Minutes of the University Faculty Senate
09 December 2019

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

Guests in attendance were Becky Hawbaker, Jacob Levang, Jim Wohlpart, John Vallentine, Patrick Pease, Brenda Bass, Doug Shaw, Diane Wallace, Laura Terlip, Chris Martin.

[00:02:42]
James Mattingly: We'll go ahead and get started. It's 3:30 I'll call the meeting to order. Are there any press with us today? Hearing none. I will say no and move on to the introduction of our guests. We do have a few today beginning with Brenda perhaps.

[00:03:03]
Brenda Bass: Brenda Bass, Dean of College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. I'm here as part of the GenEd Revision Committee.

[00:03:13]
Doug Shaw: Doug Shaw, also here as part of the GenEd Revision Committee.

[00:03:18]
James Mattingly: Fantastic. And I think there's one more guest.

[00:03:20]
Diane Wallace: Diane Wallace, Assistant Registrar, and I'm here just here for the] discussion on Curriculum for CHAS.

[00:03:26]
James Mattingly: And thank you for being with us all of you. We have courtesy announcements. I believe that President Nook is not going to be with us today. Provost Wohlpart, do you have any announcement?

[00:03:40]
Jim Wohlpart: Just very briefly as you move towards the end of the semester, I hope that all of your snowstorms are as quick as this one and that they're followed by sunshine. Thank you for everything you're going to do for the next two weeks. I know this is a very stressful time for you as it is for our students. And I know that it makes a big difference how supportive you all are. We recently had a presentation of academic affairs council of the . . . I'm not going to remember her name. She's the mental health coordinator here. She's been here for a few

months. She said in her first week here she had a serious issue that came up with a student. She contacted the faculty member. She was blown away by how supportive the faculty member was and how quickly it was to resolution. She said she's never experienced anything like that. And she said it hasn't changed from that first day now, so thank you all so much for how much you care about the students and how much we work through these things. It really makes a difference, so thanks.

[00:04:36]
James Mattingly: Faculty Chair Cutter, do you have any comments or announcements?

[00:04:41]
Barbara Cutter: I think I'll pass because we have a lot to do today.

[00:04:45]
James Mattingly: United Faculty President, Becky Hawbaker.

[00:04:50]
Becky Hawbaker: Yes, I'll try to keep it brief. First I just wanted to give a quick update on the university benefits committee. So open enrollment period is over, so I hope that you all met that deadline and got in on your flexible spending account. I wanted to let you know that the benefit we've been studying for the last couple of meetings is our long-term disability benefit. We were looking for a way to extend some Gap Health Insurance to people who are going on long-term disability or to people who are not . . . what's in the plan now is that you lose your insurance. You have, you know, you keep some of your salary but you lose all but emergency room visits under single coverage and that keeps a lot of people from going on long-term disability when really they probably need it. So we are looking at a plan that would allow or would give people some stipend to pursue Gap Insurance and also looking at ways to kind of even out some differences among employee groups in terms of benefits. One thing that we're trying to maintain as much as possible is for people who are on long-term disability for mental health and other reasons. Some of the options that we're looking at would put a time cap on that of 24 months rather than treating it like any other condition and that's concerning to us, so we're trying to protect that as much as possible. They just want to give a big shout out to our benefit staff who have been working really hard on this in trying to find a good solution. In the spring, we'll be looking at some other benefit issues. So on top on my priority list is expanding our child care options here on campus or a benefit to support child care for faculty, staff, and other employees and also tuition reimbursement. So we talked about evening out benefits. And for most benefits, that means that faculty had a better option than other employee groups. Tuition reimbursement is one example of one where faculty do not have access to a benefit that is there for other groups. It's something that only a small group of faculty would probably qualify for and be interested in since most people have their terminal degree already, but especially in applied areas or departments like mine, teaching, or Megan's, this could make a real difference. Also for our . . . not our adjuncts who are temporary but for term or renewable term people who maybe don't have their terminal degree but have proven themselves instrumental and that we want to maybe build a path towards a tenure track position. Second, we're nearing the deadline for PAC letters to go out and I'm asking for your assistance in getting

the word out to people who may need United Faculty's assistance. If they've gotten continued probation with difficulties, if they'd been denied promotion or tenure and they need representation, please refer them to us. In the past, we had negotiated to get a list of these decisions so we could proactively reach out. We're currently pursuing a prohibited practice complaint to get that back again. But until that is resolved, we're asking for your help in connecting us with people who need our assistance and advocacy. Third, there's been a lot to talk about our diversity and equity and inclusion issues and we may have some other discussions on that today. But I just wanted to thank my other faculty leaders for meeting with the student group REC, for talking about what we can do now. I know that the president is pulling together this very large committee that may or may not be useful, whatever. But all of us have an obligation to pursue this actively and proactively if it really is our top priority and a strategic plan. It means that everyone needs a to-do list that everyone needs to be advocating for our students, are marginalized students of color, another marginalized groups. And I'd also like to recognize the work of Academic Affairs under Provost Wohlpart. At one of our previous meetings, he had a list of, I don't know, four pages of things that that division is already working on. And I feel like if every department did that then maybe it really is our number one goal. I think that's it for now. Thank you.

[00:09:33]
James Mattingly: Thank you. And the Senate leadership actually does have a couple of announcements this time. There are at least two and very likely, three initiatives that will be priorities for the Senate this spring. Amy, can you announce what we'll be looking for with the Senate representation model.

[00:09:57]
Amy Petersen: Yeah, so one initiative this spring that I'll be providing some leadership around is regarding our Senate membership. So as you recall, we voted this fall to give voting rights to our term in temporary faculty. And so as a result, that means we must take a look at our Senate membership and how faculty are represented here on our Senate, which leads to really a bigger conversation, I think, generally about how the Senate is structured and how we might want to make some other changes to address challenges that we have talked about here is the last two years or more around how we communicate with our College Senate as well as with our departments. And so this coming spring, I'll be looking for volunteers who would like to serve on a working group to explore really our Senate infrastructure and Senate membership and how we communicate with various groups around campus including our college senates and our departments. So I'm just putting it out there here now as we end this semester so that as you're making commitments and thinking about your work in the spring, if this is of interest to you, or if you know someone that would be interested in being part of a workgroup, please send them my way and I will also be actively recruiting here in January, so thank you.

[00:11:35]
James Mattingly: Great, thank you. Vice-Chair John Burnight, do you have something to announce as well?

[00:11:43]

John Burnight: Yeah, there's a couple of things related to spring elections, so following up on what Amy said, one of the things that we have discussed as leadership is an attempt to try to build better communication between various committees that are at the Senate's charge and the Senate itself. And so one thing we're going to try to encourage is for more senators to take part and stand for election to these various committees that are up for the spring. And so my plan is to basically notify Senators from each college what open seats there are on committees for the spring. So for example, there's going to be an opening on the educational policies commission for CHAS rep, so I'll contact CHAS senators about the possibility to explore any potential interest on serving on that committee. Same thing with the CETL advisory seat open for the college of education. So just be expecting those [00:12:32] emails probably early next semester, so that's one announcement. Also related to election, something that we haven't been doing for recent years, I don't think, at least not in my memory on the Senate, and that is that according to Section 3 of our bylaws, actually the nominations for the vice-chair, outgoing senators are involved in soliciting those nominations. And so I will also . . . I've already sent an email out to the five senators whose terms are ending this spring and would . . . have asked them to consider potential nominees for my successor. But the other thing that I want to mention is because the bylaws also haven't . . . you can make nominations from the floor, so open nominations from the floor up until the election actually takes place, I'd like to invite everyone to consider, you know, making nominations and self-nomination is also possible. So if you're interested in exploring the possibility of moving into Faculty Senate leadership, please feel free to contact me if you want to nominate somebody else, considering nominating yourself, or just want to know more about it, please feel free to email me. But that actually, that's the very last thing we do in the year and so there's no great hurry on that, so that's it.

[00:13:41]
James Mattingly: Thank you. And I mentioned that very likely a third initiative of would be forthcoming in the spring and that's our really a set of initiatives around elevating diversity, equity and inclusion on our campus. And we're already committed in the academic affairs plan to a couple of agenda items such as doing an extensive policy review. And then we'll also be looking at curriculum areas, possibility of identifying programs or certain courses for diversity related programs. And then for all of these things, we will be reaching out to senators to volunteer . . . for working groups for these initiatives, so look for that. Okay, the next item on the agenda is the minutes for approval. You all received a copy of the minutes. First, is there a motion to accept the minutes?

[00:14:58]
Francis Degnin: So moved.

[00:14:59]
James Mattingly: Francis Degnin.

