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CALL TO ORDER
Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:15 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
Motion to approve the minutes of the 11/30/09 meeting as corrected by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION
No press present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON
Chair Wurtz noted that Provost Gibson is not able to attend today’s meeting as she is out of the country.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN
Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ
Chair Wurtz had no comments.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING
1014 Curriculum Package - College of Education and College of Natural Sciences

Motion to docket Calendar Item #1014 as Docket Item #912 out of regular order following Docket Item # 911 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

1015 Graduate Council policy revisions and course proposals
Motion to docket Calendar Item #1015 in regular order by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Motion to remove 920:131g Economics, New Course, Sports Economics off the table by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

Motion to approve 920:131g Economics, New Course, Sports Economics by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess.

Discussion followed.

Motion passed with one abstention.

Motion to remove Docket Item #911 Curriculum Package – College of Humanities and Fine Arts off the table by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

Motion to approve Docket Item #911 Curriculum Package – College of Humanities and Fine Arts by Senator East; second by Senator Soneson.

Senator Smith expressed concern about the proposed new courses, 620:164g Digital Writing and 620:170g Electronic Literature, as well as 621:189 English Portfolio Seminar.

There was no one from the English Department present that was able to respond to Senator Smith’s concerns.

Motion to table until a representative from the English Department is available to respond by Senator Soneson; second by Senator East.

Motion failed with seven yeas, six nays.

Discussion followed on the courses Senator Smith expressed concerns about 620:164g Digital Writing and 620:170g Electronic Literature, 621:189 English Portfolio Seminar, and CAP:103 Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Genocide: Case Studies.

Senator Smith moved to divide the issue into three parts with the first part including 620:164g Digital Writing and 620:170g Electronic Literature, with voting on that. The second part
would include 621:189 English Portfolio Seminar, with voting on that. The third part would be the remainder of the English Department’s proposal, with voting on that as a whole. Second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Smith to approve the English Department’s curriculum except for 620:164g Digital Writing, 620:170g Electronic Literature, and 621:189 English Portfolio Seminar; second by Senator Bruess.

A brief discussion followed.

Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Soneson to approve 620:164g Digital Writing and 620:170g Electronic Literature from the English Departments Curriculum package; second by Senator Balong. Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Soneson to approve 621:189 English Portfolio Seminar; second by Senator Balong.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion to approve 621:189 English Portfolio Seminar failed.

Motion to approve the Humanities Curriculum package by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Modern Languages Curriculum Package by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Basom.

Discussion followed.

Motion to approve the Modern Languages Curriculum Package passed.

Motion to approve the School of Music’s Curriculum Package by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Bruess.

Discussion followed.

Motion to approve the School of Music’s Curriculum Package passed.
Motion to approve the Department of Philosophy and World Religions Curriculum Package by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Department of Theatre Curriculum Package by Senator East; second Senator Devlin.

Discussion followed.

Motion to approve the Department of Theatre Curriculum Package was passed.

Motion to approve the College of Education Curriculum Package by Senator Devlin; second by Senator Schumacher-Douglas.

Motion by Senator East to divide the motion into parts by departments; second by Senator Smith. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Curriculum Package by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Devlin.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion to approve the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Curriculum Package passed.

Motion to approve the Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Postsecondary Education Curriculum Package by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Devlin.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion to approve the Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Postsecondary Education Curriculum Package passed.

Motion to approve the Educational Psychology and Foundations Curriculum Package by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Smith. Motion passed.
Motion to approve the Health, Physical Education and Leisure Services Curriculum Package by Senator Devlin, second by Senator East.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion to split the question by Senator Smith, pulling 440:015 Life Skill Enhancement out as a separate issue; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Bruess to approve 440:015 Life Skill Enhancement; second by Senator Devlin.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Senator Lowell to extend the meeting an additional 15 minutes; second by Senator Roth. Motion passed.

Discussion continued.

Motion to approve 440:015 Life Skill Enhancement failed.

Motion to approve the remainder of the Health, Physical Education and Leisure Services Curriculum Package by Senator Smith; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Department of Special Education Curriculum Package by Senator Smith; second by Senator Devlin.

Motion passed.

ADJOURNMENT
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PRESENT: Megan Balong, Maria Basom, Gregory Bruess, Michele Devlin, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Bev Kopper, Julie Lowell, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Phil Patton, Michael
Roth, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Scott Giese was attending for Doug Hotek

Absent: Karen Breitbach, Gloria Gibson

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:15 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 11/30/09 meeting as corrected by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Chair Wurtz noted that Provost Gibson is not able to attend today’s meeting as she is out of the country.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz had no comments.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

1014 Curriculum Package - College of Education and College of Natural Sciences
Motion to docket Calendar Item #1014 as Docket Item #912 out of regular order following Docket Item # 911 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

1015 Graduate Council policy revisions and course proposals

Motion to docket Calendar Item #1015 in regular order by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

**CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

Motion to remove 920:131g Economics, New Course, Sports Economics off the table by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

Motion to approve 920:131g Economics, New Course, Sports Economics by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess.

Senator Smith stated that he had moved to separate this course from the rest of the Economics Curriculum Package in the belief that what was being proposed was a course that was designed specifically to serve the interest of a particular faculty member, newly tenured. He felt that it wasn’t a topic in his mind that intrinsically merited a place on UNI’s curriculum. He has since learned that the faculty member in question was hired as a result of a search for a sports economist. He could disagree whether we should have a sports economist in the College of Business Administration but that’s not his decision. If we do have such a member on our faculty then we should also have courses in Sports Economics. At this point he is prepared to support this proposal.

Senator East expressed frustration that the Faculty Senate is not consulted when new lines with particular emphases are awarded yet we’re presumed to be willing to rubber stamp new curriculum for those hires, which seems like an awkward position to put the Senate in.

Motion passed with one abstention.

