. First of all, it is smaller than the disaster which we had. I'm really happy that this is only 37 hours, but I think that certain things need improvement. It's about 30 years old as it is. It should be more modern, more consistent with the current times, and I would like to see computational reasoning.

It may or may not mean that everybody should take a computing or programming class, but it is much more than computer literacy. I mean, data science is everywhere, and there it is in sociology or business everywhere. Now, this campus is traditionally very qualitative-oriented. There are whole departments packed with qualitative people when you would expect at least some to be quantitative. I know certain areas.

So, that needs a cultural change, and that comes through with a general program, and it will also attract more students if you make it more modern, more consistent with their times, consistent with the computer revolution, with AI, and those kind of things.

So, right now, I don't see any place for computational science here. Quantitative reasoning can be stretched, but that's a different thing. Computational aspects are very important. Now, nobody can do anything without computers these days. And also, there's so much emphasis on what faculty has passion about. I think that should be a secondary thing. The program is for students, and it should help the students get good and fill every position. It should develop the skills with the need for professional positions. The faculty, I think that they should hold their present somewhat. Let them serve the needs of the students.

This is not a major. This is the core education. So, I think that -- has anybody discussed this with their students?

[00:54:56] Ana Kogl: There will be listening sessions with students, and there are two student members.

[00:55:00] Syed Kirmani: But, has there been any survey?

[00:55:04] Ana Kogl: Did we do the survey just of students? I don't think we have yet.

[00:55:06] Brenda Bass: We gathered feedback from students along the way. I appreciate the feedback, and Ana please jump in, or Chuck please jump in at this point. The student learning outcomes are set at this point, as Ana pointed out. These learning outcomes were approved by this body, but that doesn't mean that courses proposed can't have additional learning outcomes that are included, and the certificate layer, in particular, would allow for faculty to propose.

So, for example, there could be an AI certificate proposed as long as they met the other SLOs, whatever they wind up being. That could certainly be embedded as an option for students.

[00:55:52] James Mattingly: That was Dean Brenda Bass. Provost Wohlpart has a comment.

[00:55:57] Jim Wohlpart: Sure. Thank you, Jim. So, Senator Kirmani, I very much appreciate your forward-looking insight. I think this is great. The outcomes I would encourage you all are set and I would encourage you to move forward. But, the point that Ana made is a really important one. These shouldn't be the outcomes that we live with for 30 or 40 years. In three, or four, or five years, you should go back and be revisiting these and seeing what you should add. So, I think that that is really, really important to be thinking about what happens.

And Jacob, no disrespect to students, but I'm not sure that an 18 or 19-year-old knows what they need to be successful on their careers at this point. I would encourage you all to take this responsibility yourselves. That doesn't mean that we shouldn't be talking with students about this. This is a great

educational opportunity for students. But, I'm not sure serving freshmen, sophomores about what should be in the Gen Ed program will lead to the best Gen Ed program.

That is your purview, and this is why you all have advanced degrees and do what you do. No disrespect to students on that matter.

[00:57:00] James Mattingly: Jacob Levang.

[00:57:02] Jacob Levang: Yeah, and I'll agree in some sense there is that I think once you ask an 18 or 19-year-old that just because they didn't like their math class, they're not going to want to take math ever again. That's not really, probably, the best way to go about things. I think the best way to approach it, in my opinion, is just to ask the kinds of skills students want to get out of their college experience.

So, maybe some survey would be, "Coming to UNI, what do you want to leave with that you don't have right now?" because those skills that they develop are what they're going to take into their job. I also think there's this thing of some students come and get an education because they want to be more educated. Some students can be in education because they want a job. And so, I think it's a very tricky balance of which needs to meet because some students want to be ready and get the best job that pays the highest money possible, and some students just want to be a more educated citizen. And I think it's a tough balance picking between those. I would just keep that in mind as you all move forward as well.

[00:58:02] James Mattingly: Thank you, Jacob. I believe Tom Hesse had a question, and we'll come back to Senator Holcombe.

[00:58:08] Thomas Hesse: Of the categories that are up there, critical thinking, outcome number 6 appears in every single one, but I only see writing as an outcome appearing in one.

