

Minutes of the University Faculty Senate
28 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, Danielle Cowley, Thomas Hesse, Donna Hoffman, Charles Holcombe, Syed Kirmani, William Koch, Amanda McCandless, Qingli Meng, Mark Sherrard, Nicole Skaar, Andrew Stollenwerk, and Shahram Varzavand, Leigh Zeitz, and Francis Degnin.

Guests in attendance were: Jim Wohlpart (Provost), Patrick Pease (Associate Provost), Becky Hawbaker (United Faculty President), Jacob Levang (Student Government President), Kenneth Atkinson (History), Chris Neuhaus (Library, EPC).

Note to reader: A letter in support of the application for Emeritus status of Charlotte Wells, discussed in this transcript, is included as an appendix to this document.

[0:01:31.8] JAMES MATTINGLY: We can call the meeting to order. I believe it's 3:30, or close enough. We'll probably have one or two more senators walk in, that'll be just fine. Are there any press in the room? I will assume there are not. I would like to go ahead and have the guests introduce themselves please.

[0:01:57.8] CHRIS NEUHAUS: Chris Neuhaus from the Rod Library, and I'm here with EPC.

[0:02:02.2] KENNETH ATKINSON: Kenneth Atkinson, Department of History, here to endorse Charlotte Wells' emeritus status.

[0:02:10.0] JAMES MATTINGLY: Now we'll have our courtesy announcements. President Nook is out of town today, so we'll begin with Provost Wohlpart.

[0:02:19.2] JIM WOHLPART: Sure, thank you. A couple of things. I want to mention enrollment for Fall 2020 and HLC, two things. I don't know how many of you all track these things. I track these things on a daily basis. Right now we have about 3,400 applications for fall of 2020. We generally have between 2,800 and 3,000 at this time of year, so we're well ahead of last year. Some of that is because we had juniors applying last year as part of the programs, so some of those applications are soft. In terms of admits, we have 1,813 at the end of last week. We usually have about 1,775 to 2,000 this time of year, so again, admits look very strong and are moving up. The best way to gauge where your enrollment numbers will be are confirms, students who have said yes, I'm coming. We have 421 confirms right now. We usually have about 380 to 440 right now, so we're looking very high on the confirm rate. Based on where we generally are this time of year to where that translates, it should be about under 3,000 confirms for the end of the year, which would give us someplace between 1,600 and 1,700 freshmen next year, significantly higher than where we are this year. Any questions about that that I could answer?

[0:03:38.5] LEIGH ZEITZ: How many freshmen were this year?

[0:03:40.4] JIM WOHLPART: 1,450, a little bit higher than that, I think. That was Senator Zeitz. Any other questions? So for Higher Learning Commission, I think it is next week, in two weeks, I mean? Next HLC? November 11th. I'm going to read this. This was prepared by Scott Peters to describe what will happen when we have a visit from our HLC liaison, John Marr. He is the person who the University of Northern Iowa works with at HLC on our visit and our accreditation. And Scott prepared a really nice summary of why this is important and what will happen, so I just want to read this. This is in two weeks, on Monday, November 11th.

His visit includes a discussion with faculty senate. So he will come here for about 30 minutes. Chair Mattingly has uploaded some documents about the accreditation process and you can also visit the accreditation website to refresh your, which I'm sure you all will jump on and look at all of those details about accreditation. We are making excellent progress as we look ahead to our visit, which is March 29 to 30, 2021. So March 29 to 30, 2021 we will have a team here on campus visiting us and looking at our assurance argument. Over the last two years, we've had over a hundred faculty, staff and students and administrators serving on seven HLC committees to complete our assurance argument. Two weeks ago, the Steering Committee met for a full day retreat to look at our assurance argument, the draft that we had now. We are in really, really good shape with our assurance argument. We have several more things that we need to work on we're finding in that assurance argument, and then we need to start collecting evidence and data. That'll be one of the most important things that we will do over the next several months.

We invited Mr. Marr to visit for several reasons. First, as the liaison officer, all information between you and I and HLC flows between Kristin Moser and John Marr. So that's where all the information flows out to HLC, but also into the institution. He also will be the one who will choose the team leader for our site visit, and how he discusses that visit with the leader matters. So we want him to visit our campus now, see for himself some of the work we're doing, and see that we're well ahead of the game in terms of preparing for our site visit. This is not a mock visit. He doesn't give us feedback on our assurance argument. It is our chance to seek guidance about our accreditation process. So that is part of the reason to have him here.

In addition to meeting with the Senate, he'll be meeting with Cabinet, Dean's Council, Assessment Council, HLC or Steering Committee, Gen Ed Revision Committee, and I think faculty leaders, like Tuesday morning, I think the next day. So he's also meeting with faculty leadership. The visit is designed so that we have an opportunity to talk to him about key issues that we know will be important for our reaccreditation. Two of those everybody in this room should know are? What's the first one? Gen Ed Revision, Gen Ed Revision, thank you. Ding, ding, ding, that's the number one. What's the number two? Program Assessment, that's exactly right. Those are the two things that we've been working really hard on and that it is our chance to shine on.

I'll say the next one, actually Scott says this in here. Shared Governance, including especially faculty control of the curriculum. Any visiting team always wants to make sure faculty are in control of the curriculum. That is an essential piece of it, so they'll want to investigate our curriculum process. So this is an opportunity not only for you to learn about HLC and

accreditation, John Marr will talk a little bit about the process, but for him to get a glimpse into how shared governance works on this campus. Any questions about his visit? Anything that I could answer or share with you?

[0:07:22.9] JAMES MATTINGLY: Who has a question for Provost Wohlpart?

[0:07:33.0] JIM WOHLPART: Awesome. That's all I have.

[0:07:35.0] JAMES MATTINGLY: Okay, thank you. Next is Faculty Chair Cutter? Do you have any comments today?

[0:07:42.4] BARBARA CUTTER: I think I'll pass today. I think we have a lot to cover.

[0:07:46.2] JAMES MATTINGLY: Okay. Thank you. United Faculty President Hawbaker?

[0:07:51.2] BECKY HAWBAKER: I have a couple of quick reminders. First, I would echo the President's remarks of encouraging everyone to complete the climate survey that he referenced in a recent email. I'll also remind you that Wednesday is your last chance for an on-campus free flu shot at the Health Center all day. But there's lots of places around town where you can get it, you can see that on the HR website. Also, a reminder that the open enrollment period for your re-enrolling in flexible spending account or making any changes to your insurance benefits will start November 1st. So watch for that email from Michelle Byers.

I wanted to give a quick reporting of a really productive meeting that John Valentine and United Faculty had with Paula Knudson regarding improving communication about student disability accommodations. We've been hearing a lot of feedback from faculty that since the communication system has gone all online, that it has resulted in a lot of miscommunications, misunderstandings about accommodations. So we now get that as an automatic email. And there is supposed to be, as always, another follow up conversation with the student about how to deliver the accommodations or if the accommodations are or are not appropriate in a class. And those follow up conversations are not occurring, and that's leading to a lot of other problems. And so I think we had a really productive meeting about how to improve that process.