Motion to remove Docket Item #911 Curriculum Package – College of Humanities and Fine Arts off the table by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.
Motion to approve Docket Item #911 Curriculum Package – College of Humanities and Fine Arts by Senator East; second by Senator Soneson.

Senator Smith expressed concern about the proposed new courses, 620:164g Digital Writing and 620:170g Electronic Literature, noting that outside and program reviewers recommended these courses but he wonders how going digital affects the analysis of text. Would an English major be lacking something if he didn’t have a course in these areas? What does the medium have to say about the content and the analysis of literature? He was also bothered by the proposed course 621:189 English Portfolio Seminar, a one credit course to provide guidance in assembling portfolios of students writing which would be used for outcomes assessment. It seems to him to be slight on academic content to deserve even a credit. This would be a good candidate for a zero credit course. He also has concerns about the majors in TESOL, many of which were recommended for phase-out by the Academic Program Assessment (APA).

There was no one from the English Department able to respond to Senator Smith’s concerns.

Motion to table until a representative from the English Department is available to respond by Senator Soneson; second by Senator East.

Senator Smith remarked that he doesn’t want this tabled if he’s the only senator concerned.

Motion failed with seven yeas, six nays.

Senator Soneson commented on digital/electronic literature, noting that we have moved into a computer age and this is a radical development not unlike the invention of the printing press. It is his guess that this is a course that will begin to study a new genre, which is digital writing. It will have to do with the possibilities that are made available for writing and such by the computer, and they will no doubt look at how books are put together in this new medium; it’s a radically different way of thinking about writing a book, poetry, and such. He would think this would be a very appropriate course for the English Department.

Senator Smith remarked that he would have thought this would have been more of a Communication Studies kind of thing as it’s more about communication in general rather than English
literature or language. He’s surprised that if this was important that it wasn’t already being done by Communication Studies. He is aware that the faculty in the English Department is already stretched and are trying to get out of some of their obligations to the Liberal Arts Core (LAC) and adding more courses just exasperates that problem and he doesn’t see a persuasive rationale for this.

Senator Basom noted that this is a new genre of literature and literature is taught in the English Department; not Communication Studies although there is some overlap because literature is also a form of communication. She has no problem with teaching courses on electronic literature in the Department of English Language and Literature. It’s another genre; we teach poetry, and a variety of genres.

Chair Wurtz stated that she can see where the medium will shape language. Language is organic and constantly changing; the medium will change the language.

Senator Smith commented that when he thinks of genres he thinks of poetry, short stories, novels and things like that, whether you’re writing on paper or electronically. Writing is writing and he doesn’t see it as hugely significant.

Senator East added that he didn’t think we’d ever have a course on pencil literature or paper literature. He believes that we’re much too quick to include new technology as somehow changing the face of what we’ve done in some drastic way. However, computer technology does allow us to de-linearize content and to include a much larger variety of media within publications and documents. He can imagine we’ve gone a little overboard with two courses, Theory and Practice of Digital Writing. He might be more inclined to believe that Electronic Literature might somehow be different but Theory and Practice of Digital Writing seems strange to him.

Vice Chair Mvuyekure noted that with 620:164g Digital Writing: Theory and Practice, assuming that the key term is “rhetorical analysis,” there was a faculty member hired in English to teach rhetoric and composition, similar to the situation with Sports Economics.

Senator Patton added that he would like to re-emphasize the opinion expressed by Senator East that as we develop curriculum, there is concern that many of these courses can only be taught by one professor in the department. And this is at the expense
of sections of College Reading and Writing, sections of Introduction to Literature, sections of Literature Analysis, all courses that the English Department is having difficulty meeting the teaching needs of.

Senator Neuhaus commented that he likes the Digital/Electronic courses and he believes that English has made some fairly strong arguments for them. He does have concerns that they are dropping one course and adding four; at some point they may want to start balancing things.

Senator Soneson asked if the proposal stated that new faculty would be needed to teach these courses?

Chair Wurtz asked Ken Baughman, English, if he could review the merits of the courses.

Dr. Baughman responded that digital technology is becoming an increasingly important part of professional communication. With respect to 620:164g Digital Writing: Theory and Practice, the other professional writing courses in their curriculum already include a considerable amount of attention to using digital technology in preparation of various kinds of documents. Also, in different professional settings, preparation of reports, different means of disseminating proposals and information and to have a course that provides an academic or intellectual analysis of this resource and technology will be very helpful for students who are interested in professional communication, the courses of the minor.

With respect to 620:170g Electronic Literature, Dr. Baughman continued, there is a great deal of innovation and experimentation with language and using verbal along with other media, and integrating them in unlimited creative ways. Just as we have interest in film literature we now need to acknowledge, include and explore in an academic setting these creative ways of using this media. This area is going to be increasingly important and will expand in both the practical domains as well as the literary and creative domains in the coming years.

Senator Patton commented on courses added and dropped, noting that those courses are automatically being dropped from the curriculum because they have not been offered in four years. That includes European Novel, Teaching of Media Literacy, Sex, Gender and Literature, Practicum: Tutoring Writing, 19th Century English Literature, Seminar: Phonology, Seminar: Syntax, all of which are automatically being dropped from the curriculum.
Senator Soneson asked if these digital technology courses would require the hiring of new faculty?

Dr. Baughman replied that the English Department has faculty that are interested in, have developed these course proposals, and are doing work in these areas.

Senator Smith asked Dr. Baughman’s views on 620:189 English Portfolio Seminar, which is being proposed as a one-credit course, to provide students with guidance to assemble portfolios of their writing. What would students do in the course that justifies an academic credit?

Dr. Baughman responded that students would do two things; review, select, organize and prepare examples of work they have done throughout their course work in the English major. They would also prepare a kind of introduction to the items they select, organize and gather together for this portfolio representing their work. This introductory essay would be a reflection, self-assessment of that body of work. They would like to have those English students participate directly in the reflection of their own work, which will help English faculty assess the extent to which learning outcomes are attained by students as they complete their major course work.