[00:58:22] Ana Kogl: Chuck Holcombe is gesturing too at me. You're thinking of the certificate, Chuck? The way it's written now, it would be -- so, this is something that the committee needs to wrestle with because we need to have a conversation about if we really think this idea of scaffolding certain outcomes is important, which I think we really do. I think that's a genuine sentiment on the committee that there's certain outcomes that are so central to the liberal arts and so central to the liberal arts education: critical thinking, writing, being at the university level, their outcomes, and we all kind of agree they're very important.

So, we have to have a further conversation about how are we actually going to scaffold those. One thing that Brenda said about the kind of blue tier, the middle tier courses is that the way we're kind of tentatively envisioning this happening is that so I might submit my introduction to critical theory class for the human identity or the human condition category. That doesn't mean those are the only outcomes that I've decided to emphasize.

So, if I have students working together to define justice in class, which I do, that might count for outcome 4. So, that's something that the committee definitely has to wrestle with is how do we, in a sense, enable people, kind of encourage people? If you're designing a class that you'd like to be included, how do we encourage people to think about not just one outcome, but several outcomes. Because it has to be assessable, it has to be manageable. So, that's a challenge, but yeah I'm with you and I hear you on that. I think we need to figure that out, I think, a little bit more clearly.

[01:00:09] James Mattingly: Senator Holcombe.

[01:00:11] Charles Holcombe: In the outcomes that were approved by this body in March under category B, it says that students will learn about the United States and the world. But, I'm concerned that it will be very easy to go through this entire program and get no exposure to any kind of perspective other than the contemporary United States.

[01:00:30] Ana Kogl: So, one thing that we need to do for outcomes 3 and 5, in particular, is I think -- and this is something that we barely talked about at our last meeting, and this is partly in response to the listening sessions. But, it seems to me pretty clear that's something we need to do as part of a draft is articulate what does the committee mean by outcome 3, so that then we can have that conversation, that outcome 3 and outcome 6 really are intended to be broad enough to encompass what you're talking about.

Or, if you and I are outvoted that they are merely just very contemporary snapshots of some small people, which I hope doesn't happen. But I think we need to offer campus a broader conception of what each of those outcomes, especially those categories in the blue tier. What do those really mean? I think we need to articulate that better.

So, the committee made the choice to go forward with this very sketchy model without having, even on the committee, necessarily have entirely agreed on that kind of question, and I agree with you. And for me, the diversity piece of it really needs to be much more carefully -- the human identity really needs to be very carefully considered and discussed.

[01:01:55] James Mattingly: Senator Skaar, did you have a question?

[01:01:57] Nicole Skaar: It goes back to what you said, Ana, earlier, and just as a point of clarification, on the blue tier, the outcomes that are listed there is the idea that those are the outcomes that need to minimally be met, and that's the idea there.

[01:02:15] Ana Kogl: Yeah, so it's sort of just a -- to have a class in that category, you have to minimally meet this outcome. And I can't imagine a class that -- I can't imagine teaching a class in which I address the human identity diversity outcome without any content or without any -- even any other outcomes.

[01:02:39] Nicole Skaar: Right, speaking, writing, any of that, right. Those things can also be addressed there. It's just that, minimally, for that one, you can meet 3 and 6, but you can also add 1 and 2 and 4.

[01:02:51] Ana Kogl: Exactly, yeah.

[01:02:52] Jim Wohlpart: This is Provost Wohlpart. What I hope we intend by this is that you agree that you will participate in assessment of that outcome. If you put your course in under human condition when we get ready to assess 5 and 6, you will participate in the assessment using your course. You can be doing other outcomes, but you're not obligating yourself to be part of the assessment of 1, or 2, or whatever else you use.

[01:03:18] James Mattingly: Senator Hesse.



[01:03:19] Thomas Hesse: Regarding the certificate, it says it must minimally meet outcomes 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7. Why that list? Why not 8, 9, and 10, or some other set?