Then finally, I just wanted to share a quick tribute about some sad news that I received about a pillar faculty member in United Faculty history, history professor Chuck Quirk, who passed away last week. He was instrumental in a lot of things on campus, like the development of the honors program in 1961. He was a tireless advocate and ally for faculty and students of color and was an early Chair of the Committee on University Responsibility in Minority Group Education. That was associated with the sit-in in the President's office and the development of the Multicultural House and now the Black Student Union. But in United Faculty, he was first of all the founding member of the UNI chapter of the American Federation of Teachers, AFT. And then although UF AAUP was ultimately certified as the official collective bargaining group, not AFT, Chuck was on the very first negotiations committee for the very first collectively bargained contract at UNI for faculty. He was also the person who recruited me to join UF, and so I will say that he's responsible for my being here today. So I urge you to honor his memory by joining UF and cheering for the Green Bay Packers, his favorite team. That's all.

[0:10:54.2] JAMES MATTINGLY: Thank you. And I don't have any comments today either, so we

will get right into it. You received the minutes from me last Friday. Donna Hoffman has recommended a couple of changes simply to the names of the person who was speaking, to correct those. There were two of them. Are there any other changes to make to the minutes? Then I'll ask for a motion to accept them as amended.

[0:11:34.1] SYED KIRMANI: So moved.

[0:11:36.2] JAMES MATTINGLY: By Senator Kirmai, thank you. Is there a second? Senator Skaar second. Is there any other discussion about the minutes at all? All in favor of accepting them as amended say aye?

[0:11:53.3] GROUP: Aye.

[0:11:54.7] JAMES MATTINGLY: Any opposed? Abstaining? Then the motion is passed, the minutes are approved with those two changes. We have two items on the calendar today. The first one, Item 1475, is the College of Education curriculum changes, quite a lengthy package today. Is there a motion to put those to, to put that item on the docket?

[0:12:28.9] LEIGH ZEITZ: So moved.

[0:12:30.5] JAMES MATTINGLY: Senator Zeitz, and seconded by Senator Holcombe. Does this item require any conversation? Does it have all the information you think you need to make a decision? Then I'll take a vote to put this item on the docket. Is there a motion?

[0:12:59.2] LEIGH ZEITZ: So moved.

[0:13:00.2] JAMES MATTINGLY: Senator Zeitz, thank you. That's already been seconded, I'm sorry. Yes. All in favor of putting the item on the docket say aye?

[0:13:14.6] GROUP: Aye.

[0:13:15.7] JAMES MATTINGLY: Opposed? Any abstaining? Okay. That item is passed. It'll be on the docket next time. Item 1476, the Consultation with HLC Liaison John Marr. Is there a motion to docket that item? Moved by Senator Skaar, seconded by Senator Hoffman, thank you. Does this item require any conversation before we vote to docket it? Thank you for your description of what we'll be discussing. Then I'll take a vote to docket the item, 1476, the Consultation with HLC Liaison John Marr. All in favor of putting that on the docket, please say aye.

[0:14:17.8] JIM WOHLPART: Aye.

[0:14:18.6] JAMES MATTINGLY: Are there any opposed? Any abstaining? Then that item is also on the docket for next time, and we'll see Liaison John Marr on November 11th.

[0:14:31.8] BECKY HAWBAKER: Can I ask a question about that?

[0:14:33.7] JAMES MATTINGLY: Please.

[0:14:34.3] BECKY HAWBAKER: Are there suggestions that you have about how senators can prepare for that consultation besides reading? I mean, what is the expectation for the kinds of questions we should be asking to seek guidance? Because I'm asking because I don't know.

[0:14:48.2] JAMES MATTINGLY: That's an excellent question.

[0:14:51.3] JIM WOHLPART: So this is Provost Wohlpert. That was Becky Hawbaker. We are way ahead of the game and really well prepared. We've been digging very deeply into all of the criteria and making course corrections as we have gone, and you all are very aware of those, so it's been a very transparent process. You've been very involved in what those are. So mostly what he will do is describe a visit and the role of faculty in a visit. And so you all will get to hear about that process and how important that process is and how important faculty participation is. The kinds of things that he will be interested in is what shared governance is like, what the climate is like, what interactions across faculty are with the administration, with the students. He'll probably be interested in the role of shared governance. He certainly would know about what happened in 2012, and so one of the questions that he probably will talk with faculty leadership about is what has changed, have things changed, what are they like now? I don't know if he'll know about, for instance, the changes to Chapter 20, but that's something you can and should bring up, I certainly think. I think it would be a good thing for you all to be thinking about what the role of Faculty Senate is and the things that come to this body and that you all work on here in this room collectively. So that's something that may be of interest to talk about when he's here. But beyond that, I'm not sure that there's much that you need to do. You're welcome to read that, you all will have, you all have, I think, a lot of information about HLC, more than many campuses, because we've done this pretty transparently.

[0:16:35.6] JAMES MATTINGLY: Would it also be appropriate to ask any questions about how the visit will happen when they are here on campus?

[0:16:43.4] JIM WOHLPART: Thank you, Jim. I think if he doesn't talk about that, then that is something you could ask about. But my guess is we've asked him to kind of talk about what a visit looks like, and so he should come in here and talk about what a visit looks like, who the people are that will be selected, what they'll be looking at, and the role of the assurance argument, the off-site review of the assurance argument and then the on-campus review. So we've asked him to open with that kind of a statement and description. That, hopefully, will then lead to questions that you will have in reaction to that.

[0:17:17.6] JAMES MATTINGLY: Fantastic. Good.

[0:17:19.9] JIM WOHLPART: And if he doesn't, you can ask him that question. That is certainly what he is prepared to do.

[0:17:25.8] JAMES MATTINGLY: Good.

[0:17:27.7] JIM WOHLPART: One of the things that they're looking to do is get a sense of the maturity and sophistication of the campus in terms of the team that they select. That's a really important thing for them to have an understanding of. If it's a very mature and sophisticated campus, they would sometimes put people who are still learning how to, not in terms of the chair, but in terms of the team that they put together, that it'll be an opportunity for folks to get experience with a good campus. In my experience, I've obviously never done HLC, I've done SACS [Southeast Association of Colleges and Schools] many, many times. What is happening here is off the charts. Our assurance argument is one of the strongest I've ever read. That doesn't mean that we won't come out on the other end with some follow up. It's very possible,

since our Gen Ed program won't be launched by spring of 2021, that they will ask to see a follow up of our Gen Ed program. Did it get instituted? Do you really have learning outcomes that you're assessing? How are you assessing? That may be something that two years down the road, four years down the road, they'll want to see a review of. They may ask to see another couple rounds of program assessment. That's also possible. Those are possibilities for us as a result of this visit. And those would not, in any kind of way, be unusual. That happens on most campuses, is that there are follow up visits around program assessment, Gen Ed, things like that.

[0:18:46.6] JAMES MATTINGLY: Good. Thank you for asking the question, Becky. Are there other questions? Okay. So now onto the docketed items. We have four items on the docket today. The first at the top of the docket is the CSBS curriculum changes, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Is there a motion to accept those changes? Thank you, Senator Hoffman, second Senator Degnin, thank you. What discussion is required before we vote? Barbara Cutter?

[0:19:45.3] BARBARA CUTTER: So I have a sort of general question about something I was a little confused about from the UCC minutes, so I guess that would be to Patrick. So my understanding in the past was that consent agenda items were supposed to be non-substantive changes. So I'm just wondering why things like, you know, an added course or a certificate that changes primary colleges, why those would be on a consent agenda. I mean, wouldn't it make sense for, I mean I thought that the UCC was supposed to discuss all substantive changes.