Senator East asked about CAP:103 Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Genocide: Case Studies, noting that this doesn’t talk about language or literature at all in the course description.

Senator Basom replied that this is a new Capstone course, which has previously been offered as an experimental course. It is going through the English Department because the faculty member teaching this is from English. It is not cross-listed with English.

Dr. Baughman added that it is in their curriculum packet because the proposer is a member of the English Department.

Senator East reiterated that the English Department already has a substantial LAC commitment that they have difficulty meeting. There appears to be no body here from CHFA Dean’s Office that can explain how the department has the resources to offer these new courses.

Senator Baughman responded that Stephen Gaies is the faculty member who developed and proposed the course for Capstone. He
offered it previously on an experimental basis and has been offering Capstone courses for approximately three years focusing on genocide, a topic that he’s devoted much of his professional work to recently. There is a very large value to such courses being made available to our students. It is his understanding that there continues to be a large need for Capstone courses.

Siobhan Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Coordinator, added that the English Department is English Language and Literature, and not everyone in that department teaches language skills. There is always a demand for Capstone courses, especially new Capstone courses which fill up very quickly.

Senator Smith moved to divide the issue into three parts with the first part including 620:164g Digital Writing and 620:170g Electronic Literature, with voting on that. The second part would include 621:189 English Portfolio Seminar, with voting on that. The third part would be the remainder of the English Department’s proposal, with voting on that as a whole. Second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the English Department’s curriculum except for 620:164g Digital Writing, 620:170g Electronic Literature, and 621:189 English Portfolio Seminar; second by Senator Bruess.

Senator East asked why English is dropping 620:106 Scientific/Technical Writing, is that due to lack of student enrollment?

Dr. Baughman replied that that has been a factor but the principle reason for dropping it is that students can use one of the other courses as they are re-configured such as 620:177g Applied Writing: Projects and Careers. This course serves a somewhat wider clientele.

Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Soneson to approve 620:164g Digital Writing and 620:170g Electronic Literature from the English Departments Curriculum package; second by Senator Balong.

Motion passed.
Motion by Senator Soneson to approve 621:189 English Portfolio Seminar; second by Senator Balong.

Senator Soneson commented that he’s for this, as it seems to be an attempt to academicize the portfolio process, an attempt to bring intellectual integrity, reflection, criticism and such to the portfolio process. It’s not a big deal; it’s only one credit, 15 hours. It’s not just a matter of putting together a portfolio; it’s a matter of critically reflecting on that portfolio so that one can increase the value of their education for themselves, not for an employer or instructor. This is an attempt to bring intellectual reflection into that whole process so that the education itself can be deepened.

Senator Smith noted that this is not the most egregious example of giving credit for marginal academic work that he’s ever seen but he does think it’s in the gray/fringe area, and for that reason he believes we need more discipline on these kinds of things. This is something students should do on their own. Students should be required to do outcomes assessments administratively rather than getting credit for it. He’s reluctant to be giving credit for this. Many other departments do give credit for similar things and it’s a practice we should discourage and that’s why he opposes this.

Faculty Chair Swan remarked that he opposed this in the department and he still doesn’t think it’s a good idea. One of the compelling reasons that this was brought forward was that it held students to be serious about matters that the English Department was going to use to be central in it’s assessment program. They didn’t know how else to get students to be really invested in the assessment procedures of the department and this is one of several ways; a key that was going to make valid the assessment procedures newly developed by the department.

Senator Lowell stated that she has a little bit of a problem with portfolios; it’s a way a lot of departments are going towards student outcome assessments. Student outcome assessments are suppose to be the faculty’s job, not the students. If this is a course on how to do a portfolio it should be a course offered to absolutely everyone. She’s not excited about this.

Senator East commented that he also doesn’t see the academic merit in having a course that tells you how to put together the products you produce. This seems to him to be another fad that says the way we do assessments now is through portfolios, and
everyone jumps on the portfolio bandwagon. Ten years from now there'll be a different way to organize things or it will be in electronic form, in which case we'll have to have another course called Electronic Portfolio. He questions the merit of asking students to do this and giving them credit.

Senator Balong noted that she doesn’t know about the original motivation but for this particular field a portfolio would make more sense as far as preparation for future employment. A portfolio might serve students well as they are putting together as a cohesive version of their work and talents. While this is not her field, she envisions that something like this would be helpful to majors.

Senator Roth asked if he understands correctly from the course description, that the entirety of work and substance of the course is from work completed in other courses?

Dr. Baughman responded that yes, that’s is correct.

Faculty Chair Swan added that there is new stuff in the way of an introduction or something like that.

Dr. Baughman stated that the English Department is very interested in their students, both participating in student outcomes assessment process and with reflecting on the work that they do in their courses that count towards their major program. There is the potential for substantial learning for students. They’re thinking about outcomes assessment activities, not only in terms of reaching conclusions about the extent students in their major program are demonstrating the learning outcomes that have been identified for them. They’re interested in students becoming engaged in this themselves, as they review their course work, and as they then reflect and write on that, taking into account the learning outcomes that have been identified and articulated. They believe there could be substantial benefit for their students and for faculty that are responsible for the program. The English Department would very much like to try this. It most probably will be done, and needs to be done, in an electronic format, and the university has the resources to do that. They see a great deal of potential, both for the faculty and the students, in this course.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas noted that the Early/Elementary/Middle Level Childhood Education programs have done portfolios for years. Approximately 14 years so it’s not really a passing fad. However, the responsibility of helping students prepare
that portfolio has always been a bit of a faculty issue as far as who’s responsible for it. They’ve picked out a couple of classes that help students develop their portfolios, taking away from the academics of those courses. If they weren’t already a major that had so many students they would have proposed this many years ago. Perhaps now that zero credit hour courses are being suggested they might try those. They have tried portfolios and it is a rigorous process.

Senator Funderburk asked about the mode of delivery, is this going to happen as a class that everybody takes, how is that being handled?