[01:03:31] Ana Kogl: So, writing, which is 1, and speaking and critical thinking were, to the committee, the ones that leapt out really clearly as absolutely central to liberal arts education. Collaboration, we decided, was one of those that, while it sometimes seems a little bit less important, perhaps, than writing or speaking, we felt like that was one of those outcomes that is crucial for good citizenship, to be able to listen to people who differ from yourself and to actually work together to accomplish some shared goal. And also, at the same time, it happens to tie in critical thinking and perhaps tie in written communication. So, we felt like that collaboration deserves scaffolding.

7 was more controversial in the committee. there were certainly folks that were less enthusiastic about that one being included. The committee is aware. There was very clear feedback on those outcomes for the certificate from the listening sessions. Well, in general, the feedback was very clear, which is, "How on Earth did you pick those? Why those?"

What if faculty who want to propose a certificate pick one of the yellow level outcomes and one of the blue level outcomes? Or, what if you don't restrict it at all? I think the committee is moving toward a consensus that if that certificate, I think -- please correct me, Chuck and Brenda, if you think I'm misrepresenting the committee, but I think the committee has a consensus that we need the certificate to maybe not be as restrictive as it appears here with those outcomes.

Does that seem fair? I don't want to -- I will say I feel very strongly that the certificate is a little restrictive with those outcomes, so I just don't want to misrepresent the committee because that is my personal sense of it.

[01:05:40] James Mattingly: Senator Skaar.

[01:05:40] Nicole Skaar: Yes, thank you. So, one of the things I was just thinking about as we were talking about the green part is that those that are in there are ones that are -- well, some of them are not assessed anywhere in the middle. So, if one of the points of this is assessment of outcomes across our objectives, whatever, over the course of the four-year time, four, five-year time that somebody, a student, is here that it seems to me you would want to assess them at least more than once, and maybe even assess them at the beginning, especially those ones that you're kind of talking about, Ana, in terms of those are the key ones for liberal arts education, and then once at the end.

So, as you guys continue to talk about this, that minimally must meet peace for that third tier that maybe that's a way to kind of think about that in terms of if we're going to measure those object outcomes during the first year during those foundational, the yellow years, then we might want to do that again at the end and see how they've grown because that might give us information as we look at the data across time, if we're actually having -- they're learning about writing, and speaking, and things like that.

[01:07:03] Ana Kogl: Yes, and I mean, personally, I would say even though I confess to being a little bit of a skeptic about outcomes assessment, if we're going to assess outcomes, it makes so much sense to do it that way. So, yeah.

[01:07:16] Jim Wohlpart: This is Provost Wohlpart. What I would hope is that that is happening in all of our program assessments. I would assume that, in our majors, as students are graduating with their bachelor's degrees, we're assessing things like critical thinking, collaboration, writing, speaking, those kinds of things. So, we should be doing that. It doesn't have to happen in the Gen Ed program, and remember that the students are on a journey in the Gen Ed program. They may take those courses as sophomores or juniors, but there's a whole 'nother, hopefully, two years of learning that happens and doing that assessment. It would be really important.

[01:07:52] James Mattingly: Finally, Chair Cutter.

[01:07:54] Barbara Cutter: I guess I have a question about the certificate that's more content-based, but then I have some logistical questions. And the content-based question is that I'm a little bit concerned that -- you know, it says multi-disciplinary, but it could easily be a two-discipline certificate, so overall I'm wondering if having the certificate in here, taking up four of the classes will make this, as a whole, students exposed to fewer disciplines. And I don't mean that in a content sense. I mean that in a sense that different disciplines have different ways of seeing the world, and I think it really helps you to have exposure to a wider variety of them to learn to think interdisciplinary and interdisciplinary ways and take methods and ways of thinking from these disciplines.

So, that's one of my concerns with a four-course certificate like that, and I think it also gets at Senator Holcombe's question about the global and U.S. perspective. And if you only have, say, three credits in human identity, and we don't want to have these really watered-down classes that are like the whole global -- you know, it seems like six credits where you have -- or at least another three credits with a global sort of perspective to get at this issue might be something.