[00:15:01]
Nicole Skaar: Second [00:15:01]

[00:15:01]

James Mattingly: Seconded by Nicole Skaar. Are there any changes that are needed to the minutes? We did scour them rather thoroughly especially Vice-Chair Burnight this time. Okay, well then I will ask for a vote. All those in favor of accepting the minutes as they are for the 11th of November, please say aye.

[00:15:33]
All: Aye.

[00:15:34]
James Mattingly: Are there any opposed? Are there any abstaining? Okay, then the minutes are accepted, the vote is passed. There are two items on the calendar this time, item 1479 is an Emeritus request for Taifa Yu in Political Science. Is there a motion to put that item on the docket?

[00:15:59]
Donna Hoffman: Moved.

[00:16:00]
James Mattingly: Moved by Donna Hoffman, seconded by Leigh Zeitz. Is there any discussion needed on this item? Does the petition look in order? I think that it is. Okay, then let's take a vote to docket this item. All in favor of docketing calendar item 1479, the emeritus request, please say aye.

[00:16:25]
All: Aye.

[00:16:26]
James Mattingly: Are there any opposed or abstaining? Okay, that will be on the docket. Item 1480 on the calendar is the update from the General Education Revision Committee. I've invited them to be here today just in case we can get to that item, and I hope we can. So what I'd also ask is that as we docket the item that we would put it to the top of the docket so that if we finish the other two docket items today, we can actually get their update today, okay. So I would ask for a motion to put that item on the top of the docket then, making it docket item 1358.

[00:17:09]
Syed Kirmani: So moved.

[00:17:10]
James Mattingly: Thank you, Senator Kirmani and seconded by Senator Varzavand. I did see the right hand, didn't I? Okay. Okay, good. Is there any discussion about that needed before we take a vote? Requires a two third vote to put it on the top of the docket. All of those in favor, please say aye.

[00:17:37]

All: Aye.

[00:17:39]
James Mattingly: Any opposed? Are there any abstaining? Okay, that is passed. Items at the top of the docket, hopefully we'll get to hear from the GERC yet today. The first item on the docket are the CHAS, the Curriculum Changes for CHAS, docket item number 1356, is there a motion to approve those changes? Moved by John Burnight, seconded by Senator Skaar. What discussion is required about the CHAS items? Those are not the items that [indiscernible] [00:18:31] all of the kerfuffle. Thank you. I was looking for a word. Hullaballoo didn't seem quite right. Kerfuffle is better. Okay, conversation . . . yes, please, Barbara Cutter, thank you.

[00:18:49]
Barbara Cutter: Yes, this is Faculty Chair Cutter. So even though the interactive digital studies minor is in CHAS, because it's in the cleanup session, it's a separate area we're talking about, is that what you . . .

[00:19:07]
James Mattingly: Yes, it is technically on a different docket.

[00:19:11]
Barbara Cutter: Okay, just confirming.

[00:19:13]
James Mattingly: Thank you, yes, good point. Because all of those items were discussed on a different day. Are there any of the items on docket 1356 that need discussion? There are quite a few items on there. Then if there are no objections, I'll ask for a vote. All those in favor of accepting the curriculum changes included on docket 1356 from the CHAS Curriculum package, please say aye.

[00:19:59]
All: Aye.

[00:20:00]
James Mattingly: Are there any opposed? Are there any abstaining? Then that vote is passed, docket item 1356 has been approved. Docket item 1357 is the item where there was some kerfuffle as we're calling it. I will take a motion though to approve that item understanding that there very well may be an amendment involved, is there a motion to accept the Curriculum Changes across Colleges on 1357? Francis Degnin has so moved. Is there a second?

[00:20:48]
Leigh Zeitz: I'll second.

[00:20:49]
James Mattingly: Second by Leigh Zeitz. So we know that there are some items that require discussion, did you want to kick that off?

[00:20:59]

Patrick Pease: I'd be happy to. This is Patrick Pease. The first thing I can do is explain a little bit since we've gone about this process a little bit different this year by bringing college by college, you may not have caught before that we have a special last meeting called the cleanup meeting. This is a meeting for tabled items. These are items that for whatever reason, they can't be resolved in the meeting, the original meeting or scheduled, so they get tabled for this cleanup meeting where programs have more time to think about it where we have time to invite in the right person to answer the right question or to do whatever we need to do in order to try to get the proposals cleaned up and ready for approval before the end of the cycle, so it's a kind of a last chance. These are everything from really minor things like a clarification of intent. I think the one in physics, for example, was simply that there were courses listed as prerequisites and they were listed as co-requisites and you can have both, so we just needed to contact Paul Shand and asked "Do you need co or do you need pre?" And he clarified and that was the end of it. Or there are sometimes some major issues that involve some discussion. There were several this year and those are the ones that . . . the more major ones are the ones I want to talk about a little bit because this body often has asked, is there anything that we should know about, in the normal ones really isn't anything. If there's something you would want to know about it, probably it's ended up in the cleanup meeting. So let me go through three issues that popped up this year that is worth your attention or at least as an FYI, the first was a proposal from the Department of Health, Recreation and Community Services. This was to change our Athletic Training and Rehabilitation Studies Major to call it Clinical Healthcare Studies. This was originally approved by UCC. You may recall that there were some odd characteristics around this earlier when the COE proposal came forward. There was a note that some materials had been pulled out. That's because between the time UCC approved it but before I got here, there were some concerns raised by the Departments of Biology and Chemistry over the proposal and so it was pulled out of consideration for final consideration in Senate and it was moved back to UCC and moved into the cleanup meeting so that we could have some time for discussion on the consultations and try to get some kind of resolution. The concerns centered around a couple of issues. Mostly it was around a concern about whether the proposal as a curriculum was in and of itself something that could prepare students for jobs and postgraduate work that were implied by the new name. But the second was whether or not the major under the new name would begin to infringe on some other majors. There's a lot of conversation of email, there was a couple of meetings, one meeting in particular with all the departments involved. It was all pretty productive. They did come to an agreement that the curriculum perhaps did not match the name that they were shooting for. There were some particular reasons why they need to change the name, but that the curriculum and the name might not really be matching that particular case. The department wasn't able to come up with an alternative name in the timeframe that they have that made all the parties happy including themselves. And also the department didn't feel like it had time to rethink the curriculum in the amount of time it had. So in the end, what they did was to withdraw the name change. There were some minor tweakings within the electives inside the major and they asked to keep those, but to just maintain the original name until they can have time to be more thoughtful and really think through whether or not they want to come up with an alternate name or whether they want to revamp the entire curriculum to match the name that they originally proposed. But

7

they need more time for that, so they'd withdrawn the name change from consideration. Before I go to the next one, any questions about that?

[00:25:21]
James Mattingly: I think that's a really great example of how the consultation process worked as we hope it does.

[00:25:33]
Patrick Pease: If I can continue, then the second issue was an interesting one. It was in the Department of Technology, the Electrical Engineering Technology Major, this was brought forth with some relatively minor edits to the program but the practice of UCC is to, when a program comes into their review, they look at the entire program. And what they discovered was that this major was accidentally an extended major when it was not supposed to be, and so this created some conversation around what to do. The major sits at 77 hours, after the LAC double counting is subtracted out it's 73 hours, there's a 68-hour max limit for BS program. So it's five hours over what it's supposed to be for the program length it had. It took some reconstruction to figure out what happened but it seems like it went out of compliance in the 2010-2012 catalog. It went over by two hours when the department added the technical writing class. The only explanation that UCC has for this is that they simply missed it when it went through in 2010-2012. It was a human error that the class was added but they didn't catch that it was in fact making it an extended program. It went further out of compliance in the 2012-2014 catalog when languages and literature replaced that technical writing class with a different class. The new class had a prerequisite that the old class didn't have, so now there was a hidden prerequisite in addition. So the department thought they were just swapping out obsolete course for the replacement course. And again since technology had not brought their program in for review when the class change was accepted, it wasn't caught that it created a problem for technology. So that wasn't discovered until this year when technology brought theirs back in and it was discovered that this new prerequisite was in there that had not been when the class was originally added. So this created a lot of conversation about what do you do when you have something that's out of compliance? But it's been out of compliance for a while and so we spent a lot of time talking about the reason why those policy is in place. Jim Mattingly very kindly went back and found some very old Senate minutes that actually laid out the charge to UCC about extended programs which said that there should be no more. No programs that are extended should be allowed to get longer, no non-extended program should become extended. And over time, extended programs should try to bring their length down. So this was a long discussion but UCC didn't really know what to do with this. And so in the end, what they did was ask that it be labeled officially as an extended major and then that they would take up the discussions of how to tackle these bigger issues with Senate at a later date and I believe it's this Wednesday is when that conversation is going to start. And Jim is going to come talk with UCC about how to tackle some of these more thorny kinds of issues.