Dr. Baughman replied that they anticipate it being part of a faculty members teaching load.

Senator East commented that his practice for reading course proposals and descriptions is to look at what they start with, and what they lead with here is students putting together stuff they’ve developed in other courses. And it includes reflection on attainment of program objectives. Putting together a portfolio of your work just puts together a portfolio of your work. If, on the other hand, they really want students to reflect on what they’ve done and whether or not that meets the programs goals then that’s what should be said up front; students reflect on or write about, or have their reflections evaluated as they organize their material. It’s his belief that this is not well thought out and not something we want as part of our curriculum.

Senator Smith added that he believes that this is a good thing to do but not for credit.

Motion to approve 621:189 English Portfolio Seminar failed.

Motion to approve the Humanities Curriculum Package by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Soneson.

It was noted that there is only one proposed change in the Humanities curriculum, dropped Humanities minor.

Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Modern Languages Curriculum Package by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Basom.
Associate Provost Kopper reviewed the changes in the Modern Languages Curriculum Package, noting that there are a variety of changes, in hours, titles, and restatements. There were no specific items that were of concern to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC).

Senator Smith noted that the APA recommended phasing-out many of the language programs due to lack of student interest. He is disappointed in this curriculum package to see none of those phase-outs being carried through. There’s not a lot of overlap with these courses, and it cost money to offer those kinds of programs and when you don’t have many students enrolled in them it is really questionable whether the resources should be used in that way. He was disappointed that the Modern Languages Department wasn’t proposing to phase-out some of these very low enrollment programs. Perhaps the timing didn’t allow for that.

Senator Basom responded that the same students are majors and minors, and if you cut the major programs you’ll end up with only minors and will end up with courses with even fewer students. If you eliminate the major students will choose to go to another institution. Class size will not be increased by cutting courses; the ultimate effect will be to decrease class size even further. What the department is proposing with their reorganization, they’ve started a very significant restatement of all the majors but they’re just not ready to bring it forward at this time and it will be proposed in two years. There are already significant changes. They’re trying to offer fewer courses and use faculty resources so students can have an excellent experience and use their resources better.

Senator Smith responded to Senator Basom, noting that he understands that and in language you have to have a full panel of programs, majors and minors certificates, and such, but the question is, should we be in all the languages that we’re in? The one that really stands out is Portuguese; can we afford in this budgetary environment to be offering Portuguese? Shouldn’t we really be telling students who want to major and minor in Portuguese that they ought to go to the University of Iowa as UNI really doesn’t have the resources to offer that language in addition to French, Spanish, German, and Russian. The APA task force proposed to cut German and Russian, also very low enrollment programs. Can we afford to offer all of them? He wishes there was more sensitivity between the administration and the Department of Modern Languages in regards to resource issues than he’s seeing in this proposal.
Senator Devlin remarked that she appreciates Senator Smith’s comments, but from a logistical standpoint, what are we debating? We’re basically debating something that’s not even up for debate. Yes, they are very legitimate points that should be discussed, and the Department of Modern Languages is in the process of changing and updating their curriculum, but don’t we have to follow what’s in front of us, voting to approve or not to approve what’s currently in front of the Senate?

Senator East offered up another point that will not make any difference, noting that the second course on the Department of Modern Languages list is a technology course, 700:193g Technology in Foreign Language Education. We have technology in everything, for every program on campus and he believes we ought not to do that.

Motion to approve the Modern Languages Curriculum Package passed.

Motion to approve the School of Music’s Curriculum Package by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Bruess.

Associate Provost Kopper reviewed the changes in the School of Music, citing several new courses, the first being a new LAC course as well as two LAC Music courses that are being dropped. There a couple of new courses that are being offered for zero credit, and a variety of changed course descriptions, prerequisites and such. The UCC did have a discussion on the B.A. Core curriculum under the Music major, the waving of some of the choral co-requisites, and also had discussion on the Trace 4, B.A. in Performing Arts Management as that is being taught by adjuncts and staff. Those were the main issues discussed by the UCC.

Senator Soneson asked Dr. John Vallentine, Department Head, School of Music, to respond to the concerns raised by the UCC.

Alan Schmitz, Associate Director of Undergraduate Studies, and Dr. Vallentine were present to respond.

Dr. Vallentine noted that at the graduate level there was a question about 560:110g Double Reed Making Techniques, a new course, which resulted in the most discussion.
Senator Smith stated that he has a concern about their proposal for a new graduate program.

Dr. Vallentine replied that was not correct.

Senator Smith asked what was proposed in terms of graduate programs?

Dr. Vallentine responded that there is a track in the Performance Degree program on multiple woodwinds, which will actually increase the number of students, not decrease.

Senator Smith reiterated that it’s a new track in an existing graduate program. His concern is that the APA task force felt that we’ve over invested in graduate programs in Music. UNI has an excellent School of Music and the task force recognizes that but it is the third most expensive department on this campus in terms of direct cost per student credit hour. Compared to other music departments at other institutions it is very expensive, more expensive than most. It might be a scale issue as to the number of faculty to have a school of music and then not attract enough students to keep it efficient. Our School of Music is very good but it’s also very costly, and given the cost, shouldn’t we be thinking about ways to cut back particularly the graduate programs and the more specialized programs. He didn’t see any recommendations for that in the Curriculum Package, which is disturbing to him. We should be recognizing the budgetary realities at this university and he doesn’t see that happening.

Dr. Vallentine responded, noting that the recommendations from the APA were considered by everyone and rejected strongly by the faculty, rejected by the Dean, and rejected by the Provost. There are 56 graduate students in the School of the Music, which is fairly healthy in looking at graduate programs across the university.

Senator Smith asked what the School of Music is doing to try to reduce its cost per student credit hour? How are they trying to be responsive to the budgetary situation on this campus?