[0:20:28.7] PATRICK PEASE: This is Patrick Pease. The consent agenda is created by two members of UCC beforehand, so there are primary and secondary readers for each of the, each of the way teach of the colleges. Those two people come together and work through, sometimes they do the work, a little work ahead of time, but there's a meeting. They create the consent agenda prior. There's been a little bit of evolving and experimenting with UCC and what that really means. I think that they've fallen into a line of thought that if there is, they're the ones that go into the full meeting and present. They do a motion, they do a second, they kind of primarily lead that college through. And their thinking is, if they don't see any reason to have a conversation, then they're putting it on the consent agenda. The rationale is that if it's not on the consent agenda, we'll spend at least five minutes talking about it, and so they're really trying to, even if there's nothing to talk about. And that's true. It's actually rare. I think this was the first time they tried putting a new course on. It ended up getting pulled off and discussed anyway, I think. And so I think they sort of backed off of that a little bit. But the rationale is even if they don't have anything to say about it, there's nothing to really talk about, it still takes five minutes of meeting time to, just to bring it up and go through and get everybody oriented and then find out that there's no questions and simply approve it along.

So they're really seeing the consent agenda as a mechanism to speed up the actual meetings. We very often come very close or even run out of time at those meetings. They end up being very tight, and you can see, particularly starting in the College of Education, and I think CHAS are very, very big packets. We already have to split CHAS into two as it is. And so they're just using it to speed up the process. So really, the way they consider it is if they don't think there's any reason to discuss it, there's no errors, there's no controversies, there's no issues with it,

then they'll consider putting it on the consent agenda.

[0:22:45.2] BARBARA CUTTER: Thank you for your responses. This is Barbara Cutter again. I am a little bit concerned, and part because I remember when this move was made, it was supposed to be just non-substantive changes, when the Faculty Senate approved it maybe five, six years ago. And so I'm not bringing up any concerns about these particular items, it's just that I find it a little bit worrisome when you're talking about a new class or when you're talking about a program shifting from one college to another. In this case it's shifting from 1 to 3. I think that's a good idea, but those are big issues, and just because two people who have studied it don't have any concerns doesn't mean that people from other departments in the college might not have concerns. I mean, I think that in the interests of efficiency we could end up having changes made that after the fact people might be pretty upset about. So just wondering about other people's feelings.

[0:23:54.2] PATRICK PEASE: This is Patrick Pease again. I think that's fair. The, I'll remind everyone that there is, one of the first things we do at the meetings is to call for anything to be removed from the consent agenda, and that can be from anybody in the room. The other UCC members certainly do read the materials. They don't engage with it in perhaps as much depth as leaders, but they do read them. And it's not that uncommon to have one or two things pulled off. Other guests can come and request that as well, so if someone from another department actually does want that to be discussed it can be, they can express that and UCC will pull that off. So there is that opportunity. Of course, you would have had to have read the proposals to know that, but if it's something of interest. But it can happen.

So I think this is fair. I'm happy to take this back to UCC and share that, if you like. I don't really control that too awfully tightly. I allow the UCC, the voting members of UCC, remember I'm ex-officio, so I allow the voting members to really drive what they want to do and the direction they want to go. But we do have some meetings coming up. The UCC committee has decided to look into some of the perpetual challenges that they see each year and actually engage with those and decide whether or not some recommendations need to come forward to Senate about that. So there's actually a plan to meet through the spring semester now. Thus, I'll have an opportunity to bring this up and share it with them. So this can be something that the committee talks about and sort of maybe reestablishes what their goals are with the consent agenda. I'm happy to do that.

[0:25:42.8] BARBARA CUTTER: Thanks.

[0:25:45.7] JAMES MATTINGLY: Senator Degnin?

[0:25:46.8] FRANCIS DEGNIN: Francis Degnin. I understand what you're saying too, so the question I guess is, it sounds like, I wasn't here five years ago in the Senate, but it sounds like we authorized a certain kind of exception, and so we probably would have to reauthorize a change to that, is what it sounds like.

[0:26:09.9] PATRICK PEASE: I'm not sure that there's an exception. It's just a procedure with the way in which they review it. UCC still votes on everything. They just, the consent agenda is simply to bundle a number of things together without any further discussion. So they're still

approving it. I think we might have to unpack a little bit what you mean by exception.

[0:26:32.5] FRANCIS DEGNIN: Well, even with what Senator Barbara pointed out, what Chair Barbara pointed out, was that it's, apparently the Faculty Senate, it sounds like they authorized the consent agenda kind of idea for a certain kind of thing. And if we want to expand it, if that's true, then you might have to come back through us again.

[0:26:54.7] BARBARA CUTTER: This is Barbara again. So what I recall, and I'd have to go look it up again, is I do recall the curriculum handbook revisions coming through the Senate, and this idea of non-substantive changes being able to be bundled and put on a consent agenda is what came up. And I remember that because it allowed us to change the process when I was on the GCCC, to bundle those non-substantive items.

[0:27:32.7] PATRICK PEASE: I think you're right. I think that's the only place it's identified, is in that handbook. One of the interesting difficulties that has arisen is the substantive and non-substantive is defined by the kinds of changes, but those don't define whether or not something actually needs to be discussed. Sometimes very minor changes create errors or conflicts with university policy, and it actually does have to be discussed in some way. Whereas something significant like a new course might be a very clean proposal, no concerns with it, and so there's a little bit of disconnect between non-substantive and following policy and not needing any discussion. So that's I think where some of the blurring has come from. But I think it's fair. Your comment's fair, and I can take it back to them and they can, they haven't gone through any revisions of the handbook yet, so this may be something that they want to clean up and can take a look at. That work is still pending.

[0:28:38.7] JAMES MATTINGLY: That makes sense. Other questions or comments about this matter? Is there anything else you had a question about, about the CSBS curriculum package, before we vote? Then I will take a vote. All those in favor of approving the CSBS curriculum changes, please say aye.

[0:29:20.0] GROUP: Aye.

[0:29:21.7] JAMES MATTINGLY: Are there any opposed? And any abstaining? Then the curriculum package passes. This is docket item 1350. The next item on the docket is the consultation on the Academic Positioning Initiative. Patrick, that's you again. But first, I'll take a motion. Excuse me, I'm sorry. That's a consultation. Patrick, what can you tell us about the Academic Positioning Initiative?

[0:30:05.6] PATRICK PEASE: Well, Academic Positioning, it's framed as a capacity building opportunity really meant to kickstart and accelerate the process of thoughtful innovation that we hope will create conditions under which excellence in teaching, service and scholarship can flourish into the future. So this is an exercise in looking to what our future is. The document itself I think is fairly expansive. What I'm actually hoping is to get some comments and feedback from this group on what is drafted out in that document. I can talk a little bit, if you're interested, in how we came to this document. I'm not sure if you're aware or not. I've been in this body and talked about this a little bit at an earlier stage, but a lot has happened since then. Would it be helpful to talk a little about how we got here?

[0:31:04.2] JAMES MATTINGLY: Please.

[0:31:05.1] PATRICK PEASE: So this started with a conversation around campus, a little bit in Dean's Council. We talked about it in a few other groups with department heads and with this body. Starting last spring, we had a series of retreats. We had a formal retreat with Dean's Council and other campus, people in campus leadership, similar roles in other divisions. We had people from the foundation, from student affairs as well. We then had a retreat with faculty leadership kind of at large, and that included Senate leadership, UF leadership, the chair of the faculty, chairs of college senates, and then again, a range of people from inside and outside of Academic Affairs that were in similar kind of leadership positions. And then our third retreat was with department heads and directors of schools. And at each step along the way, we took feedback, we modified our thinking, we modified what we were presenting, and we incrementally made changes throughout. So really the first draft of this document emanated from those three retreats.