[00:28:52]
James Mattingly: Along with Faculty Chair Cutter.

[00:28:54]

Patrick Pease: Good. So this was one that was some human error and then some changes that were not technologies making that just created an unfortunate situation. Any questions about that before I go to the next one?

[00:29:13]
Francis Degnin: This is Francis Degnin. Shouldn't Technology have figured this out when the consultations were done? Like when English changed and affected them that they should in a consultation?

[00:29:25]
Patrick Pease: Ideally, yes. I actually don't know if the department got that consultation or not. I have no way of knowing . . . we don't have the records to reconstruct whether the department was consulted or not. Or how the department took those consultations whether they just said, yeah, we don't care, didn't look at it very closely or whether . . . I just don't know the story behind that. In an ideal world, yeah, that would have happened, but it didn't for whatever reason.

[00:29:52]
Francis Degnin: If we agreed to label them as an extended program, I guess my thinking is along the lines of we don't want extended programs but we should give them some time to come into compliance, I guess, is more my thinking. There has to be a really compelling reason to accept another extended program. But I also think they need a lot of time to figure out how to come into compliance. Is that a possibility that we're aiming toward or are we going to be just stuck with another extended program?

[00:30:19]
James Mattingly: Faculty Chair Cutter has a comment on this.

[00:30:23]
Barbara Cutter: Yeah, I was just going to clarify then Patrick can say if he sees it the same way. But since there is room for extended programs to exist, it was just no new extended programs. This is kind of an odd situation because it shouldn't have been extended back in 2010 but it's not a new extended program. So I think that's what we're going to talk about on Wednesday because I think you're making a really good point. It wouldn't be fair to people, you know, 10 years later and say, you have to change immediately.

[00:31:03]
James Mattingly: Is this . . . what is the UCC's general thought about what should happen here?

[00:31:10]
Patrick Pease: I don't know if they have a solid idea of what to do, but when they went back and looked at the original charge that they were given to monitor for extended programs, Senate at that time made it very clear what the intent was. And I think they feel that even their committee has drifted away from policing that as closely as it should be. I mean it was . . . the original proposal at that time had been to eliminate extended programs. That didn't pass

through and so the compromise was to have no new extended programs not to allow currently extended programs to be any longer. That was the compromise from the original proposal which was to eliminate them and force programs to become shorter. But the language was pretty strong back then and so particularly a couple of members of UCC really felt like this is something that should be tackled, but they recognized that they needed some sort of guidance from Senate. Being the Senate committee, they need some kind of guidance on how they should approach it, how firmly they should approach it then they also begin to have much bigger conversations around the notion whether that committee should be more proactive in trying to go through curriculum or to move curriculum policy in certain ways because they see the same problems year after year and they sort of complain about those problems year after year. And they began to think well maybe this is a body that can fix those problems that we're not seeing them year after year in some way. But again they wanted to get together with Senate leadership and talk through what that might mean, how they might do it, what kind of authority they might have to do certain things. And so I think that that's going to be very productive for them.

[00:33:02]
James Mattingly: I think so too. It's my intention to help them to understand that we value and need their expertise and therefore we would like them to freely make recommendations for changes in policy including one that we've discussed this morning, the setting of standards that would prevent a number of things from becoming problems in the first place.

[00:33:27]
Patrick Pease: Yeah. Anything else on the . . . or I should say I don't think I mentioned the major that was electrical engineering technology. Anything else on electrical engineering technology before I move to the third issue I want to bring to your attention? The third issue actually developed much more acutely in the last 72 hours, however it was on the cleanup agenda anyway, but some additional information has come through. The Interactive Digital Studies Major had a number of challenges to it and the program wasn't able to answer the questions UCC was asking at the first meeting so we had moved it to cleanup and give them a series of things to take a look at. Some of which are not really a problem now. They weren't cleaned up, but there were a number of issues. This is a program has bundles, these are tracks basically. And UCC discovered that in two of the bundles, there were unreported prerequisites, hidden prerequisites, that were in it. One of them was a new bundle that they built but hadn't reported all the prerequisites required for the courses in there. In particular, in that one, there's a marketing 3148 class that requires econ 1031 in marketing 2110 in order to take the course and they were not reporting the first two.

[00:35:00]
James Mattingly: [overlapping] [00:35:00] bundle 9.

[00:35:01]
Patrick Pease: During that meeting, we recognized that this was a problem. They had IDS that wanted to just waive that requirement and UCC pointed out that since that is run through communication and media, they didn't have the authority to waive marketing and econ

prerequisites, and so they needed permission to do that from college of business. In the meeting, we're really working to try to find a resolution. Someone in the meeting called the associate dean during the meeting and asked if they would consider waiving it. At the time, they declined to waive those prerequisites and so UCC asked that they either just report the prerequisites or drop the class or I think there might have been one or two other suggestions that were less viable. The program representative at the time decided to report the prerequisites in that meeting. We thought it was finished but the department head saw the draft catalog and disagreed with that decision and wanted to bring it back up for some more consideration. We had a meeting this morning, the department head had talked with the instructor and the instructor was keen to speak of the department head. The instructor of those courses that were the prerequisites was keen to go ahead and waive them for IDS students. And this is not uncommon curriculum for a prerequisite to be held in place for some students and not required for other students. Generally things like if you're in a major there'd be one condition. If you're out of the major, there might be another condition for that. And so it's not that uncommon to have something like this. So it appears that there may be a possibility to waive those prerequisites which we'd get the program back down to where it wanted to be in terms of the number of credit hours. Would you like to finish that conversation on where we are on the status of getting all that approved?

[00:36:59]
James Mattingly: I actually have a letter here from the instructor that teaches that course and I would just like to echo what Associate Provost Pease has said. The instructor actually went further to say that it really is important that the students are in this class and they continually . . . that there's a common practice already waiving these prerequisites for the students. And in fact, he closed by saying that it's very unlikely that these courses would make, would have enough marketing students in them if the IDS, the Interactive Digital Studies students weren't also in the course. So I think the solution that we talked about this morning was that we would have . . . that we would automatically systematically waive the prerequisites, not for the marketing students, but for the students in the IDS program so that when they register for the course, it wouldn't even come up as a prerequisite and they wouldn't be limited from registering for the course.

[00:38:20]
Patrick Pease: And that is essentially what IDS had wanted to in the first place. So what we're really looking for was permission to do that.

[00:38:27]
James Mattingly: And they wanted something a little different from that. I think they wanted to include the consent of instructor verbiage in there note, but that's really not . . . probably not a very good way to do this in the first place because it disadvantages the students that . . . it does a lot of things. But one of the things it does is disadvantage students that may not be confident enough to go ask for an exception. If we're going to make an exception for some students, it's probably more fair to students if we just do it for all students in the class.

[00:39:09]

Patrick Pease: Speaking on behalf of UCC, they say they're interested in systematic solutions that can be coded by the registrar so that students don't have to seek special one-off permission for things. And Diane Wallace is here and this is something that's quotable the way we've talked about it, right, Diane?

[00:39:26]
Diane Wallace: That is correct. And we do have that in certain instances. There are sometimes biology majors that are in certain majors that are already getting that type of content and so they don't feel that they need that as prerequisites. So we do code that behind the scenes.

[00:39:43]
James Mattingly: Good, thank you. And I know there are senators that want to weigh in. Francis Degnin.

[00:39:48]
Francis Degnin: The first question was just answered. I was going to ask if it was codable. The second question then is, you had the consent of the instructor, but called the dean or whatever and they said no. Does the marketing department, do they agree to this because the department used to agree.

[00:40:04]
James Mattingly: And that's the issue. I think that's what Associate Provost Pease was referring to when he asked if I'd like to disclose the status of this program. And so the instructor that designed the course and teaches the course has said yes, we need the students in the class. The department, the college, they have not weighed in on this proposal yet.

[00:40:28]
Francis Degnin: So how can we go forward until we hear that back, I guess?

[00:40:32]
James Mattingly: Well, we can go forward and the reason we can go forward has to do with our charge in these issues. If there is . . . part of our charge as the Senate is to adjudicate conflicts. So it is possible that the college of business could say no, but it's also possible that we could override them as a Senate. That's our responsibility.

[00:40:58]
Leigh Zeitz: Isn't the reason you have prerequisites so that the instructor will know that there is a knowledge base upon which they can work? And so if we are pulling out and negating the prerequisites, and that means that the instructor will now have to lower the level of expertise that he expects from the students, and it will change the curriculum itself.

[00:41:24]
James Mattingly: That's a very thoughtful point. So that's one of the points of tension, right, potential points of tension. The instructor has already told us that these students do quite well, in fact, these students have won awards in his class in competitions. So that is not the issue in

this particular case. For Vice-Chair Burnight and perhaps others that begs a] question of then why are they prerequisites in the first place.