Dr. Vallentine replied, using Euphonia-Tuba instructor Senator Funderburk and Flute instructor Angeleita Floyd as examples, noting one cannot teach the other’s instrument. That does create a cost issue because this involves one-on-one teaching, but that is the case around the country. They have a comprehensive, very high quality program where they will not be
substituting instructors. At some other institutions you do have faculty attempting to try to teach other instruments or other voice types that are not their specialty, and they’re not very good at it. At UNI we have high expectations, with the largest number of music educators in the state of Iowa teaching and remaining in the profession. Our performance majors are performing world wide, and are successful. When you have a high quality program that’s what you’re going to have. If they cut people then you’re talking about cutting numbers of students as well as and UNI will lose students if we can’t offer these specialties that we have.

Senator Funderburk commented that when you look at the School of Music things are hard to sort out. There is a scale issue that if you’re going to offer a comprehensive music program it’s very inexpensive to offer a piano and voice music program. As soon as you want to expand into something else you need a full orchestral staff, which is a lot bigger, and you’re offering many one-hour one-on-one courses. In the graduate program most people take the same courses. There are very few changes and by dropping a program you haven’t changed anything except reducing the number of courses, for example, a graduate history course. It’s very difficulty to wrap ones head around this and there’s a limit to how large of a theory class you can have without having graduate teaching assistants, because there is a lot of homework grading to do every night. There are some logistical things that every school is going to have fight with.

Senator Smith asked if all the quality schools of music have all of the graduate programs that UNI does?

Dr. Vallentine replied that UNI is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music. He consulted with them during the APA process and UNI must remain transparent with their degree titles, with programs offered so that when students get a degree in conducting, for example, they can go out and get conducting positions because they have a Masters degree in conducting. They are very, very specific according to accreditation standards, which are very high standards. The national accrediting team will be here next year for their ten-year re-accreditation.

Motion to approve the School of Music’s Curriculum Package passed.
Motion to approve the Department of Philosophy and World Religions Curriculum Package by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that the Department of Philosophy and World Religions Curriculum Package contains only two dropped programs, recommendations from the APA process.

Senator Soneson, Department Head, Philosophy and World Religions, reiterated that these two programs were recommended to be dropped by the APA.

Motion to approve the Department of Philosophy and World Religions Curriculum Package passed.

Motion to approve the Department of Theatre Curriculum Package by Senator East; second Senator Devlin.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that there is a new course, a variety of changes in prerequisites, and a restatement, adding that there are more dropped courses than new proposed courses and that the Theatre Department should be praised as these came from their APA recommendations.

Senator Smith noted that two programs that were recommended by the APA for phase-out, one, a joint program with Communication Studies, which he felt there was a good rationale for it. The other, Undergraduate Major in Theatre with Youth Emphasis, was not phased-out. He also noted that Theatre is another very expensive department, second most expensive department on campus. When they are that expensive it behooves the department to be very careful about what they’re offering.

Eric Lange, Department Head, Theatre, responded, noting that the APA recommendations were examined and in large part rejected by the department. They did receive notification that all of their emphasis areas were reclassified for maintenance as opposed to being phased out, which is the direction they’re pursuing. More importantly, they have just started this semester, and will continue spring and into the first month of fall semester next year, the process of seeking accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Theatre. There is a preliminary process to that that involves communicating to them what UNI’s curriculum is. By their initial review of our curriculum they have stated that UNI is in a good position to receive that accreditation and it’s the department’s feeling that to change a
major portion of their curriculum as they are seeking accreditation is probably foolhardy. They want to be judged on what they are doing, not what they may do. They are also hoping that as part of that process they will be informed by comparison to other accredited schools across the nation, how that particular emphasis should be dealt with or should be treated. One thing that is true about the self-study process of National Association of Schools of Theatre is that it deals with a large number of criteria, one of which was mentioned in the APA evaluation, that of outreach. This particular program is responsible for an incredible amount of outreach that he feels does UNI’s department well, and more importantly, does the university well. Were the Theatre Department ready to drop this particular emphasis they still would not drop the courses that make up that emphasis, and thus, no real benefit to be gained.

Dr. Lange continued, noting that the other issue that was brought up by Senator Smith, the issue of expense in terms of student credit hours. They have started a process whereby the work that faculty do on the mounting of Strayer-Wood Theatre productions, which is a huge amount of work, and they have failed to find an mechanism to accurately reflect that work in the past. Beginning this semester, they have started to explore a new mechanism for the accurate reflection of that work, working with the UNI Registrar’s Office to put that system in place. This is their first semester with it and they will need time to see if that accurate reflection really comes to the point that they would like it to be.

Senator Smith asked if that would be granting more student credit hours for the work that they do?

Dr. Lange replied that you would see more student credit hours for the work that students do alongside the faculty in mounting the productions.

Senator Soneson added which would reduce the overall cost per credit hour, while not the total cost. It’s important to note that cost per student credit hour in the Theatre Department is quite expensive because of the particular way we have recorded credit hours for faculty. We apparently record them in a way differently than other schools. Other schools are able to reflect the credit hours that are being taught for performances mostly the same way and we’re trying to put UNI in line with those schools to accurately reflect the cost of student credit hours.
Dr. Lange responded that that is correct.

Motion to approve the Department of Theatre Curriculum Package was passed.

Motion to approve the College of Education Curriculum Package by Senator Devlin; second by Senator Schumacher-Douglas.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that there is a variety of both undergraduate and graduate programs. One of the issues that the UCC spent a lot of time on was in Health, Physical Education and Leisure Services (HPELS), specifically the Health Promotion major related to Option 4 – Science Intensive: Environmental Health. The UCC initially approved that upon review; at the next meeting they rescinded that decision and it was brought back on the table. It was discussed again and ultimately approved it.

Motion by Senator East to divide the motion into parts by departments; second by Senator Smith. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Curriculum Package by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Devlin.

Senator Patton noted that several areas in Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) were recommended for phase-out and he would like to hear from C&I as to how they can expand their doctoral programs.