From there, we've gone back to Dean's Council again and we've gone to faculty leadership with sort of capitals in there, which are the leaders of Senate, the leaders of UF, and Chair of the Faculty specifically. And we showed them the first full draft of the whole document that was borne out of the feedback from the retreats. We got a lot of good feedback there. Again, turned around another edit and we checked in with the Dean's Council all along the way. And that really brings us to where we are now. So we've had close to, at this point we've had well over 75 people, probably getting closer to 100 people that have actually been a part of this process in one way or another, whether through individual meetings, through the retreats, through different kinds of feedback. And so we've had a lot of input at this point to get here.

And as I said, at each step along the way we refined things and focused on different parts. By the time we'd gotten to the department heads retreat, we were actually in a good position to talk about the structure, and that's where the last page comes from, are really conversations, that was borne out of conversations with department heads based on earlier conversations we had with other groups. So we were able to present within all the different ideas we had and help, and they really helped us boil down to what we think is a workable model for how to do this.

[0:33:57.5] JAMES MATTINGLY: So a big question I guess would be, this is Chair Mattingly again, a big question regarding this might be, what might be some examples of some of the things that might come forward through the working groups that should naturally merge and bubble up with ideas? I'll just start, because I had one thought, given my engagement with the University Budget Committee. We recently heard a presentation from Mike Zwanziger with Facilities, and I wondered if it might be a good idea for some subgroup, say, of the Faculty Budget Committee, to work with Mike to come, to produce some kind of recommendation about how we might, we might change the way, for example, that we do evening classes on campus, and have them in fewer buildings or perhaps even one building. Would that be one example of something that might go through this?

[0:35:05.7] PATRICK PEASE: Yeah, I think that's a fair example. What we have tried to create here is something that's not limited to just majors or departments. That's certainly a part of it. We want to look at the academic offerings and really with an eye toward are we offering the

right kind of academics for what students need today to be successful after they graduate? But there's a lot more to the way we're put together in terms of structures. We think that offices even outside of strictly speaking academic departments could be involved, and I think this is a perfectly reasonable example of how we can take a look at how academics operates in conjunction with other aspects of the university.

I'll share another one that you have I have talked about a little bit. But it's really expressed in phase 3 of this document, but might actually need to move along or might be prepared to move along a little bit more quickly, and that's just looking at the actual curricular approval process. One of the things that's been talked about a lot is there seems to be a fair amount of frustration around campus with the pace of curriculum approval, and I think this is another opportunity to take a look at that process in a very in depth way, get a working group together and really examine how that operates. And we've actually had these conversations a little bit in UCC in preparation to give some information to you. And some of these are kind of bigger questions. It's not all process, some of it is our choices about who sees what kind of material. And there are some limitations to speeding things up with the current approval process we have, and so it may need to be opened up and thought about in an entirely different way. That's, of course, a decision for faculty to make and for the Senate to approve, but I think that's another example where something that's not really strictly speaking curriculum, but it's related to curriculum, that would have a good place within this.

[0:37:09.5] JAMES MATTINGLY: And the UCC or a subgroup from the UCC might be a natural group to work on that. Senator Degnin?

[0:37:18.3] FRANCIS DEGNIN: So I think this is a great idea. I have a couple questions. And right now it kind of centers on, how did you come up with three to five colleges? And I mean, is this data driven or is this something? And also, we combined CHAS, and I was actually president and vice president and then vice chair and then chair of CHAS when this happened. And we know what you told, you said a little bit of having to divide the CHAS studies into working groups to do the curriculum process. It really is, I think, cumbersome to have that many departments in one college. And so, but that would split us into six again. So I wonder if we actually ever did the work to see did we actually save any money and really significantly improve efficiency, even back then? In that example.

[0:38:04.6] JIM WOHLPART: This is Provost Wohlpert. What great questions. To be quite frank, the three to five came from our meeting with department heads. They wanted those parameters on there. Can we change the colleges? And we said well, everything is on the table here. Well, can we have two colleges? Well, that probably doesn't work. Can we have six or eight colleges? That probably doesn't work. So those guardrails were put on partly from that conversation. This is the, the point of this is that there is no structure that has been decided. And so this is to free us to think about what it is that we should look like so that we can, in fact, offer the programs that we need to meet the needs of the university. I think I've told stories here, and now have three stories, where families spoke to somebody in admissions and said well, it's too bad that my son, my daughter, wants to do science. They'd really like to go to UNI but UNI doesn't do the sciences, and so we need to send them to Iowa. Well, why is that? Well, we have the College of CHAS. So we need to do some things to elevate the work that we're doing. And some of that is marketing. We know that, we're working on that. But some of it is

our structure, as well. What does that mean? What does that look like? What does the data say? We've got to gather all that and make those kind of decisions. Great question.

Another area that this actually, I think this happened before I came, I think we had a consultant on our campus about advising, and that consultant said we really should be looking at our advising, which we haven't done. That's another potential work group. What does advising look like? What should it look like? That's another possibility.

[0:39:40.0] JAMES MATTINGLY: Senator Skaar, you had a question.

[0:39:41.3] NICOLE SKAAR: Yes. It sort of goes off that. Where does like admissions and students and athletics, because these are the people like recruiters for athletic teams, they're talking to students on a regular basis trying to recruit them to come to UNI. And I would guess they wouldn't have a sense for what programs students are wanting that we do not have or that we're not marketing well. So where do they come in in this process? Is it phase 1? What's the idea for getting their input?

[0:40:12.5] JIM WOHLPART: So, this is Provost Wohlpert again. I think you're talking about two separate things. One is, what would be the role of athletics in academic positioning? This is an Academic Affairs exercise. We will welcome other people in if they want to participate. If Athletics wanted to join us, for instance, and talk about the Athletic Learning Center and how that fits with what we do with learning centers, that would be great. I don't get to decide that, obviously.

[0:40:34.0] NICOLE SKAAR: I mean like in the recruiting phase.

[0:40:36.0] JIM WOHLPART: Yeah. So in terms of making certain that the folks who are doing the recruitment of athletes have the correct information, that is work that we need to do in admissions and I know Kristin Woods has already started talking about that. How can we do better, get better information to the folks who are doing this recruitment?

[0:40:49.9] NICOLE SKAAR: Yeah. Well, and I mean, I'm not sure you're getting my point maybe. So for example, my husband works at another university. He's an athletic coach. And as their university is talking about this kind of stuff, he's like, why aren't they coming to talk to me? Because I turn away, kids decide not to come here because we don't have this program or we don't have this major, and I am on a regular basis turning kids away that would be great athletes for us. So they have information that I feel like other people don't have. Like I as faculty don't have that information, right?

[0:41:31.9] JIM WOHLPART: Thank you. I'll let Patrick Pease answer that.

[0:41:34.4] PATRICK PEASE: One of the important things to understand, how we really hope this is going to work, is the structure. And all of the proposals will be developed by what we're calling a working group. We really want those groups to dig in and ask those kinds of questions and to really look at research. We don't want to just make decisions and create programs or look at different structures without some solid reason for why that should be. One of the things we're going to do is try to support those groups with as much research and as much data as they need, and whatever they want. That's a great point that nobody's brought up before, but it's something we should take a look at. So inasmuch as we can gather information about the

importance of certain types of programs or certain wants and needs of students from outside of our traditional recruiting areas, then that becomes a piece of research that we really need to engage in. And that's one of the reasons to have these working groups and have these large groups of voices that are out there, so that these ideas emerge and they're not forgotten.