So, what I'm saying is we might need more courses in the second tier, and maybe a capstone 3 or 6 top tier thing because I'm also concerned about the logistics of this for faculty and for students. And one thing that's sort of -- I mean, there's a lot of stuff, but I'll stop with this one comment about, if you have students who transfer in associate degrees right, they'll have some sort of articulation agreement. Now, if you have a four course third tier, it seems to me unlikely that they're going to have to take that. In the current articulation agreement, they have to take six credits, is that going to be doubled or are they just not going to have anything in the Gen Ed? Or would it be something at the lower tier, which conceptually is confusing to me? So even though you're not going to be involved in the articulation agreement, it might make sense to think do you, what do you want transfer students do should they have any of this coursework?

[01:10:34] Ana Kogl: I will take that back to the committee. I don't really think we've talked very much about that. We've kind of put that off the articulation agreement and what will transfer in and what will students still need to take? I don't think we've really talked very much about that.

[01:10:46] Brenda Bass: So this is Brenda Bass. If they come in with their AA, the committee has said that will meet the general education requirements. They come in without an AA would be similar to right now. It would be course by course comparison and would look at the outcomes and they bring the credits in and whether or not they meet the requirements that would be through articulations. Community colleges in particular are very adept and being adaptive and very quickly in terms of their curriculum typically is what we found. Does that answer the question?

[01:11:24] Ana Kogl: Yes, so I guess there's no intention of having it like it is now where they take six credits even if they have an AA.

[01:11:30] Brenda Bass: Correct, because the goal of the committee was to create a program that we thought would be quality and structured and how we thought would best serve our "Native Students" that start here or do their general education program here, but we didn't want to disadvantage transfer students and our potential enrolments from transfer students. I'll also say with the certificate, the parameters on that, you mentioned the fear of it means just two discipline certificate that still wide open. Those parameters could be that the courses have to come from three different departments or four different departments. You could put on a parameter that there needs to be a global perspective that those parameters aren't set right now. So, it is possible, and the committee has talked about that making sure that it is truly multidisciplinary and not a singular or just two disciplines.

[01:12:32] Barbara Cutter: Can I?

[01:12:34] James Mattingly: Please, Faculty Chair Cutter.

[01:12:35] Barbara Cutter: Yeah, I guess to that, I'd say it sounds really exciting when you put it that way, but I do think that would be logistically very difficult for to get certificates with especially with more guidelines to get them worked out and offered consistently and things like that. So that would still, I think that's a concern.

[01:13:03] Jim Wohlpart: This is Provost Wohlpart, remember that as you're thinking about the courses that are in that final tier, they don't necessarily have to be brand new or different courses from other courses that are in the general education program. It's how it's packaged together. You would tell students they could double them. It could count in two places, but these are not that they don't have to be a whole another set of courses and we have to worry about getting them offered. That would not be a good way to do this, because that'll really stretch resources.

[01:13:27] James Mattingly: Former Chair Peterson.

[01:13:30] Amy Petersen: I was just going to respond and share that we do have the interdisciplinary committee at work, that is a Senate committee that I think they are planning to come and update us soon. They've done a survey, they're exploring what interdisciplinary work might look like on campus and they might be the group that could take on perhaps some of those logistical things around the certificate.

[01:13:59] James Mattingly: There certainly should be some overlap between the interdisciplinary committee and the GERC relative to multidisciplinary certificates.

[01:14:10] James Mattingly: Senator Hoffman.

[01:14:12] Donna Hoffman: I just like to thank the committee. This is a heavy lift and I know you have been working on it for a really long time and putting lots of thought into it. My comment in this is if you know me, this isn't a new comment, but I want to put it out there.

I recently put a child into college and in looking at how universities are described in the various listings and that kind of thing, I came across UNIs and this is from US News and World Report. The University of

Northern Iowa was founded on a strong liberal arts curriculum. I would hate for us to replace that with the University of Northern Iowa was founded on the strong general education curriculum, because I don't think general education means much. I understand the reasons why some want to not call the liberal arts. I think as an institution of higher education, we have to be able to explain what the liberal arts are. However, having said that, I think we can come up with different ways to describe this that would mean something. Perhaps we don't want to call it the liberal arts, I would still think we do, but core curriculum sounds even better than general education. Panther core is another way that I've seen some universities doing this. I think we do ourselves a disservice if we call it officially general education and we're replacing that with liberal arts and we're doing it for reasons that I think I understand what those reasons are, but I also think that there are better even marketing oriented ways to talk about that, that can make it still attracted to both faculty, staff, students and people out there in terms of what we offer students that makes us unique, that makes us different from Iowa, that makes us different from Iowa State and different from other institutions as well.