Senator Devlin asked, from a technical standpoint, if the Senate is debating things that aren’t even up for debate? It’s not on there to delete so how can we delete something that’s not up for debate?

Chair Wurtz responded that the Senate is debating the merits of the proposal.

Senator Devlin replied that senators are bringing up themes of why don’t we phase out programs that were cited in the APA report, how can we debate something that’s not even up there to be debated?

Chair Wurtz noted that she’s interpreting it as background information to explain support or lack of support.
Associate Provost Kopper clarified that there are a few programs, Media Minor, Elementary School Teacher Librarian Minor and Elementary School Teacher Librarian Minor, Teaching that were recommended by APA to be dropped and they are included in this curricular package.

Senator Smith noted that he is sensitive to Senator Devlin’s point, however it is the case that the Education Doctorate and C&I was recommended for restatement and we could say that we would not let them restate this if we felt the program should be dropped, which is what was recommended by the APA task force. That’s going to be true for almost all the doctoral programs in the College of Education and elsewhere. The APA task force was very concerned that UNI was offering doctoral programs, often in departments that seem to lack the courses or the heavily research-qualified faculty to deliver first-rate doctoral programs. In some cases there is student demand for these programs, but should we be in doctoral education if we can’t really do a good job?

Jill Uhlenberg, Interim Department Head, Curriculum & Instruction, responded that the proposal for reorganization of the doctoral program was put forward to the Provost’s Office as a result of the APA, and that reorganization was approved. They are in the process of developing that reorganization of the ISA.

Senator Smith asked if she anticipates that at the next curricular cycle to have a proposal relating to the doctoral program?

Dr. Uhlenberg responded that yes, they would.

Shoshanna Coon, Chair, Graduate Curriculum Council Committee (GCCC), stated that the actual restatements of all the EDDs that are in the curriculum package were actually at the request of the Graduate College and the Registrar’s Office. To clarify, in the catalog the electives students use in the intensive study areas, by having those electives on the online program of study template students don’t have to file as many student request forms to have their courses appear on their programs.

Senator Smith asked if the GCCC addressed the issue of whether our doctoral programs have the intellectual and other resources they need to be successful, to meet our standards for good programs?
Dr. Coon responded that they did not because none of the restatements were actually in the original course proposal; they were requested by the GCCC as clean up items, mainly for student convenience. For graduate students, anything that is actually in the catalog, students must file online student requests to add to their program of study. The volume of online student requests is predigest, and anything that can actually be in the catalog as stated electives that students can take drastically cuts down on the number of student requests and increases the convenience for students. That was the main reason for requesting that. They did not address issues of EDD content per se, as they were not included originally.

Senator East remarked that he would like to hear something about the six new courses included in the doctoral program, as they are 300: level courses.

Dr. Uhlenberg replied that those courses are in C&Is Reading Recovery program, which is a state legislative funded program that we have had at UNI since it was dropped at the University of Iowa.

Dr. Salli Forbes, Associate Professor, C&I, stated that she is the one that wrote the proposal for those six courses. Reading Recovery is an early intervention program for children who are having difficulty learning to read and write in the first grade. It is a train-the-trainer model. It is a trademark program that is held by Ohio State University. There are several universities that offer these courses. The six courses that have been proposed are for preparing the teaching of leaders who will teach two courses to prepare teachers to teach Reading Recovery. It is at the doctoral level, which is required by the standards and guidelines of Reading Recovery. UNI had applied to become a center for Reading Recovery two years ago and was accepted, and part of that requirement is that we offer these courses.

Dr. Forbes noted the issue of rigor, saying that these courses are quite rigorous. Her own Ph.D. is from the University of Iowa and any one of these courses is as rigorous as anything she took in her doctoral program. Similar courses have been at Ohio State University, University of Iowa, University of Illinois, and Perdue University. She’s taught these courses at the University of Iowa, Perdue University and National Louis University in the past. It is a matter of districts or Area Education Agencies deciding if they want to have someone prepared as a teacher leader so they can mount the program or
continue the program in Reading Recovery. It does have a high rigor in terms of academics because they want these teacher leaders to be well steeped in understanding literacy development.

Senator Devlin asked if this is funded by grants or state appropriations?

Dr. Forbes responded that it is funded from interest off the state’s School Funds Account; they get 55% of that interest and a center at the University of Iowa gets 45%.

Senator Devlin commented on questions about APA recommendations, why things haven’t been done. With curricular packages coming in, in HPELS their revisions based on APA recommendations are not even due to their director until March 1, 2010 so those changes will be seen next curricular cycle. A lot of this is unfortunate timing for the College of Education.

Motion to approve the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Curriculum Package passed.

Motion to approve the Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Postsecondary Education Curriculum Package by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Devlin.

As these are all graduate programs, Dr. Coon, Chair of the GCCC, updated the Senate as to what changes were included in the Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Postsecondary Education’s (ELCPE) package. She noted that there are three new :300 level courses for the superintendent certificate that are being proposed to meet state requirements. These will replace other courses, which will be dropped as cohorts move through the program. There are a number of changes in the hours of some courses to make the catalog confirm with current practice. There is a change in the Counseling area in an effort to reduce the number of hours required for those degrees. Currently they are 60 hour Master degree programs and are attempting to reduce them as much as possible given certification requirements that school counseling has.

Senator East noted that he sees a lot of credit hours going from one and three to zero, is that correct?

Dr. Coon responded that they’re not going to zero credits, but to unstated number of hours because there has been a directive
that the catalog will be followed in terms of the number of hours that a course can be taken for and whether the course can be repeated. The statement of no hours means the course can be used as needed within the degree program. Typically these are courses, such as Readings in..., where students might take more than one Readings course in their degree program. If the statement actually said 3 hours the students would not be allowed to use any more than three hours in their program. The purpose of this is to allow it to be more open in using the number of hours.

Senator East stated that where he sees this seems to be in the course descriptions, not in degree requirements.