So hopefully this will come out in that, the research components of those groups doing that kind of work when they're really looking at it. I think that just the fact that you brought it forward, it's now going to be on our minds and we can help connect those different kinds of groups around campus to make sure they're talking with those groups. So hopefully a lot of this gets taken care of with the depth of research that we're hoping that the individual groups can do to really answer the questions that they're focusing on. You want to add anything else, Jim?

[0:43:08.4] JIM WOHLPART: No, that's great.

[0:43:12.0] JAMES MATTINGLY: Good questions. Senator Kirmani?

[0:43:14.1] SYED KIRMANI: Yes. Well, I looked at this document and I thought it's a very nice document, and it is really time UNI makes some serious efforts for academic positioning. It can be again changes for UNI. To tell you the truth, I am very impatient with the pace of change at UNI. I think a lot can be done, and this can be a powerful recruiting tool. And not only this, of course, it will be good for our students. So I really like the document, and I like this idea a lot, and I will have some suggestions for that later on. For example, I would like to see interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary teams come in here. After all, they are in our, I think that they are in the strategic plan also. Sometimes the strategic plan just means nothing, but I think that it should. So, and I will have those suggestions also, things like data science, computing, and those kind of things. There are a lot of, a lot of this school.

But I really think that you and I are not really in a position to do this academic positioning unless it makes some important changes. For example, there is virtually no, there is virtually no joint appointments here. There are no courtesy appointments here. Those are the things which encourage this kind of thinking. But those things can be overcome. On the whole, I really like this thing. I think it's a nice plan. It does gloss over certain things, which is understandable. For example, I'm sure that there will be a resources problem or some mistakes. A lot can be done without any additional resources, because matter of fact, it will be a question of repackaging the programs and all those things. So a lot can be done even with the existing resources.

But for example, suppose that you want to go big on, let us say, computing and artificial intelligence, data science, those kinds of things. And you really can't ignore that. All the schools are doing it. All the research universities are doing it. Now the comprehensive universities, well, they always have a time lag. So, but anyway, if we do that you will have to strengthen certain departments. For example, to be frank, our computer science department is really languishing. And it's the key department if you want to go on computing technologies and artificial intelligence and those kind of things. So some departments will need more support. Now computer science is not my department, but I feel that it's important. So that definitely means some, some resources. They will have to come from somewhere.

And I think it is nice that you are promising that we will retain all current permanent faculty, that's great. That should assure people. But let me tell you, a lot of resistance to changes on

this is from the faculty. Some people take that they don't want to go out of their PhD area. They don't realize that their PhD thesis has a very short shelf life now. But it is basically the faculty which refuses to move out of their areas, and that's why they're overlooking the possibilities of newer disciplines and all that. But those things can be overcome. I think on the whole this is a very good development.

[0:46:57.7] JAMES MATTINGLY: Thank you, Senator Kirmani. Senator Petersen?

[0:47:02.9] AMY PETERSEN: This is Amy Petersen. I just wondered if you had thought about, I see Faculty Senate is defined in the document. But I wonder if it might be helpful to also include college senates, because they are part of the curriculum process and potentially the impact of this work would affect them? And then I also wondered about how are you choosing the project management team? And if you could speak to perhaps the timeline, phase 1?

[0:47:38.2] PATRICK PEASE: This is Patrick Pease, on college senators, there's no reason not to add them in. They're not purposely left out. We had, on the chart, using a different color and not connecting anything, we put the curriculum approval process in, which includes college senates, as something that still exists outside of this. So that would be part of that. I suppose under consultation, senate and other groups as needed, we could more explicitly state that that may include college senates as well. So yeah, I think you're right. We could be more explicit about that.

For the project management team, are you looking for the chart?

[0:48:22.8] JAMES MATTINGLY: Yes. Keep going.

[0:48:24.2] PATRICK PEASE: It's the very last page.

[0:48:26.4] JAMES MATTINGLY: There we go.

[0:48:28.5] PATRICK PEASE: So I think we sort of thought it would be both in that blue box, which is just its own thing, where this process is not usurping curriculum approval and also consultations, but I can understand what you're saying and I think you're probably right.

[0:48:44.9] JIM WOHLPART: I think you can follow that where we talk about faculty centers.

[0:48:47.4] PATRICK PEASE: Yeah, we certainly can.

[0:48:47.6] AMY PETERSEN: I see it there. The reason I wanted it explicit is because I know that there's a challenge to how we communicate between our faculty senate here, our college senates and our departments. And so I was thinking if it was more explicit, that perhaps would support such an infrastructure.

[0:49:10.0] PATRICK PEASE: Thank you. Yeah. We will absolutely do that. The second question was about the project management team. One of the things that we had heard throughout, and one of the universal themes that we heard, every group we talked to was more voices and new voices. And so we really thought a lot about that, and we decided the way we want to move forward with the project management team was to do it through an application process. In other words, we wanted to professionalize this role a little bit and have people really think about what, this is an important role on campus that, and we wanted people to talk about their

experiences and their philosophical grounding of things as a mechanism to apply to be on this. So we didn't want this to be by virtue of a particular position or by virtue of who stepped forward first. We really wanted to create a thoughtful process that people would think about, why do I want to be on this and what would I bring to it?

And so we're developing an application for this. So we're going to make the application, we don't want it to be difficult or onerous and be something that turns people away, but we want to give people an opportunity to talk about their background or their experiences or their ideas, whether those are hard experiences or just ideas that they have, and give them the opportunity to really talk about their role and how they see their role, they see themselves in this kind of a role. From that point, it is, it will be the Provost who goes through the applications and selects that team. And this is still a little bit fuzzy. Twelve to fifteen, that's a number that we threw out early on and we really haven't changed it from there. We want it to be a large enough group so that we have a lot of voices. We do not want it to be a large enough, such a large group that it becomes unwieldy.

But one of the reasons for that kind of a size is we've talked about a number of ways that the project management team can work as a liaison with these folks' working groups. And we're hoping there's going to be a lot of folks working groups. What we've kind of settled on, although this will still be decided later, but we've decided we think that maybe the best model is to have someone from the project management team be assigned as an ex officio member to each of the working groups, just to help them move along, be a person so that if they're stuck there's a place to go back and try to find data, try to find resources, and so we need enough people so it doesn't become an onerous task so that each person on the project management team might only be sitting in on a couple of groups' meetings, so it doesn't become too awfully onerous.

There are some different ways that we could create that relationship, but that's the one that we think might be the best. One of the things that we're going to do when the project management team actually gets together is one of the first tasks will be to get them to really dig in with the broad brushstroke kind of charge that we've given them here, and think about the day to day working structure and what they're really going to do. And so we really expect that group to get together and have some additional conversations about how to do the work from that point forward.

Timeline. We are looking at having the application process open through the end of this year. We're, this is a good piece of information. The next step is to have a formal launch on November 20th. That's the right day, right? I got my dates mixed up now. The 20th at 3:30, it will be in the Great Reading Room. The Provost is going to send out an email soon inviting everybody to this. And thus we're going to launch this out to the larger public and invite people to begin looking at the application and applying. Since that's going to be mid-November, we know it's going to take some time. People get busy, so we decided we'd leave it open just until the end of the year, December 31st. That will give people the rest of the academic year. If they're too busy they can have some time with the break. The application is not going to be onerous. We're talking about a few paragraphs of written material, but we still want to give people plenty of time.