[00:42:00]
Leigh Zeitz: Exactly. I mean, if you can pull out for those students who aren't in the field then why did the other ones have to have a prereq.

[00:42:07]
James Mattingly: Right. And maybe they need to have those courses but perhaps they should be required courses not prerequisites for another course. And as Associate Provost Pease has mentioned, sometimes departments do this for sequencing to make sure that their students can't get through . . . well take certain courses at certain times, but we can do that in other ways as well. Senator Cowley.

[00:42:41]
Danielle Cowley: This is Senator Cowley. One example of this in our minor is we have prerequisites for certain methods courses that practicing teachers, they're part of the elementary ed major would take, but we have a couple of classes that communication science or communication disorders students take. They're not education major so they wouldn't take these teaching classes, so the course isn't any less rigorous, it's just that students are different and they're bringing different knowledge. And I believe we should approach to how you all are talking about as far as for CES students, those prereqs are waived and so it doesn't count or add necessarily to the numbers, but there are specific class of student that experiences the course in a different way based on their background. But it's just as rigorous for them.

[00:43:40]
James Mattingly: Our student in the room, Jacob Levang.

[00:43:51]
Jacob Levang: You know, I'm in the college of business and so we have these 13 core classes and the business professors in the room can talk about this as well. And as a student, there's not always a rhyme or reason, we have to take all 13 and there seems to be in order that we're told to take them in and then we're done and we get to say we did them. I can tell you, econ, though I know is required for admission to the college, so I would assume that's why it's a prerequisite to this class. It's not because you need econ for digital customer experience, you need econ to be a business major. And then principles of marketing, I think, obviously makes sense for why but . . .

[00:44:31]
James Mattingly: For marketing majors?

[00:44:33]
Jacob Levang: Yeah, for marketing majors. But a lot of these classes are very specific to learn one thing, well, the college of businesses have a lot of building on as they would say. I think most of the classes within that college are very specific to you're learning this one specific

pocket, niche, area and that's what you get out of this course. Not to say there is not . . . no building upon that, but it's my observation.

[00:44:56]
James Mattingly: Good point. Barbara Cutter.

[00:44:59]
Barbara Cutter: Yeah, and I think all this conversation reveals another issue which is that we're all talking about the instructor and the instructor's evaluation of what's appropriate. And so that's why I think the most important thing here is that the instructor approves this. And I concur with Senate Chair Mattingly's, you know, observation that, well, if the college felt differently, maybe the Senate should put some pressure on the college there because it's really . . . it's the, you know, instructor is the one who knows best what's appropriate and these particular students wouldn't be in the college of business, they'd be in CHAS.

[00:45:49]
James Mattingly: And I'm not sure the college, if given the chance again, given some more time to . . . because they were put on the spot earlier, would say the same thing. Because I know being a faculty member in the college of business that generally, when we're asked about waiving prerequisites, our canned answer is no. If one student has to take the prerequisite, all students have to take the prerequisite. But the problem is . . . and that's fine for all students within your department, within the program, that are part of the program that the course was created for. But if you say that for all students across the university, you undermine the potential for interdisciplinary programs. And we need to elevate and expand our interdisciplinary programs, not put up roadblocks to them. So I think we have a momentous choice to make.

[00:46:51]
Patrick Pease: Can I particularly want to ask Diane, what is our timeline for making this decision? It is very short now, right?

[00:46:58]
Diane Wallace: The proof copy was requested back from the departments tomorrow, the 10th, but I can work with that given the situation. So if we just have a response by January, early January.

[00:47:15]
James Mattingly: Okay, so they have . . .

[00:47:16]
Diane Wallace: That will give some time.

[00:47:19]
James Mattingly: Senator Degnin.

[00:47:21]
Francis Degnin: Yeah, I mean, I can see your point that we can override them if we have to, but I also think that we need to go back to them first. I just think that's a matter of courtesy and authority, yeah.

[00:47:33]
Jim Wohlpart: So this is Provost Wohlpart. Let me suggest that the issue has less to do with the administration because the administration does not control curriculum. And it goes beyond, I would encourage you all to think, beyond the instructor to the department faculty and the university curriculum team. I don't know where they are with us. If they oppose this, I would be cautious about the faculty Senate overriding them. That's just from my perspective. I have no qualms about you overriding the administration if the administration weighed it. But I'd be cautious about overriding the faculty and if you have heard from the faculty for the college curriculum.

[00:48:10]
James Mattingly: Thomas Hesse.

[00:48:11]
Thomas Hesse: I mean, according to UCC notes the department has already weighed in--Lisa Jepsen spoke for them. And I mean these are the words. Maureen Clayton spoke with Lisa Jepsen and the department does not want to waive marketing 2110 for IDS majors. So they've already weighed in once. Now upon further thought, they might change their position, but at least initially, they said no.

[00:48:37]
Francis Degnin: Is that just a phone call though or is it something more?

[00:48:42]
Patrick Pease: It was the phone call.

[00:48:43]
Francis Degnin: Right, so they were just on the spot.

[00:48:45]
Patrick Pease: UCC had identified this. This is the rewritten version where UCC added the hidden prerequisites back in. And so I think this one was . . . I can't recall if this was discovered in the first meeting or if it was just discovered in the second meeting, but basically UCC was asking for them to simply reveal it. And that phone call was basically an attempt to see whether or not there was an ability to waive it.

[00:49:15]
James Mattingly: And I think that phone call came, if I remember correctly from reading the transcript, I think that phone call came because there were a number of people in the room during the UCC meeting, Mark Fienup was one of them who came up with a solution that's very

15

similar to the one that we're talking about right now. And I believe perhaps if I remember from the transcript, maybe even Diane Wallace also said, why? It's a shame that students would have to take those courses if they didn't need them. And so I think they were getting ready to come to the conclusion that we have also come to and then the phone call came and that's the point of tension.

[00:49:58]
Jim Wohlpart: So this is the Provost again. I would encourage to have the instructor reach out to his colleagues in the department and also UCC which we should be able to do by tomorrow to give an answer to the registrar. And from my perspective, you will need to decide what you're going to do with the proposal that's in front of you with the caveat that it may be changed by the department faculty and the college curriculum team.

[00:50:19]
James Mattingly: Thank you. So there are a number of options. One thing . . . yes, Tom Hesse?

[00:50:25]
Thomas Hesse: Well, there's also the issue at the English department and model 4. Do you want to treat that separately or . . . ?

[00:50:31]
James Mattingly: I think we do need to treat it separately and we don't have the feedback back from the English department that we've gotten back from the marketing department. But if what we're saying . . . what we're saying is that we're going to give the department a chance to weigh . . . another chance to weigh in then I think we should treat them both the same way. Senator Degnin.

[00:51:00]
Francis Degnin: If we give them a chance to weigh in, will we have another meeting before, we have to have this sent into the registrar's office?

[00:51:07]
James Mattingly: I don't think so. Our next meeting is January 13th.

[00:51:10]
Francis Degnin: Right, I don't think it's going to be . . . so can we do this by email?

[00:51:15]
James Mattingly: We could or another thing we can do, we have the power to . . . the Senate has the power to delegate its authority to the UCC in this case. That's one thing that could be done. Another thing that could be done is we could pass an amendment that provides this conclusion that we've come up with. And in the case that that's the one that has a proposal to the UCC effectively. And then if that's not the one that they come up, that they agreed to, then we would need to do something else.

[00:51:58]
James Wohlpart: This is the Provost . . . what I would encourage you all to do is to approve it as is with any changes that are made or adapted. If the department decides to waive it then it's gone and that's easy enough to do, you all have approved it in advance. I guess the question I would ask is to the department and Chris and Laura are here, would they want this to go forward as is if the department and the college curriculum team does not waive the prerequisite?

[00:52:23]
Laura Terlip: Yes. First of all, let me say that we have always footnnoted that so that the prerequisites weren't hidden, they were just a quick note not put upfront. It seems to me that's kind of a middle position where it's there but it's not specified as 21 hours.

[00:52:42]
Laura Terlip: That's in practice in a number of majors since I've been here 25 years.

[00:52:54]
James Mattingly: I don't think that that is a practice that either the UCC nor the Senate would approve of going forward.

[00:53:08]
Patrick Pease: Yeah, this is better . . . over the last few years, I feel pretty confident that UCC would so that if it's required, it's required. And if it was required it should be listed. This is the language the committee has begun to use over the last years is truth in advertising. If you have to take the course then it should be listed and transparent to the students. And so footnoting it and saying that this is 15 hours when it's actually 21 is, in fact, where what got us into this conversation. So UCC would say that unless these were going to be waived, this is what UCC wants is it requires 21 hours as it stands now and so they want it listed as being 21 hours long. I don't think that committee is going to have any concern of it dropping to 15. If it really is just 15, they won't have any problem with that. But they just want an honest reporting, it is really all it all comes down to.