[01:16:04] James Mattingly: Senator Kirmani.

[01:16:06] Syed Kirmani: Yeah, I think that the name Janet is probably not the best choice, UNI Core will be a great name, if you really wanted to be the core. But I think this proposal needs to be better defined. I think right now it is too fuzzy. Apparently, the committee people themselves are not clear about it. And I am certainly not clear about a lot of things. For example, suppose I have a course, I develop a – that most of the courses are like that. The students do projects, teamwork and all that. Would that meet the condition of collaboration?

[01:16:44] Ana Kogl: Possibly, I mean the committee still needs to come up with criteria or at least even if they're not formal criteria, at least some guidelines to give campus, more information about what we mean by something like...

[01:16:58] Syed Kirmani: Yeah, what exactly is collaboration then?

[01:17:00] Ana Kogl: It is essentially what you said. I mean if that's what the committee intends? But the committee hasn't sat down and written anything anymore lengthy than the list of outcomes that went with one of the emails.

[01:17:14] Syed Kirmani: Yeah, but it would help if it was better defined. Otherwise, what will happen is that, I mean you can write whatever you want, but it all boils down to implementation. What will matter is that it is implemented properly and the whole purpose can be defeated by a lopsided interpretation of these things and all that. So, I think it needs some more work. I would personally like to see a better definition. Right now, it's just too fuzzy.

[01:17:47] James Mattingly: Brenda Bass.

[01:17:49] Brenda Bass: I appreciate that feedback. I think the committee appreciates that feedback as well. We of course are trying to balance coming out with information to the committee to the campus from the committee to gather feedback before coming up with a final proposal. We made the deliberate choice the whole committee did come out with this information while it was still fuzzy, as you say because we wanted fundamental feedback on these core pieces before we start it, coming up with more definitive rules for it. I think we've all experienced committees where they came out with a proposal that they said they wanted feedback on, but it was clear that it was a done deal. This is not the

case. The committee has deliberately along the way, come out with things that are not fully formed, but the overall sketches on I have said so that we can receive feedback, take that back to the committee, work with it and use it to refine the next iteration of that which we will again bring out not only this body, but to campus.

[01:19:01] James Mattingly: Thank you, Brenda. Are there any other questions, comments about the general lead revision committee's proposal in its current form? Chair Cutter.

[01:19:17] Barbara Cutter: So I do have one more question about the certificate. And I think it's really important that you have that out listed in there that it's not required, because for transfer students and all kinds of student scheduling issues, but I suspect that there could be a tendency here that the out ends up being taken more often than not and then that top tier could become a sort of extension of a major in a lot of ways is that you thought about that kind of question where three out of the four courses could be in a major if they're in the core.

[01:20:06] Ana Kogl: So one of the things that I heard very clearly, particularly from some individuals of the listening session was and we already had this concern on the committee was it even on the blue tier. There are going to be some departments that will be very well represented in this, just because of the nature what they do is so close to the heart of the liberal arts. And so we are already aware of a need even at the blue tier as it stands now, even if students took a certificate that we need to figure out a way to overlay some distribution need element on top of that, because otherwise I think about because I teach political theory. So, I think about how I could do human identity responsibility and human condition and certainly history has I think a similar potential. And as much as of course we love our respective disciplines, I think we all kind of agree, we don't want people just loading up on their own discipline if they aren't a liberal arts major. So, I think even for the blue tier to require somehow, a simple kind of clumsy but simple way to do it is to just say your classes have to come from at least four different disciplines or programs or something like that. And I think if students don't opt for a certificate, we could probably figure out something similar, but scaled up a bit. But I will certainly take that back to the committee because I share that concern that we know that we don't know how many certificates there will be especially starting off, it may take faculty a while to get excited to rearrange, to figure out how their existing course fits or to design new courses or to talk with their friends to figure something things else. So, we understand that the certificate is a little bit of uncertain piece of this even kind of regardless. So, to make sure that it's set up so that students are taking classes across liberal arts major is important to the committee, but I'll take your comment back.