That will allow us to get back in January right away and turn the materials over to Provost Wohlpert to begin making decisions. We really hope to have that project management team filled in January, so that they can begin to review any early pre-proposals that come in. At the launch, we're also going to invite people to begin to think about these pre-proposals, so that things that you talked about, Jim, are some of the early ones that groups may already want to come together and start talking about. So we want that process to be able to get kick started as quickly as possible. So those can start coming in as early as January, we hope.

[0:54:12.2] JAMES MATTINGLY: Senator Cowley?

[0:54:14.1] DANIELLE COWLEY: So I just want to say that I appreciate the structure of this, that it is coming from a leadership and faculty perspective and that it's across the university, and that it seems like it will be supported from start to finish. Because as someone who's been a part of this work, at least in the College of Education, there's other folks like Senator Zeitz who have been a part of things like TESI, and then reimagining our professional sequence. We have gotten started and then we have to stop. And then we get started again and we have to stop. So this at least feels very comprehensive, and I'm more hopeful that the innovations that we've discussed and we want to bring forward, from like an inclusive teacher prep program, can actually move ahead. But I just, I think it's important to know that some folks, some folks may be a little tired because we have tried this and have been, I don't know the right word, but have not been able to move ahead. But this feels like there is a lot of wraparound leadership and supports and structure to do that.

[0:55:34.2] PATRICK PEASE: Thank you for saying that. That is very reassuring. That was the intention, to have a project manager team that would work as a liaison to try to help all these groups move along, give them support, help them find data they need, help them if they get stuck. The other piece in this is, you will have noticed we talk about pre-proposals. The reason for that is, and those are not meant to be onerous, they're meant to be a paragraph or two of what you're going to do, and there's two reasons for that. One is to, if someone comes up with a fantastic idea but it's just not viable, we're just not going to be able to accomplish it here, we don't want people to put in an enormous amount of work in something that we're just going to have to say no to for whatever reason that may be. So we want that kind of a process.

The other is we hope that there's enough interest out there that there might be a couple of groups that are thinking about similar things, and we want to know that early on so we can get those groups together and provide that early support to have that conversation, to see if they should just be coming together, or if they're really talking about different things. So I appreciate that affirmation that we are on the right path.

[0:56:48.1] JAMES MATTINGLY: Provost Wohlpert? Did you have something to add? Tom Hesse, you had a question?

[0:56:54.0] THOMAS HESSE: Yeah. In a couple places the document talks about the need to sunset or phase out certain programs, and that's understandable. But then the very first guiding principle is we will retain all current permanent faculty. And I don't see how those two fit together.

[0:57:12.0] JIM WOHLPART: So this is the Provost. We have quite a few programs that have very

few students in them, and we have faculty that teach in multiple programs.

[0:57:19.5] THOMAS HESSE: Okay, so those would be on the books then, okay.

[0:57:23.4] JIM WOHLPART: It's possible.

[0:57:26.3] JAMES MATTINGLY: Senator Zeitz, do you still have a question?

[0:57:27.7} LEIGH ZEITZ: Senator Cowley brought up some good points, and I think one of the problems we had was TESI. We worked over two years on that, and then we brought it up to the point where the next step was to implement it or do something, but there was no procedure. And so I think what's essential here, I don't see it here, but there needs to be a procedure that is already laid out so that when it gets up to that point it can be enacted. Because like I said, we put in two years of work and it just was left by the wayside.

[0:57:59.0] JIM WOHLPART: So this is the Provost. Thanks for that, Leigh. And what I would say is that, we have spent now since March, April talking about this. We have had a very comprehensive conversation about how this will flow. So I think that the procedure is in fact this flow, that there is a team of people responsible for making certain that ideas come forward and then move towards implementation through all the regular channels that we have, curriculum approval process, if it's not about curriculum there are other processes that we have to use. But I think that this flow, as Patrick said, will need to be refined once the project management team is pulled together. I think TESI got launched quickly with lots of enthusiasm. This one is not getting launched quickly, it's getting launched after a lot of conversation around campus. We already have several groups that are working on proposals, so there's a lot of enthusiasm and we've told them you need to slow down until we can finalize this and move it forward.

[0:58:56.9] LEIGH ZEITZ: This is Senator Zeitz again. So when, maybe it's right here, but when it comes to the point where we say okay, we're going to set this up with three colleges, etc., etc., is there a process that's been already identified as to how that's going to happen?

[0:59:14.4] JIM WOHLPART: How we determine the number of colleges?

[0:59:15.9] LEIGH ZEITZ: No. Once you make that plan, how is it going to be implemented?

[0:59:20.5] JIM WOHLPART: How we would implement three colleges if that's the decision?

[0:59:23.3] LEIGH ZEITZ: Whatever the decisions were.

[0:59:25.2] JIM WOHLPART: So those are administrative processes and we would need to make sure that we involve all the right people in making those, first of all I would say making those decisions, because everybody would need to be on board with what those decisions are. Those decisions won't happen without the involvement of the faculty. Once you make a decision like that, you need to go through, it takes generally about a year and a half to do that well. A year and a half to two years to change the structure of your colleges, if you're going to do it well.

[0:59:49.7] LEIGH ZEITZ: Okay, thank you.

[0:59:51.1] JIM WOHLPART: You would need to talk to the college senates, you would need to

talk to the faculty senate. It has implications for curriculum, it has implications for faculty evaluation. You might want to talk to the handbook committee. It has implications for merit distribution, all of those things. So you would have to have multiple conversations before those decisions were made.

[1:00:12.0] LEIGH ZEITZ: Thank you.

[1:00:15.6] JAMES MATTINGLY: Barbara Cutter?

[1:00:16.6] BARBARA CUTTER: So I really like the focus on interdisciplinarity here. And I do have a concern about timing, when we talk about people coming up with pre-proposals and then working on proposals. And I'm thinking about, I mean I know they're not all curriculum proposals, but some of them would be curriculum proposals and we've got the Gen Ed revision going through and people are starting to, going to start to have to think about how classes fit in there and certificates. And it seems like this is, this kind of curriculum conversation, there's going to be these two conversations going on at the same moment, and people are going to feel like they really have to participate in the Gen Ed one. And people who might have a lot of interest and ideas for this one might not feel like they can do both at the same time, even though they could really be complementary in some ways. So I just, I'm concerned about like these major potentially real big commitments at the same time.

[1:01:38.9] PATRICK PEASE: This is Patrick Pease. I think that's a fair concern. We haven't really set the, there's going to be two things that are going on with this. One is an initial pulse, if you will, that might lead to some kind of significant restructuring in different pockets of campus, depending what kind of proposals come forward. But the other part is to institutionalize this way of thinking so that we're not doing this kind of work every 30 years or something like that, that these kinds of innovative changes just become kind of part and parcel of what we do. We do expect there's going to be some kind of a larger set of proposals in the first round. We haven't really set what the end of that first round is, though, and that may get defined a little bit by how quickly the working groups can move along. If we have a lot of them moving along and it looks like they're converging on some things that we can do by the end of the first year, maybe we'll begin to implement some things there. Or maybe it takes a little bit longer. That's one of the things that we just don't know. It really depends how quickly the work groups can work and how big the projects are that they're working on.

We suspect a lot of the ideas that will emerge from this could have come along anyway. There's really nothing to prevent this kind of work from going on. So a lot of this is a way of incentivizing and promoting and just creating some energy around this. So it does depend on the size of the projects and how fast they move along. But I hear what you're saying. I know that people may be distracted a little bit. But the Gen Ed work should be wrapping up in the next year, and that should give people some, as they begin to transition I'm thinking should be able to give them some space to move to the next thing.