Dr. Coon replied that it’s not degree requirements, it’s a matter of the course descriptions in the past not always being followed in terms of how they were used in degree programs. There is a new directive that the course descriptions will be followed. Rather than trying to restructure the degrees it was felt it would be more desirable to make the catalog conform to what has been established practice.

Senator East asked that if it says for no hours it can be taken for any number of hours a student wants?

Dr. Coon replied that that is her understanding. Will a program approve an unestablished number of hours of these things, no, because any use of these courses requires Advisor, Graduate Coordinator and Associate Dean of the Graduate College approval. There are checks and balances to keep these courses from being used excessively.

Senator East asked about how there can be checks and balances if there are no requirements that limit the number of such courses you can take?

Dr. Coon that there are in that things have to be approved. If it has been course 270:285, for example, can be taken for three hours, and it doesn’t say if it can be repeated, a student is limited to one Readings course. Perhaps a student needs more than one Readings course, but if the catalog is followed, they can’t do it. Not every student will use these options but for flexibility, to be there if needed, this is what’s been done. These changes were actually suggested by the Graduate Record Analyst in the Registrar’s Office because she was having trouble reconciling students programs of study with current catalog descriptions.
Senator East continued, stating he does not understand how this fits together. The course in the catalog is going to say no hours.

Dr. Coon replied that it’s not going to say zero hours; it’s just not going to have an hour statement at all.

Senator East reiterated that the statement “no hours” in these course descriptions means there will be no statement of hours. What happens in the degree requirements?

Dr. Coon responded that the degree requirements state that students have a certain number of electives in their degree and if a student has approval to use one of these :285 or :385 courses for one of those electives then they put in a request and if approved it’s added to their program. If not approved then it does the student no good to take it for any number of hours.

Senator Funderburk commented that adding “this course may be repeated” would a simpler way rather than eliminating the number of hours, if he understands this correctly.

Dr. Coon noted that there were various ways of accomplishing this; one way would have been to say that the course could be taken for 1-3 hours, may be repeated. It’s seems simpler to cover all the possible uses by leaving the hours unstated.

Senator Funderburk added that the original intent to reduce the number of student requests seems to be in the opposite direction now by setting courses up so they need to define the number hours and how many times a student takes the course.

Dr. Coon responded that they were in the situation of having students who, by established practice, had taken these courses for more hours than the catalog had stated. The Graduate Record Analyst can no longer “do the magic” that they’ve been able to do in the past. Moving into the new Student Information System implementation all of these course requirements and descriptions have to be coded in. Rather than having a human being interpreting what the catalog says, it’s going to be coded in that this course can be taken for this many hours, and may or may not be repeated. It will be a much more automated system. In the past the Graduate Record Analyst have been able to make the program work; they have been told they can no longer do that.
Senator East noted that there are three new courses and Dr. Coon had suggested that as cohorts move through the program the other courses would be deleted. Is there any mechanism to ensure that this will happen?

Dr. Coon replied that they have new cohorts that are beginning the program that need the new courses to meet new state certification. They have older cohorts that are already going through the program that might not be through and thus need the older courses. Is there a mechanism? Only the memory of the GCCC to remind the ELCPE Department that they were going to drop those courses, and it is in the minutes of the GCCC discussion.

Motion to approve the Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Postsecondary Education Curriculum Package passed.

Chair Wurtz noted that it is now 4:59 and if discussion is to continue she will need a motion.

Associate Provost Kopper reminded the Senate of the extent of work that still needs to be addressed; the Senate has one more meeting scheduled before break and this all must be wrapped up before break.

Motion by Senator Smith to extend the meeting by 15 minutes; second by Senator Devlin. Motion.

Motion to approve the Educational Psychology and Foundations Curriculum Package by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Smith.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that this consists of changes in prerequisites, title and hours and there were on issues from the UCC.

Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Health, Physical Education and Leisure Services Curriculum Package by Senator Devlin, second by Senator East.
Associate Provost stated that there are a variety of changes, with the Health Promotion Major, Option 4 Science Intensive: Environmental Health. As she previously stated, that was approved by the UCC, rescinded and brought back to the table and ultimately approved. The issue on this was related to exempting students from core courses with the major, and the UCC had a variety of information on this that resulted in their extensive discussion.

Senator Smith noted that there were a number of programs that the APA had recommended for phase-out but as Senator Devlin had indicated earlier because of the cycle they weren’t acted on. He questioned the new course 440:015 Life Skills Enhancement, which appears to be a course for athletes. He has a lot of respect for UNI’s athletic program but he would hate this to become a program like other schools have where there are special courses for athletes that are basically “dumb downed” courses. He’d like to hear some rationale for why this is an academically meritorious course.

Stacia Greve, Athletic Academic Advisor, Athletics Administration, responded, and stated that she is currently the instructor for this course. It is not a course exclusively for athletes; any college freshman may take the course.

Senator Smith asked what is the substance of this course that makes it a two-credit hour course and if this is a learning to learn orientation to college kind of course?

Ms. Greve replied that it combines both of those and has various units covering academic success skills, study strategies as well as nutrition, relationships, code of conduct, alcohol, drug use and abuse. There is also a component where they discuss NCAA eligibility requirements, as well as academic plagiarism and academic writing. This course gives students an idea of what is expected of them at the collegiate level. They emphasis critical thinking in everything they do. Students have exams, papers, projects and journal writing throughout the semester.

Senator Smith noted that it sounds like some of the things that are done in the Wellness course, which is a required LAC course. This is the kind of thing that academically faculty get concerned about because it is a good thing to do but not for academic credit, and that’s his concern.

Anne Woodrick, NCAA Faculty Representative, responded that as a member institution of the NCAA Division I, UNI is required to
provide a life skills class to student athletes; this is in the NCAA legislation. To be in compliance with NCAA this type of class has to be offered. It’s not just offered at UNI, it’s offered at other member institutions.