[00:54:09]
James Mattingly: Chris Martin, please weigh in.

[00:54:11]
Chris Martin: Just I appreciate the additional time that might be available from the registrar's office. I think our main concern was that these things happen. And again in terms of truth in advertising from a different perspective, if that's 21 credit hours and our students haven't been taking those prerequisites then I think it gives them an idea that they have to take two more classes there. So I think if we have to have a little bit of time to go back and actually talk specifically with the departments and kind of explain, you know, for seven years we've had IDS program where it's been five courses per bundle, there've been generally equal bundles then how we can resolve this in a way also makes the department happy, I think that might be a good resolution. But we just need a little bit more time to go back and talk about how we might

do that in a way that's transparent both for the students and for the program and it doesn't mess up the design of the IDS program as well. My favorite concern that I express this with Patrick and Jim earlier today was that as we're embarking on academic positioning, we need to think about how we're going to handle doing things across department boundaries where it must be just, you know, design curricula that have no prerequisites at all. We have to think about how we want to handle these. And I understand like in some cases, you know, we don't want to jump to French 2 before we've done French 1, but there's other courses, I think Jacob mentioned this where you might not need them . . . particularly it might make sense for the person in a certain major but from another major it may not make sense. So those are the kind of things we need to sort, to take a little bit more time to sort through.

[00:55:57]
Jim Wohlpart: So again, this is the provost. Chris, I appreciate that and I do hope that the instructor goes back to the department in the university for the college curriculum team. I guess the question for you though, in terms of the Senate approving this, let's suppose that in the next day or two, they say no, are you happy with this because this is what's in front of the Faculty Senate.

[00:56:17]
Chris Martin: Yeah, I think in that case, I mean, if we have to work with them, I mean, you know, and I know time is of the essence, so we don't have a whole year to work through this. So I think we can accept that with any . . . I think the proposal was any additional changes we might make at the departments before the deadline I think.

[00:56:33]
James Mattingly: Francis Degnin, you had a question.

[00:56:35]
Francis Degnin: This is Francis Degnin. I just want to note again I find it compelling, the instructor's letter fairly compelling. And so I'm thinking about . . . I'd like to make an amendment that for this and the English proposal, we go ahead and delegate to the UCC the authority to either accept it in this form or to eliminate the prerequisites for the programs listed after conversation consultation with the departments.

[00:57:02]
James Mattingly: The amendment's on the floor.

[00:57:03]
John Burnight: Second.

[00:57:04]
James Mattingly: Okay, that's second. Does that require . . . what conversation do you need around that before we can vote? Barbara Cutter.

[00:57:11]

Barbara Cutter: Well I guess my question is, this came to us as an unresolved issue. So I'm a little concerned about delegating it back to the UCC rather than sending them with a recommendation of what we think is best since it's the Senate's job to adjudicate unresolved curriculum issues.

[00:57:37]
James Mattingly: An alternative would be to hold an electronic vote in the Senate. I could email all of you once we have this.

[00:57:48]
Francis Degnin: This is Francis Degnin again. My concern about making a strong recommendation even though I have one in mind is that if we make a strong recommendation, it feels like we're forcing the department and it's still better to consult with them first, let them come to their own conclusion, and then either let UCC or us draw our conclusion after that.

[00:58:09]
James Mattingly: I don't think there's anything wrong with the Senate weighing in on what we think should be done here. In fact, I believe that's our role. I think that's our responsibility. Senator Kirmani.

[00:58:23]
Syed Kirmani: Now what's the problem with adding consent of instructor there.

[00:58:29]
James Mattingly: That's a very good question. An issue has to do with, say, people who suffer from anxiety. They may not have the confidence to go ask the instructor for an exception when other students might. So there are issues of injustice there to deal with. That's why we're saying if they're going to be waived for some, they need to be waived for all. I think Leigh Zeitz had a question and then Barbara Cutter.

[00:59:00]
Leigh Zeitz: I was just reviewing our stuff. We do have prerequisites because we want everybody before they get into our other minor classes, to take our edtech and design. But it's a matter of sequence. Now is there any way as, I mean, prereqs definitely bring about sequence. Is there any way to enforce sequence without prereqs?

[00:59:23]
James Mattingly: One way is to say junior or senior standing. That's probably the best way. That they can't take it until they're a junior. They can't get it until they're a senior. There may be other ways we could find to do that, but those are the two that are current . . . I mean that's the alternative that's currently available. Barbara Cutter.

[00:59:53]
Barbara Cutter: So I just want to say I completely agree with Senator Mattingly's point about consent of the instructor having some issues, but I also . . . my understanding is that's currently

allowed and it's quite common, so there's no . . . if one couldn't have a better solution than that, there's no reason that wouldn't be allowed to happen under our current system.

[01:00:23]
Patrick Pease: This is Patrick Pease. That's in place right now with the rewritten UCC version. There still is . . . or consent of instructor in that course. So in fact that outcome that the IDS wants can happen. It just isn't going to happen systematically for every student. Now the students have to go through extra steps to make it happen. But it does exist, so that that option is there. The concern is what is creating something that is equitable for all students and quotable by the registrar's office so that the solution in fact does happen for each student without them having to have some additional awareness of what that opportunity is.

[01:01:05]
Barbara Cutter: This is Barbara Cutter again. I guess my follow up question is, ideally, it would be waived for the IDS students. But if for some reason the department said no, couldn't it say consent of the instructor and be down to 15 hours?

[01:01:20]
Patrick Pease: It could but it's not IDS's call. It is marketing's call. So IDS will be relying on marketing for the waivers because you can't waive a prerequisites from somebody else's course.

[01:01:31]
James Mattingly: Which is what they do now. The instructor freely gives this so . ..

[01:01:37]
Becky Hawbaker: But it still has to be . . . sorry. It still has to be reported as 21 hours though, which is sort of pseudo truth in advertising.

[01:01:48]
James Mattingly: Francis Degnin?

[01:01:50]
Francis Degnin: If we're going to make a recommendation, perhaps we should just poll the Senate to see where people are standing in terms of, you know, do we recommend that the prerequisite be dropped for the students, I guess would be in question. I'm just wondering if we should poll the Senate.

[01:02:12]
James Mattingly: I think that's a fine idea. We do have an amendment on the table that we need to defeat if we're going to . . . if we're not going to do that.

[01:02:17]
Francis Degnin: This is just an informal poll.

[01:02:19]
James Mattingly: Okay.

[01:02:20]
Francis Degnin: Then we could make another amendment or remove it, so.

[01:02:23]
James Mattingly: Okay, so I guess then the question is how many people would be in support of that approach, right, which is the approach we've talked about which would be to waive, automatically waive in the system prerequisites for all IDS students.

[01:02:43]
Becky Hawbaker: Just for the marketing or for . . .

[01:02:45]
James Mattingly: Just for the IDS students [overlapping] [01:02:47] the marketing.

[01:02:47]
Becky Hawbaker: And not the English ones?

[01:02:48]
James Mattingly: And not the marketing students.

[01:02:50]
Becky Hawbaker: No, I mean, not the English one? There's two prereqs.

[01:02:54]
James Mattingly: If it's good for one, is it good for the other?

[01:02:57]
Becky Hawbaker: I don't understand that part of the issue.

[01:02:58]
Francis Degnin: So we need to talk about the English [overlapping] [01:02:59]

[01:03:00]
Becky Hawbaker: I don't have to vote for that, I don't vote. [overlapping] [01:03:02]

[01:03:03]
James Mattingly: And I don't think we know whether there are those differences because we haven't heard back from that department. Chris Martin, I think the question the question on the table is, are there significant differences, substantive differences that we know of and the necessity of the prerequisites for the digital writing bundle, the English course, versus the marketing course. We already know that those aren't necessary for the IDS students taking marketing . . .

[01:03:36]
Chris Martin: I don't know of any differences. I mean, in practice again for seven years, I mean, with advisor help, I mean it's been 15 credit hours so that's usually been way through consent of instructor. I didn't get . . . I've been trying to reach and talk . . . we want to talk more at the faculty in that area in the language and literature, so we don't have a final answer from the faculty themselves, so.

[01:04:02]
James Mattingly: Okay, good. Tom Hesse.

[01:04:05]
Thomas Hesse: Well again going back to the UCC minutes, it says the English department designed the bundle. And so if they designed it with the course, the prerequisite in the bundle, there's probably a reason for that.