There are a lot of things going on in the university. There's always a lot of things going on in universities. So I think this just becomes part of what we need to be thinking about. We should get away from these big changes on incremental cycles, though. We do want to kickstart this as something that just becomes part of the normal thinking.

[1:04:02.5] JAMES MATTINGLY: Senator Koch?

[1:04:03.8] WILLIAM KOCH: Yes. I like the idea here too of exploring the revisioning of academic affairs. It's like we have three big re-envisioning projects going on, which is great. It's interesting to see the overlap that is possible or hasn't been seen yet, as long as there's neither redundancy of things. One of the values mentioned here was utilizing efficiency, but hopefully not at the expense of the human condition, which sometimes you just can't kickstart things, it has to ferment and marinade before it can really become seasoned, things like that. And I guess this leads me to just one other point, is that it would be interesting to have some kind of articulation of our philosophy of education, which I believe the Provost had mentioned is part of the Gen Ed revision. Because we have those three big re-envisioning projects, so what is liberal education? Even might be more important, how does the public envision it or see it? And are there any blind spots on either side that need to be addressed? And this is a great opportunity to get to those really basic frameworks that are core, as well as comprehensive. So I would encourage us to keep, maybe even a common read among those who are in this, since we got that for the cornerstone quotes, and also available to the entire university.

[1:05:45.6] JAMES MATTINGLY: Very well said. Thank you. What other questions or comments do you have about academic positioning? I know I have this question and I suspect others might around the room, and some who aren't in the room as well. I think, I don't think, I know that it has been both stated and implied at various points that part of this process, that is the academic positioning process, is likely to lead to a reconfiguration of our colleges. And what do we think, at least at a high level, that process is likely to look like?

[1:06:53.8] JIM WOHLPART: So this is the Provost. This is how I have experienced this before and how I would imagine this, is that we would hopefully get a whole host of working groups putting forward projects to a project management team who says here's kind of a landscape. If that landscape that is then imagined through that suggests perhaps a different structure, and that might be one of the working groups might work on that, then we need to have a conversation about what, why that makes sense to restructure and what that would look like. Is it more cost effective or efficient or not? Is it a cost we want to take on and when and how? So it would be a transparent conversation that we would need to have about what that would look like, and it would need to be data informed, for certain.

I don't mean to sound cagey, but none of that stuff has been decided, and it really does need the university community to come forward to have conversations to decide those, help decide those things and shape those things. We may end up with the same four colleges we have.

[1:08:06.1] PATRICK PEASE: This is Patrick Pease. One of the things that we really want, the work we intend to encourage the working groups to do is to not just think about curriculum, a new major or something like that, but think about the structural changes that might need to happen in order to make that possible. And so Senator Kirmani brought up the idea of appointments. We actually had that phrase in here, although perhaps we, it was too much of a euphemism, but we referred to it as novel faculty appointments. That may need to happen if you want people to work across multiple kinds of majors. We may need to rethink how a faculty can be, what those appointments look like. Whether it's joint appointments or whatever example you used, whatever that means. And so we want to encourage groups to think through

all of those issues as well, not just here's this great interdisciplinary idea, but what does it take to actually populate that? Is that a physical realignment of people or is that a conceptual consortium of people with multiple types of joint appointments? There's different ways that that could be, something like that could be configured. And we want groups to think about it. And if all the working groups are thinking about those, then that should help to serve as a lot of different paths we might go down.

Then that impacts what we are actually talking about if we're talking about restructuring. There are real restructures and there are virtual restructures, and we haven't even gotten to that point yet because we don't know what the proposals are going to be at this point. So I mean, there's a lot of questions out there.

[1:09:41.3] JIM WOHLPART: So this is the Provost again. I would imagine this to be something like the Academic Master Plan. I don't know how many of you all remember participating in that, where we had multiple visions, multiple goals, and faculty gave feedback. I think we had multiple structures, multiple possibilities for how that would align. We would convene faculty to give feedback on they like this piece of this, this piece of this, and have that kind of a conversation, which will slow things down. So you can't be impatient. But that's a really important step, in my opinion.

[1:10:15.2] JAMES MATTINGLY: Absolutely. Becky Hawbaker?

[1:10:18.3] BECKY HAWBAKER: I just wanted to speak to that slowing things down and to remind senators of your critical role in the curriculum process, and that sometimes being slow and deliberate is intentional and important. I want to emphasize that all of this is critically important, but it does not replace existing procedures that are there to safeguard all of our shared work. So yes, it will kickstart innovation and will get us talking, but all of us need to take on the responsibility of making sure that it is thoughtful and mutually beneficial.

[1:11:01.0] JAMES MATTINGLY: Well said. Thank you. Are there other thoughts or questions, observations about academic positioning at this point?

[1:11:16.9] PATRICK PEASE: Can I close it out then? So when the invitation comes out, please come to the launch and please encourage your colleagues in your home departments to come and hear about this as well. I do want to say, even though I'm here today and I look like the face of this, all of this work is in conjunction with Jennifer Waldron and we've worked very, very closely together, and she deserves a ton of credit as well, even though she couldn't be here today.

[1:11:43.7] JIM WOHLPART: All the parts that you like came from her. [laughter]

[1:11:49.4] PATRICK PEASE: I wasn't going to say it that way. [more laughter]

[1:11:54.3] JAMES MATTINGLY: Okay. Well, thank you very much. The next item on the docket is the Emeritus Request for Charlotte Wells from the History Department. And Ken Atkinson is with us today from her department to speak on her behalf.

[1:12:21.0] KENNETH ATKINSON: Kenneth Atkinson, K-E-N-N-E-T-H A-T-K-I-N-S-O-N from the History Department. And I send regrets from our department head, Jennifer McNabb, who has

a scheduling conflict. She wanted very much to be here. We think it's important to represent candidates going up for emeritus status in person and share a little bit more about their background that you wouldn't get from a letter. And Professor Charlotte Wells has been employed at UNI for 26 years. She'll be retiring next semester. She's still staying in the community, so she'll still be an active member of the community, which is fortunate. Just a little about her background is actually very interesting.

She earned her BS in history from the University of Wisconsin River Falls, and then she decided to be a librarian. Earned an MA in library science from the University of Wisconsin Madison, and worked in information services at University of Wisconsin. Then she became the director of the library at Lakeland College in Sheboygan, Wisconsin. Then she decided to continue her career in history, pursued an MA in history at Marquette University, graduated in 1987. And during that time she served as an adjunct instructor at Lakeland College, Sheboygan, had a lecture at Indiana University, and then she completed her PhD in history from Indiana University of Bloomington focusing on early modern French history. And joined our department in 1993, was promoted in 1999 to associate professor.

And she's taught many classes. Much of her work has been dedicated to liberal arts core, especially teaching Humanities 1, 2 and 3. And she was very interested in global history diversity long before we started talking about that here. And she created a class in world civilizations to kind of broaden our horizon and bring Eastern, Western, non-Western history together. And she also thought that we needed to think of creative ways to bring students in their classes using kind of pop culture as a vehicle, and she created a very popular class on witches and the witch craze in early modern Europe and America.