[01:22:00] James Mattingly: Senator Hoffman.

[01:22:02] Donna Hoffman: All I could do is in the current liberal arts core, there are no courses with prerequisites in it. Is that the intent? That also in this kind of design, there would also not – none of the courses in the certificate would have prerequisites, or would those prerequisites have to be already in the core?

[01:22:20] Ana Kogl: I think it has to be, have we talked about that? I don't I mean...

[01:22:24] Brenda Bass: It's been discussed but not fully decided, but that's been the general discussion was that there would not be prerequisites built within the general education, whatever it might be called program.

[01:22:39] Jim Wohlpart: So, this is Provost Wohlpart, are we sure that's true, in the sciences and in math, that that some of our math classes in the Gen Ed program don't have prerequisites to them?

[01:22:47] Donna Hoffman: I think that's true.

[01:22:49] Ana Kogl: I think you have to...

[01:22:50] Brenda Bass: This is Brenda Bass. There is options for every requirement within the current general education program the LAC that do not require prerequisites, other than junior or senior standing for like capstone in non-western, but there are some courses in there that have prerequisites like calculus.

[01:23:12] Jim Wohlpart: Okay. So, you can't take calculus through which is part of our Gen Ed program without having completed calculus two.

[01:23:17] Brenda Bass: I don't think calculus three is in the Gen Ed. I think calculus one is, and you have to have had an ALEKS score that places you there.

[01:23:30] James Mattingly: United Faculty President Hawbaker.

[01:23:32] Becky Hawbaker: I'm not sure how that makes sense but because you wouldn't want someone taking their multidisciplinary certificate before they took their yellow year classes, right?

[01:23:42] Ana Kogl: Well I think, so I understood the question to be about individual classes prerequisites. We haven't figured out the mechanism yet, but correct. Yes. I mean, the idea is that the years on that – on that left-hand side are intended to be at least a rough guideline for students. So that you don't have students taking their certificate their freshman year, because their thinking would be maybe their classes that don't have pre-reqs they're not 1000 model classes either, if that makes sense. So, the figuring out the mechanism for the actual tiering of maybe just you have to have sophomore status before you can take certain classes needs to be worked out for sure.

[01:24:31] James Mattingly: This is Chair Mattingly and I'm actually going to weigh in here, too. There are... I'm the first one to say we shouldn't be asking our students, you know what to put in our general education program, but I think there are at least two points where we and future students could benefit from student feedback. Probably the first would be when we have some multidisciplinary certificates that we'd like to propose, I think students might be a good judge of which of those sound more engaging than others, maybe even the best judge. Another place is where I think student feedback could be helpful is related to a feedback system. I think we shouldn't let the general Ed revision committee off the hook until we have a feedback system set in place that will help us to adapt this as we go along. I think I would love to have them propose that kind of feedback system, but I think that's where students could help again. Certainly, they shouldn't be the only element of the feedback system, but they also probably shouldn't be ignored. I suspect students could have told us 20 years ago that our Gen Ed or LAC was aging. So, I think we should involve students as one of the ways that things bubble up to tell us there is something that needs changing. Brenda Bass.

[01:26:05] Brenda Bass: The feedback of the two student members on our committee as well as more broad feedback has been very helpful in a couple of regards. They've talked to their own experiences, but then also serving as RAs and on summer orientation staff it helped on-board incoming freshmen.

They've talked to us a lot about structural issues and barriers that students face in terms of getting registered, working their way through the curriculum. And so they've been very helpful with those types of insights, as well as giving us a general sense of what students are looking for perhaps not in terms of specific classes, but for example, the certificate as well as the ability to have a little more flexibility to double major, add on extra minors or simply have room to take some more electives within their structure. So those pieces have been very helpful to hear directly from students.

[01:27:01] James Mattingly: Thank you Brenda. Jacob Levang.