[01:04:17]
Chris Martin: I should mention it was something, if you look at the minutes that was added in in the last cleanup meeting by UCC, so it wasn't anything that they requested nor that we had requested, so to that extent it was a bit of a surprise.

[01:04:32]
James Mattingly: Okay.

[01:04:32]
Francis Degnin: This is Francis Degnin. Just to clarify, part of the reason I'm asking for the poll is we can still delegate the authority for the decision to the UCC, but basically say that this is a strong sense of the Senate so that . . . but they may find something compelling, reason to go against it. Now I want to give them that flexibility when they begin to explore. But then we've given them some guidance, too.

[01:05:00]
James Mattingly: And so I think that we could. We know enough to make that kind of assessment relative to the web development program because we know something about the marketing prerequisites. But I don't think we know enough about the English program to make an assessment about that, so I would recommend that if we do such a straw poll, that we exclude the digital writing bundle from that poll. Megan Balong.

[01:05:31]
Megan Balong: I just have a clar- . . . and maybe it's in the notes here, but [indiscernible] [01:05:35] the principles of marketing is the same instructor. Sometimes I do worry, I think instructors should have lots of choices and timing but they do need to work with their department and the curriculum can't lie within an instructor themselves. And so I wonder how long that course has been under the guidance of that instructor and the development of that

instructor. I worry about something would happen to the instructor, what . . . it's a programmatic change based on a person, not the system.

[01:06:09]
James Mattingly: Yes. I know that that instructor created this course and another course that these students often take. Created it and is the only person that teaches it to my knowledge.

[01:06:23]
James Mattingly: Amy Petersen.

[01:06:24]
Amy Petersen: So I just wanted to ask Diane when she says early January what that means. Because the Senate is meeting on the 1st day of classes which I think is January 13th. And then I also wondered if we are going back to the UCC, when their next meeting will be.

[01:06:43]
Patrick Pease: They have no standing meetings at this point. It would be an ad-hoc meeting.

[01:06:50]
Diane Wallace: And for my point, Diane Wallace. From my perspective, if this is good for students and we come to a good resolution, January 13th is when a decision can be made, I can work with that. I've got plenty of other curriculum I can be working on at any time.

[01:07:08]
Amy Petersen: So we could bring it back to the Senate potentially and vote on it, January 13th?

[01:07:13]
Diane Wallace: If that would be the best solution, yeah.

[01:07:19]
James Mattingly: Senator Cowley.

[01:07:21]
Danielle Cowley: I first just want to thank Diane for that [applause] because I do think that if this . . . so I understand that the truth in transparency and that that can have multiple meanings depending on how the catalog looks. But thinking about if this is what it needs to look like to make students aware of prerequisites, that it can have a snowball effect for example minors that draw on majors for prereqs. So for example, the special education minor for our methods prereqs, they have to take elementary ed methods prereqs first because you can't differentiate teaching until you know teaching. But then that would literally double are minor if we had to put all of the prereqs in a list like this. And so I just worry . . . I understand this process, but that if it's like set in stone and has to be this way, what happens then when other programs come about what their curriculum changes and we need to make them look like this. So it could mean more time.

[01:08:42]
Patrick Pease: This is Patrick Pease. On that issue, I want to be clear that the faculty who designed the curriculum, if you design a 60-hour minor, that's your decision to design that. So all UCC is doing is asking you to report everything that you put in there. UCC has not added anything to any program. UCC did not add anything to this. They ask that the prerequisites be shown because the department designed it with those prerequisites in there. So not revealing them has nothing to do with the length of the program that's still coded in the SIS system for whatever number of hours that is. I will say though to your point, UCC does treat things differently. If the minor can only be taken in conjunction with the major, they will treat it differently than if the minor can be taken by anybody. If it can be taken by anybody then they would say everything needs to be revealed. If you can only declare the minor if you are already in a major, they've been more flexible on the reporting with the double counting in there because there's a condition, there's an additional condition in there that prevents a random student from psychology coming and taking that minor. And so they see that clearly a little bit differently in that particular scenario and that's actually come up. Yeah, so if it's tied specifically to a major then it can't . . . it is treated a little bit differently.

[01:10:08]
James Mattingly: Francis Degnin.

[01:10:09]
Francis Degnin: Okay, so given the new revelation, thank you about the registrar. I'm going to withdraw that motion, but I'm going to make another motion and that both the English and this part be taken out for approval by the 13th and ask for the UCC to see with some additional negotiation and have more information for us by then.

[01:10:31]
James Mattingly: So the motion is that we would remove these two programs from the cleanup package and consider the rest of the package, potentially approve the rest of the package and then consider these at our next meeting. Is there a second?

[01:10:47]
Thomas Hesse: To just be clear, we're just removing bundles 4 and 9.

[01:10:50]
Francis Degnin: I think that's right, yeah.

[01:11:03]
Patrick Pease: I think that it seems to be the best solution just to table these for that meeting and then you will approve either as is or in some modified form. It'll still be approved in time to be in the catalog regardless of which version of the changes are in place.

[01:11:23]
James Mattingly: Well I guess I'll just ask the question. Could we . . . can you work on the rest of the bundles? I guess we could just pull these two bundles out and approve the rest. It would

refer . . . it would pertain to two different programs, both the major and the minor, so we would do the same thing for both. I guess we can do that.

[01:11:53]
Francis Degnin: Okay.

[01:11:56]
James Mattingly: So then is there a second to pull those two.

[01:12:02]
Leigh Zeitz: Sure, I'll second.

[01:12:04]
James Mattingly: Okay, Leigh Zeitz. Any other discussion involved in what we're doing? Leigh Zeitz.

[01:12:12]
Leigh Zeitz: Yeah, I'm not sure. I still I want to verify something about the instructor consent. So what you're saying is that we're concerned about student anxiety as to whether they will actually go to the instructor for consent and that's why we're trying to . . .

[01:12:24]
James Mattingly: We're concerned about equity.

[01:12:27]
Leigh Zeitz: I understand that. Can we . . . I mean they have program counselors, you know, advisers who help them out on that sort of thing. Would that be a way in which they could go through the adviser? I mean I understand that students . . . I mean, I've heard from students all the time and I do understand that many times they say we'll choose anyone who talk to the instructor. But when they talk to me, I say well, this is how you do it and I help them do it. And I don't know what . . .

[01:12:58]
Jim Wohlpart: So this is the Provost. I would encourage you all to be thinking about systemic approaches to your curriculum as opposed to one-offs. It is true in this bundle that every student does not need to take this. Let's not put students through a hoop. Systemic change, that way it can be coded and you never have to worry about it.

[01:13:18]
Patrick Pease: This is Patrick Pease. There's one instructor that teaches now. If something happens, who knows what, and that instructor turns over, the entire deal may change. Right now the instructor will waive them by consent of instructor. Spring semester, if somebody else is teaching it, they may say no, I don't want to waive that and the entire condition is changed that you built your curriculum around, so this needs to be something that is a permanent

solution one way or the other. It either is 21 hours or it's 15 hours. And we need to decide which one it is, well, really the department of marketing has to decide which one it is really.

[01:13:59]
James Mattingly: And then we remove all of those unneeded transactions that's why I ask.

[01:14:03]
Patrick Pease: It just becomes, yeah, students never . . . they won't see 21, they'll see 15, they'll see the list of what they need to take and they'll never have to ask a question about it and never have to get special permission if that ends up being the solution. So that really is the long-term fix for . . . for some things going to go in the catalog because this program may not get reviewed again for years.

[01:14:27]
James Mattingly: Are there any other . . . anything else that needs discussion about this, are we ready to vote? Okay.

[01:14:38]
Thomas Hesse: Can you just recap what we're voting on? Just to be clear on [overlapping] [01:14:41] words.

[01:14:44]
James Mattingly: Yes. We are pulling items 4 and 9, the digital writing bundles and web development bundles from the . . . I can't remember what it's called. The major . . . the IDS major in the cleanup package and approving the rest.

[01:15:14]
Thomas Hesse: And what are we doing with those bundles?

[01:15:17]
James Mattingly: With those bundles, the departments have already been asked. We will ask the departments to weigh in on whether they would like to systematically . . .

[01:15:29]
Francis Degnin: The UCC will do so, right?] The UCC will follow up with the departments and then we'll make a decision. We're actually not . . . we're just removing them from the bundle, we're not actually approving the whole bundle yet . . . the whole thing yet. We're just removing them and deferring them until the 13th.

[01:15:44]
Amy Petersen: Yes.

[01:15:46]
Francis Degnin: To give a little more time.

[01:15:48]
James Mattingly: Diane Wallace.

[01:15:48]
Diane Wallace: Did you want to include the minor with that because they do affect both.

[01:15:53]
James Mattingly: That's right, for the . . .