Her student evaluations during her career consistently about 90 percent or more positive. And the Phi Alpha Theta History Society gave her an award for teaching in 2014. And her scholarship is excellent. She has many papers, publications, and Bibliotheque Nationale in France has multiple copies of her books. But she was also, I'd like to point out, a pioneer in digital history. She helped create a trance, which is a scholarly digital list which has over 6,000 members. And then she's helped create H France, a journal, film and fiction for scholars in France, which is an online journal, which she's the associate editor and she's in the running for Editor in Chief of that. So she's kind of a pioneer in bringing peer reviewed scholarship in electronic formats.

And she spoke in many conferences, both library science and history. She has a great record of service, a long list of university college services, library science services. But I would like to also point out that she's been very active in community engagement since she's been here. She speaks in many popular forums, the Irish Fest, Grout Museum, community events. She's heavily involved in the Canterbury Forum, which is a lectureship series run by several members of the history department, the community. We bring community speakers, academics to public format. We average about a hundred, 120 members each event.

She's also been involved in taking students overseas with the Catholic Students Center, supervise the academic component of that. So it's an educational experience in Rome, Assisi, various historical religious sites in Italy. And she's very active also in many community groups. So we wholeheartedly endorse her request for emeritus status based on her numerous accomplishments in the community, and it will be a great loss for our department.

[1:16:35.8] JAMES MATTINGLY: Well, we wish her all the best. I would like to add thank you very much for writing this letter that goes along with her file and for being here today. I will add this letter to the minutes.

[1:16:51.4] KENNETH ATKINSON: Thank you.

[1:16:52.2] JAMES MATTINGLY: Certainly. I'll take a motion... Senator Holcombe?

[1:16:56.7] CHARLES HOLCOMBE: I'd like to just add a comment echoing Dr. Atkinson's from his description. The question of excellence in teaching, I can testify from personal observation that she's a great teacher, and her service at the department, especially in the category of coordinating the scholarships for our department, has been very much appreciated. So we would very much urge people to support this.

[1:17:21.9] JAMES MATTINGLY: Thank you, Senator Holcombe. Is there a motion to approve Charlotte Wells' emeritus request? Thank you, Senator Kirmani. Second by Francis Degnin. Is there any further discussion required? Then I'll take a vote. All those in favor of approving the emeritus request for Charlotte Wells, please say aye?

[1:17:49.9] GROUP: Aye.

[1:17:51.5] JAMES MATTINGLY: Any opposed? Or any abstaining? Then the motion has passed.

[1:18:00.4] KENNETH ATKINSON: On behalf of the History Department, I thank the Senate for their time and consideration. Thank you.

[1:18:06.0] JAMES MATTINGLY: Thank you, Ken. Okay. So for the last item on the agenda today, the consultation regarding the EPC update on the scholarly misconduct policy. I would ask that we, I'd ask for a motion to go into executive session. Bylaws, our Senate Bylaws, Paragraphs 7.12, allow us to do that when there are special circumstances surrounding the confidentiality of what we need to talk about so that that discussion needs to be literally off the record and not in the minutes.

[1:18:47.3] FRANCIS DEGNIN: Can I suggest that before we do that, I think the order would be if we want to make another motion we have to come out of executive session and we're almost out of time. Can I suggest we first vote to extend the meeting?

[1:18:57.9] JAMES MATTINGLY: Thank you.

[1:18:59.0] FRANCIS DEGNIN: And then go to executive session.

[1:19:00.7] JAMES MATTINGLY: I think that's a wise...

[1:19:02.7] FRANCIS DEGNIN: This is Francis Degnin, yeah.

[1:19:04.5] JAMES MATTINGLY: Thank you, Senator Degnin. So Senator Degnin has moved to extend the meeting, let's say ten minutes, fifteen minutes? So he's moved to extend the meeting for fifteen minutes. Is there a second? Amy Petersen second. All in favor say aye?

[1:19:23.5] GROUP: Aye.

[1:19:24.4] JAMES MATTINGLY: Any opposed? Any abstaining? The motion is passed to extend

the meeting for fifteen minutes. Is there a motion to go into executive session? That vote will require a two-thirds majority. Moved by Leigh Zeitz. Is there a second? Nicole Skaar. All in favor say aye?

[1:19:55.8] GROUP: Aye.

[1:19:56.8] JAMES MATTINGLY: Any opposed or abstaining? Okay. We are in executive session.

[1:44:21.4] JAMES MATTINGLY: Okay. So we have just risen from executive session. The Educational Policies Commission gave us information that the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs has asked for a pause to the Senate's charge to the EPC to revise the scholarly misconduct policy. And the Senate agrees, given the nature of the very confidential reason for that pause, that the pause should take place until the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs can once again join us in revising the scholarly misconduct policy. And so that has been the general consensus in the room is that the EPC will pause with RSP and will work on it again when we can, when the confidential reason has passed. Okay. So is there a, it's just time for adjournment. Is there a motion to adjourn? Petersen and Burnight. Time to adjourn. Thank you.

Note to reader: A letter in support of the application for Emeritus status of Charlotte Wells, discussed in this transcript, is included as an appendix to this document.

Dr. James Mattingly
Chair, Faculty Senate
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

September 31, 2019

Dear Dr. Mattingly:

I am writing this letter to support awarding emeritus status to Professor Charlotte C. Wells, Associate Professor of History. As a faculty member at UNI for 26 years, Professor Wells has made many contributions to the Department of History and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. During her tenure, Professor Wells has been an active teacher in the Liberal Arts Core, where she has offered classes in Humanities I, II, and III. She has additionally created upper-division history classes on early modern Europe. She has also designed and taught a course in World Civilizations and a Junior-Senior seminar on "Witches and the Witch Craze in Early Modern Europe and America." Among the most popular teachers in her department, Professor Wells has consistently received 90% positive student evaluations. UNI's student chapter of Phi Alpha Theta gave her an award for outstanding teaching in 2014.

Professor Wells has an extensive record of accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service. She has written many peer-reviewed articles on early modern French culture and history and numerous book reviews. Her scholarship is widely used in North America and Europe. The famed Bibliotheque Nationale de France owns two copies of her book *Law and Citizenship in Early Modern France*. In recent years, Professor Wells has been active in moving the scholarship of French culture and history into the digital world. She played a major role in developing the international scholarly digital association H-France, which currently has over 6,000 members. She currently serves as Associate Editor of the H-France journal *Film and Fiction for Scholars of France*. Professor Wells is currently under consideration for the position of H-France Editor-In-Chief.

In addition to her accomplishments in teaching and scholarship, Professor Wells has maintained an active service profile at UNI and throughout the Cedar Valley. She has served on many university and department committees. Since 2012, she has been the chair of the History Department Scholarship Committee. As part of her duties, she prepares an exhaustive review of each applicant, ranks them, and determines their financial need. Because of the great effort Professor Wells has put into this task, the department has been able to stretch its limited scholarship budget.

Professor Wells believes UNI faculty should give back to the community. She is a member of the Canterbury Forum Coordinating Committee, which is a community forum that presents academic lectures by speakers from a variety of cultural backgrounds on diverse topics relevant to the Cedar Valley. She also delivers numerous presentations to a wide variety of community groups in Cedar Falls and Waterloo. She has also led several student trips to Rome through St. Stephen the Witness Catholic Student Center at UNI. This semester, Professor Wells is teaching a Lifelong University course titled "Notre Dame: Past, Present, and Future."

Professor Wells will remain in Cedar Falls after her retirement where she plans to continue her scholarly activities and stay active in the community. Based on her immense record of accomplishments at UNI, I enthusiastically support Prof Charlotte C. Welles to receive emeritus status.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Kenneth Atkinson".

Kenneth Atkinson, Ph.D.
Professor of History
Department of History