Senator Devlin commented on Associate Provost Kopper’s mention of the Health Promotion Major, Option 4 Science Intensive: Environmental Health and the concerns that the UCC had with that. It was a concern that was brought up by just one faculty member in that division and it was overruled by the division. It was also overruled by the College of Education, and ultimately by the UCC. That faculty member was bringing up the issue that if students in the Environmental Health area were not taking some of the prerequisites, they would ultimately not be eligible in that emphasis area for accreditation by the National Health Education body. That accreditation is not needed; it is completely irrelevant to the rest of us and the other emphasis areas.

Senator Bruess asked Dr. Woodrick if the NCAA required that we give credit hours for this life skills course?

Dr. Woodrick replied that they require a life skills class.

Senator Bruess reiterated if they require credit hours attached to it? Or could it be something similar to what Business is doing with zero credit hours?

Dr. Woodrick responded that no, the NCAA does not require that credit hours be given but because it has an academic success component and is a strategy for success they felt that the content of the class actually reflects academic credit.

Senator East asked to hear more about the possibility of core courses in the major being not required or cancelled out for some majors. He’s also curious about the new course 42T:140 Athletic Training Practicum, which says that students can repeat for maximum of 12 hours. He’s wondering how that counts towards the major.

Todd A Evans, Associate Professor, HPELS, Athletic Training, responded that the practicum course that students are currently taking is not required as part of the major right now. The accreditation standards state that students have to have a class that awards credit for their clinical experience, kind of like student teaching except they do it from the beginning of their program. Prior to receiving credit for practicum students were
putting in study hours during the afternoon without credit. Right now all of the students in the program would get twelve credits for taking Practicum, one credit hour each semester as a sophomore, two credit hours each semester as a junior, and three credit hours each semester as a senior. As they go through the program they gain more skills and proficiency, and by the time they are seniors they are doing more and need to be spending more time because they will be practicing health care professionals. Down the road they can see their program going to a two-year program, as some institutions around the country are doing, which would cut down on credit hours. They have had some debate as to whether they can do this but the problem is that they can’t ask their accrediting bodies if they can have some students graduating with six hours practicum and some with twelve. Thus, they have put the number of hours in a range and right now every student would take it for twelve credit hours, which is how the program is currently running.

Diane Depken, Associate Professor, HPELS, Health Promotion and Education, stated that they have two accrediting bodies now for their program. Environmental Health is a new program that started in the last curricular cycle and it’s been extremely successful with twenty-some undergraduate majors. There is now a different national accrediting body for their Health Education/Health Promotion majors. The Environmental Health accrediting body is up and running with their components and UNI is poised to become a really strong Environmental Health undergraduate major across the country. The health component is in flux, and their competencies and their accreditation procedures aren’t quite ready and they will be going after that accreditation in three or four years. In the meantime they need to get ready for the Environmental Health accreditation. It is a very successful program and there is no other program that she’s found that devotes the amount of core course credit hours that we do to the fundamental components in Health Promotion. She could not find any other program that did a three-credit class. They will be re-looking at their core courses, streamlining them in order to be able to do it all.

Senator East commented that it was his understanding that there is a set of core courses for a set of majors and some majors are allowed, or prohibited, to take or not take the core courses.

Dr. Depken replied that that is preparation for their streamlining process.
Senator East continued, asking were they were unable to make it so that the majors don’t actually require those courses?

Dr. Depken responded that until the national accrediting bodies get their acts together they are currently in this “tension.”

Senator East asked if this is being done because they have majors sharing the program?

Dr. Depken clarified that they have majors sharing competencies, noting that the Environmental Health is a very science intensive program.

Senator Devlin added that those classes are simply not required; they’re not necessary within that profession. They are looking at merging three of those classes for the next curriculum cycle.

Discussion followed on the amount of work still before the Senate, the fact that there are people present today waiting for the Senate to address their department’s curriculum and that they may not be able to attend next week’s meeting as that is finals week.

Motion to split the question by Senator Smith, pulling 440:015 Life Skill Enhancement out as a separate issue; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Bruess to approve 440:015 Life Skill Enhancement; second by Senator Devlin.

Senator Roth stated that he supports this course for academic credit because this is not like the business course the Senate previously looked at. This is different; when talking about abusive relationships, alcohol, sex, things like that, with incoming students, that content is so important and he believes it can be done rigorously.

Motion by Senator Lowell to extend the meeting an additional 15 minutes; second by Senator Roth. Motion passed.

Senator Balong asked what the ramifications would be if this is not approved, because it is something that UNI needs to offer, can it still be offered as zero credit?

Associate Provost Kopper responded that she cannot speak to NCAA regulations, but this course has been offered the maximum number
of times it can be as an experimental course; it cannot be offered again as an experimental course.

Senator Soneson asked Dr. Woodrick if in looking at this course, as a member of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, Criminology, if she considers this an academically rigorous course in which genuine academic education is taking place.

Dr. Woodrick responded that yes, she has looked at the curriculum and sat in on the class, and she agrees with that.

Senator Soneson replied that that’s good enough for him. He knows Dr. Woodrick well as she teaches a religion class and her class is one of the more rigorous ones at UNI.

Ms. Greve elaborated on 440:015 Life Skill Enhancement and the previous business seminar course previously discussed by the Senate; the business seminar was specific to business and the curriculum there. They have worked hard to present the material in 440:015 Life Skill Enhancement that crosses disciplines; it prepares students for their academic path regardless of their major.

Motion to approve 440:015 Life Skill Enhancement failed.

Motion to approve the remainder of the Health, Physical Education and Leisure Services Curriculum Package by Senator Smith; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Department of Special Education Curriculum Package by Senator Smith; second by Senator Devlin.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that there are a variety of changes but nothing of special interest for the UCC.

Motion passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Smith to adjourn; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 P.M.
Respectfully submitted, 

Dena Snowden 
Faculty Senate Secretary