[01:15:55]
Male: Major and the minor.

[01:15:56]
James Mattingly: For the IDS major and the minor, that's correct. Okay, so are all in favor of removing those two items from both majors or from the major and the minor? Okay. All in favor say aye. Thank you.

[01:16:15]
All: Aye.

[01:16:16]
James Mattingly: Any opposed? Abstaining? So we've removed those items. Now we can vote on whether to approve the rest of the package. Francis Degnin.

[01:16:26]
Francis Degnin: I guess I'm still concerned about the technology size and do we want to give some guidance for that for the extended major because we presented the problem but we didn't actually discuss or make any motions about how to deal with it.

[01:16:46]
Barbara Cutter: I just have one comment that I think the Senate and the UCC are going to have to have a lot of conversation about this. It's going to take some time because if you think about it, when we revised the LAC, a lot of people's majors and minors are, their length is tied to classes they're currently in that system. So when those requirements changed, there's going to be a lot of programs who could potentially be in the situation of having their majors lengthened which could cause them to be extended. So I wouldn't see this as a kind of one-off situation. This is going to be something that I think we're all going to have to think about quite a bit.

[01:17:33]
James Mattingly: We will be having a conversation . . . Barbara and I are having a conversation with the UCC on Wednesday. We can begin a discussion about that topic then. And I think it'll be back. Senator Kirmani had something to say.

[01:17:45]

Syed Kirmani: Yeah, you know, I have a feeling that the departments are not really careful when they decided the prereqs. I mean if a prerequisite is really needed for teaching the course, then have it. But if it is not, then why include it? I have a feeling that some departments do that to inflate the course numbers for other courses. And I don't think that once your done with prerequisite just for the sake of prerequisite, if you really need it, fine, go ahead and have it. Now in this case, the department is also at fault, so let them suffer. They should have been careful from the very beginning. They should really think is it really needed. If it is not needed, then don't have it.

[01:18:32]
James Mattingly: I know at least one other person in the room that would agree with you. Francis Degnin.

[01:18:37]
Francis Degnin: What I think I'd like to move is that we approve our proposal for now, but we give them two years perhaps to come into compliance. So they have some time to work out how to do it.

[01:18:55]
James Mattingly: I suspect the UCC has had some conversation about this and might be willing to weigh in and tell us what they think so. I'll ask them that question.

[01:19:06]
Jim Wohlpart: So this is the Provost again. I would encourage you again to address this systemically. I would encourage UCC to come up with a recommendation to you all about how they're going to address all of these issues including what happens when GenEd changes so that there's a systemic approach to how we address any of these kinds of issues rather than singling somebody out and rather than slowing up this curriculum.

[1:19:29]
Patrick Pease: And that's in fact what UCC would like is guidance on systematic decision making that they can apply as curriculum proposals come through.

[1:19:42]
James Mattingly: And they have a great deal of expertise in that regard so they may be able to make some recommendations about what they'd like to see. We have a vote. We need to vote on this curriculum package. After taking out the two offending programs that caused all the kerfuffle in the first place, who would like to . . . who is in favor of approving the rest of the package say aye.

[01:20:20]
All: Aye.

[01:20:21]

James Mattingly: Are there any opposed? Are there any abstaining? So the rest of the package has been approved. We have one more item that we could get to it if you would like to give us a little more time. Is there a motion to extend the session for 15 minutes today till 5:15?

[01:20:45]
Leigh Zeitz: So moved.

[01:20:46]
James Mattingly: Leigh Zeitz. Is there a second?

[01:20:48]
Gretchen Gould: Second.

[01:20:50]
James Mattingly: Gretchen Gould. All in favor of extending by 15 minutes, please say aye.

[01:20:56]
All: Aye.

[01:20:57]
James Mattingly: All opposed? Any abstaining? We are extended. So we have time for the GERC Update. We have a seat up here, Doug, that has a microphone nearby, if you'd like to come talk? Doug Shaw, our co-chair . . . the Faculty co-chair of the GERC. Brenda, there's another if you want to come.

[01:21:26]
Doug Shaw: In recognition of the fact that this is an extended meeting, in my New York Heritage, I will be extremely quick, but then you can certainly ask questions. So thank you, etcetera. Number one, we received a lot of feedback over the . . . since we last spoke. We had listening sections, department visits, counseled academic department heads, advising network, etcetera. There is still availability to visit your department. If you would like us to, please let us know. We want all this feedback because this should be a product of the entire department. Two, we did not have a lot of hate over the basic idea, so we are talking about details, but the general three-tiered structure that we presented, the consensus among the faculty is it's basically a good idea. And of course we are discussing specifics and that's what we've been doing in our committee right now is incorporating all that feedback. So specific things that are going on as a result of that feedback. Tier three, it turns out that there had been two different that are overlapping but not exactly the same interpretations of that. As some people had been thinking of it as kind of a second minor and some people had been thinking of it as taking one complex problem and attacking it from multiple perspectives, so we definitively said the second approach. We are thinking of tier three as you take a big problem, attack it from multiple perspectives and so that's the idea behind tier three. Point four, the diversity outcome, outcome three, we are discussing whether it should appear two places or three places, perhaps more, at least one of them will appear in the tier one, at least once in tier two. And I want to emphasize that an outcome appearing in a course, what that means is that is going to be

assessed. So if you put an outcome in a course, that means we are going to assess it. If you don't put an outcome in a course, it still can be covered by that course, it just means it won't be assessed. Number five, the human condition is now in two boxes, so we took human identity out as its own thing and we put human condition in twice, once from a global perspective and once we don't have the right word for non-global perspective but that would be more, the intent would be kind of a United States-y thing. We figure that . . . there we go. Good thing this isn't being recorded. The idea is that some of the outcomes like outcomes three and five are kind of broad. And really to do it right, you should attack it from a global and non-global perspective. And number six, please notice that I did that in five minutes. Number seven, any questions? Yes.

[01:24:16]
Leigh Zeitz: This is Leigh Zeitz. I don't understand when you're talking about taking a big problem and addressing it from multiple perspectives for a tier three.

[01:24:24]
Doug Shaw: Okay. Just off the top of my head, world hunger. World hunger is a problem that you can think of from a chemistry perspective. Basically how do you grow more food or biology. It's certainly an economic problem and I would argue it's also a communications problem. So give me several courses that attack world hunger and we'll call that tier three.

[01:24:47]
Leigh Zeitz: And that would be the certificate where somebody will get a world hunger certificate?

[01:24:52]
Doug Shaw: Okay, yes, and then whether we're calling this thing a certificate or whatever, we call the thing that's something that we're still discussing and that's based on a lot of faculty feedback on that.

[01:25:00]
Leigh Zeitz: So it's a world hunger thing?

[01:25:01]
Doug Shaw: But the soul of tier three is not the certificate. The soul of tier three is take a big problem and have several courses that deal with that problem from different disciplines. And if you think about it, there are a lot of big problems that can and should be addressed that way and traditionally they aren't.

[01:25:21]
Leigh Zeitz: Thank you.

[01:25:22]
Doug Shaw: Yes.

[01:25:23]
James Mattingly: Francis Degnin.

[01:25:24]
Francis Degnin: With the tier three, be able to . . . one of the questions I've raised previously was, could all this be done in the community college and transfer. It sounds like tier three would not be able to even though the other tiers might be able to.

[01:25:37]
Doug Shaw: Correct.

[01:25:38]
Francis Degnin: Okay, thank you.

[01:25:39]
Doug Shaw: Yes.

[01:25:40]
James Mattingly: Barbara Cutter.

[01:25:40]
Barbara Cutter: It sounds like you're talking about getting rid of the human identity category, is that what you were saying or did I misunderstood?

[01:25:48]
Doug Shaw: You did not. A human identity as its own course would be . . . we're getting rid of that. What was the made . . . right now the outcome for human identity was diversity and that would be appearing several places throughout.

[01:26:03]
Barbara Cutter: So instead of human identity . . .

[01:26:05]
Doug Shaw: So the outcome is . . .

[01:26:06]
Barbara Cutter: . . . and human condition, there's two human conditions. So there's no additional credit hours in that area.

[01:26:13]
Doug Shaw: Correct. And the same outcomes would be evaluated . . . the same outcomes would be measured what . . . obviously there are tradeoffs here but we wanted to explicitly put a global perspective and I'm thinking United States perspective but that's not quite right.

[01:26:31]

Barbara Cutter: No, I see what you're getting at. I'm just concerned that the number of credit hours wasn't increased there.

[01:26:37]
Doug Shaw: No, no. Take one out, put one in. So taking out human identity, putting in a second human condition.

[01:26:46]
Brenda Bass: But that's still under discussion, but not about the human condition, but in general between tier two and tier three, the committee is having extensive conversations, so it is still possible that they could come back and say they've taken some credits from that tier three, the certificate, and put on tier two.