[01:27:04] Jacob Levang: What you were saying earlier just maybe think of something quick, but it's very difficult. This balance of what students need to learn versus what students want to learn, because I've been in classes before where I'm like, why am I here? And I know deep down why I'm there, but it's so hard to sit there and regurgitate information that I'm like, I'm never going to use this again, honestly. And that's, but I understand why I need it for background context. I will use it but in not a direct way. And so, when you're thinking about the certificates, it's for me very, very, very tricky to figure out okay, what are students going to be interested in? So, you might want to have a certificate and I don't know, let's say art or something like that, right? But maybe only 1% of our students on campus actually want to learn about art. And then you decide you have that certificate or not, but maybe some other certificates be very popular, because there are some things again that students need to learn this and diversity is probably one of those where we need a lot of students to learn this, but how do we engage students who want to learn about diversity not just forced them to learn about diversity, because that's a very, very tough struggle I run into all the time. Just talking to students it's like you forced on taking diversity class, but they don't want to be there, so they don't learn anything anyway. They just write their paper to appease their professor and they go home. And so just keeping that in mind. Yeah, I'm sorry, I hate to be honest with you all, but...

[01:28:29] James Mattingly: Just don't be sorry. That's why you're here. Senator Kirmani.

[01:28:36] Syed Kirmani: Yeah, I would like the committee to spell out these diversity, collaboration, human condition those kind of things in a bit more detail, exactly what they need. For example, the responsibility learning outcomes 6, 11 and 12. So, suppose I develop a course on personal finance and investing. Will it be acceptable there as a responsibility?

[01:29:04] Ana Kogl: Can you scroll down to 11 and 12? Please Thank you.

[01:29:08] Syed Kirmani: Six is critical thinking, 11 is values, 12 is ethics, personal finance and investment, it involves all of them.

[01:29:19] Ana Kogl: So, we've only gotten this far at this point, but that articulates a little bit more what we mean by 11 and 12. Students will develop a greater understanding of their personal and civic responsibilities by applying ethical reasoning to range of human conduct and then 11 is more personal, thinking critically about your own personal values. 12 is more societal or political applying a normative or ethical reasoning to those. So that's the piece that we have already decided we know we need to do is what we now have in those letter categories, kind of explaining the outcomes a little bit. We're realizing we need to explain that a lot more. So that's already a plan that we have to articulate to give campus a bit more information about what we mean by those things. So that then you can decide if you agree or disagree.

[01:30:07] Syed Kirmani: Yeah, so what do you think of this the example which I just gave and I like that course. I would like to make it personal, finance and investment. Some amount of finance everybody should know, right? Okay, suppose I make a course that I will argue that it will involve critical thinking. It will also involve values, it will involve ethics also. And what can be more responsible than financial responsibility? So, will you accept that course there?

[01:30:41] Ana Kogl: First of all, it's going to be a second, it's going to be a second committee that will make those decisions.

[01:30:46] Syed Kirmani: Yeah, but you see much will depend on what you write here.

[01:30:49] Ana Kogl: Which we are planning to do as the next, as our next big project is to give you the criteria that I think you're asking for.

[01:30:58] James Mattingly: That if I were on that committee Senator Kirmani, it would be a hard sell for me. I don't yeah... I don't.

[01:31:05] Syed Kirmani: Yeah, I know, I know their thinking. That's why I asked that.

[01:31:11] James Mattingly: [01:31:11] And I was a finance major.

[01:31:13] Syed Kirmani: Yeah, I know.

[01:31:13] James Mattingly: As an undergrad.

[01:31:14] Ana Kogl: But it raises a really important question that the committee has talked about, but not come to a decision about yet and this is going to require a lot more feedback from campus, because this is a very delicate question. What other courses that are not taught in liberal arts programs? Is that the instructor's feel meet these outcomes? How do we think about those? So, we realized that that's something that we have to think very carefully about.

[01:31:39] James Mattingly: It is five o'clock now. We're either going to have to adjourn or accept motion for more time. So, do I hear a motion to adjourn? Thank you, Senator Koch. Is there a second? Senator, Vice Chair Burnight. Thank you, and now we are adjourned.