[01:27:03]
Doug Shaw: Oh, yeah.

[01:27:03]
James Mattingly: That was Brenda Bass.

[01:27:06]
Barbara Cutter: And Barbara Cutter again. Because just to follow up, one of my concerns about diversity is that a lot of the coursework in diversity tends to be . . . it doesn't have to be I know, but it tends to be in humanities and social sciences and so not making that category any larger could . . . you might not end up with any more diversity related course work than you would have gotten in the old system even if it's more explicitly labeled this time.

[01:27:35]
Doug Shaw: And we are also thinking of a third diversity thing. And again, diversity could be in every course. The question is when do you measure it, when do you assess it? And we really want . . . as far as the outcomes based model, we really start thinking of an outcome in a box is a statement on when do you assess it.

[01:27:55]
Francis Degnin: I'm just checking . . . I'm trying to remember now, is tier three required or is it optional?

[01:27:59]
Doug Shaw: Tier three is required. What we had been talking about before was whether you could do tier three with or without a certificate. But tier three has always been required. And when we started talking about certificates then there was a bit of a schism when some people were thinking in terms of this as a second . . . as like a . . .

[01:28:19]
Francis Degnin: A minor.

[01:28:19]
Doug Shaw: Yeah, as a kind of a fake minor that we're not going to do.

[01:28:25]
Francis Degnin: Okay, excellent.

[01:28:27]
Doug Shaw: Sure. Yes.

[01:28:28]
Thomas Hesse: This is Tom Hesse. The changes you just described, are they on the GREC website?

[01:28:34]
Doug Shaw: Are they up yet? I'm asking Brenda Bass.

[01:28:36]
Brenda Bass: Those are not. This is Brenda Bass. They are not because they literally have still been under discussion as of last Friday and so the changes aren't up yet in terms of a new draft. The committee is trying to work out all the details to then bring back a cohesive new total draft to the Senate and to campus rather than piecing it.

[01:29:00]
Doug Shaw: But part of what we had discussed last year was to give you updates as often as possible.

[01:29:05]
James Mattingly: And thank you for that.

[01:29:06]
Doug Shaw: We're awesome.

[01:29:08]
James Mattingly: Yes, you are. Barbara Cutter.

[01:29:10]
Barbara Cutter: So, yeah, I have a couple of questions about tier three. One thing I might add, I think, you know, I assume maybe you're talking about putting diversity in there and I would think that it would be hard not to if you're talking about a big current problem from multiple perspectives. And the other thing is, is did you have any conversation about sort of trying to ensure . . . in the first iteration, it was at least two disciplines.

[01:29:38]
Doug Shaw: What do you mean by it?

[01:29:39]
Barbara Cutter: The tier three. The four . . .

[01:29:41]
Doug Shaw: Yes, yes.

[01:29:42]
Barbara Cutter: Have you done any more thought about sort of . . .

[01:29:48]
Doug Shaw: The question isn't . . .

[01:29:50]
Barbara Cutter: Because there's also the out, that people can just take the four courses.

[01:29:55]
Doug Shaw: Right.

[01:29:56]
Barbara Cutter: And so have you talked about making sure that that's multi-disciplinary and not just two disciplines so you end up taking the four [overlapping] [01:30:04]

[01:30:05]
Doug Shaw: The thing we're discussing is how, not if. So yes, it should be multi-disciplinary, everybody agrees on that. And now the question is now and that was when we discuss things with the advising network. We got a lot of feedback on a lot of what you can and can't do routinely.

[01:30:22]
Barbara Cutter: And just to clarify another question that people had previously, if somebody has an AA degree, they don't . . . they're potentially not going to take any of this, correct?

[01:30:31]
Doug Shaw: I would say that's correct.

[01:30:32]
Brenda Bass: That's what the committee has discussed.

[01:30:35]
Barbara Cutter: So the question about, you know, is tier three able to be taken at community college then the answer would be no. But if you have the AA degree, it doesn't matter, you won't take it anyway.

[01:30:47]
Doug Shaw: I think, Brenda's on it.

[01:30:50]
Brenda Bass: Correct. In terms of the way the committee has discussed it is within the larger context of the university wanting to be accessible for transfer students. We wouldn't want to add new requirements on for people who have AAs. And now if someone comes in without an AA, they enter into our, whatever, our new general education program is [indiscernible] [01:31:13] but for transfer students, the committee has viewed it as an AA will meet the requirements of general education.

[01:31:23]
James Mattingly: Francis Degnin.

[01:31:24]
Francis Degnin: Do we have a sense in terms of transfer students of how many, what percentage have AAs versus do not have AAs?

[01:31:33]
Doug Shaw: I haven't heard of any of that.

[01:31:35]
Jim Wohlpart: This is the Provost. We can get that data. It's a good question.

[01:31:37]
Francis Degnin: Then it becomes a situation where we could have a lot of potential students who don't ever have to take an LLC course with us, so.

[01:31:45]
Doug Shaw: And that's also an issue with the current . . . with the status quo.

[01:31:49]
Francis Degnin: Well, they still have to take Capstone, yeah, with us, so . . .

[01:31:53]
James Mattingly: This is Chair Mattingly. I'm also concerned and for their own benefit as well, about transfer students coming in that might lack some basic skills that our own students might have. And screening for that and catching that and then remediating it, have there been any conversations about that?

[01:32:18]
Doug Shaw: Not yet. I mean in my department, the math department, of course, it's a very, very important issue.

[01:32:23]
James Mattingly: Yeah, and you have tests that they have to take.

[01:32:26]
Doug Shaw: Yeah, we have the ALEKS test and then if they don't pass the ALEKS, ALEKS will also allow them to remediate right there and then.

[01:32:34]
James Mattingly: Right, okay.

[01:32:35]
Doug Shaw: But, yeah, I believe, not speaking for the committee, this is a huge issue and this is an issue far beyond the scope of the GERC committee. This is an issue.

[01:32:48]
James Mattingly: I would hope at least that in the GERC's final recommendations that it'd be noted that this is something that needs to be done even if the GERC didn't get to it.

[01:33:01]
Brenda Bass: In terms of screening or [overlapping] [01:33:03]

[01:33:03]
James Mattingly: Screening and remediating.

[01:33:05]
Brenda Bass: . . . admissions processes. I can certainly take that back to the committee.

[01:33:10]
Doug Shaw: Is that in our chart?

[01:33:13]
James Mattingly: Well, you can consider it in there now.

[01:33:15]
Doug Shaw: Okay, that's awesome.

[01:33:19]
James Mattingly: Amy Petersen.

[01:33:20]
Doug Shaw: I would encourage you all to get some information on that. What we find is that our transfer students like our high school students in their first semester have a hard time but then they succeed at levels just as great as our neighbor students. So I'd be cautious about jumping to any sweeping decisions about what it is we should do with transfer students until we study it.

[01:33:38]
James Mattingly: Absolutely. Amy Petersen.

[01:33:40]
Amy Petersen: Thank you. I have just two comments. Thank you for sharing with us again today. I continue to be excited about the tier three and so I appreciate that you're continuing to work on that tier because I know it's complicated. But I also see it as potentially something that could set UNI apart and could encourage students who potentially might seek out an AA elsewhere to come to UNI because of an opportunity to work on a big problem that they might care deeply about. So I'm really encouraged by your work on tier three. And then our leadership team met last week and we had . . . we were meeting around issues of diversity and we really feel strongly that we want to see more diversity outcomes in all the tiers and so I'm excited to hear that you're moving in that direction, too. And here is where I might not . . . this is my opinion. But I'm not necessarily opposed to more assessing around diversity because it is part of our strategic plan, it is something that we should be measuring, and I know that often if we do not measure it, it may not be an emphasis area of ours. And I just speak from my field of special education in 10 years ago, well prior to No Child Left Behind, we never required teachers of students with significant disabilities to be held accountable for their students' literacy learning and so those teachers literally did not teach reading to students with significant disabilities. And so I think if we say that we care about diversity then we shouldn't be afraid to measure it and we should see it really throughout everything we do. And I think that would be a really bold kind of powerful statement. And so I'm glad to see you moving in that direction, too.

[01:35:42]
Doug Shaw: Thank you. And you are not the only person who has told us that.

[01:35:50]
James Mattingly: Are there any other questions for the GERC? Well then there's only one thing left to do. Who has a motion?

[01:36:04]
Nicole Skaar: So moved

[01:36:05]
James Mattingly: Nicole Skaar. Who wants to second?

[01:36:07]
John Burnight: Gretchen.

[01:36:07]
James Mattingly: And Gretchen Gould. We are adjourned. Thank you.