

9-14-2015

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 14, 2015

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2015 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa, "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 14, 2015" (2015). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 7.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/7

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Regular Meeting # 1768
UNI FACULTY SENATE
Sept 14th, 2015 (3:30 p.m. - 4:52 p.m.)
Oak Room, Maucker Union

SUMMARY MINUTES

1. Courtesy Announcements: **Summary of Main Points**

A. No members of the press were present.

B. Provost **Wohlpart** offered comments about his impression of UNI, mentioning “pockets of student engagement inside and outside of the classroom” and his desire to make that engagement more intentional and developmental. **Wohlpart** would like to see UNI be less reactive in the budget process and more thorough in its preparation for external reviews. He stressed the importance of faculty attending Master Plan forums and their department meetings where he can hear faculty concerns. More time for questions for Provost **Wohlpart** will be allotted at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

C. Faculty Chair **Peters** explained that between accreditation visits, the Higher Learning Commission now requires the University to select an improvement project. He and co-chair Kristin **Moser** will need a group of faculty volunteers to help choose that research project.

D. Faculty Senate Chair **O’Kane** welcomed all faculty especially the new Senate members and asked for assistance as he was unexpectedly put in the position of Senate Chair.

2. Minutes/Transcript

April 27, 2014. Approved **Walter/Kidd** All aye.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1281 Emeritus Request for Fred **Halgedahl**, School of Music, Carole Singleton **Henkin**, Department of Social Work; Bruce **Plakke**, Department of Communication Sciences & Disorders; Rick **Traw**, Curriculum and Instruction, and John **Wynstra**, Rod Library.

** Motion to docket in regular order. **Zeitz/Gould** All aye.

1282 Request to change the committee description for the Advisory Committee for the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning

** Motion to docket in regular order. **Terlip/McNeal**. All aye.

1283 Curriculum proposals for new degrees and associated new and changed courses for MATr, TCHRLEADINTL-MA, BAS (LAC, Criminal Justice; Tactical Emergency Services with Vulnerable Populations); BA in Supply Chain Management

** Motion passed **Zeitz/Swan** to separate items for discussion, and to docket in regular order: MATr [Master's of Athletic Training], TCHRLEADINTL-MA [Major in Teacher Leadership for International Educators], BA in Supply Chain Management.

Motion passed **Kidd/Zeitz to docket in regular order and discuss the BAS degree program itself and the BAS programs up for consideration: (LAC, Criminal Justice; Tactical Emergency Services with Vulnerable Populations).

4. New Business

a. Election of a new Faculty Senate Chair: Gretchen **Gould**

b. Faculty Senate Committee Appointments:

1 – Committee on Committees: Gretchen **Gould**

2 – Advisory Committee for the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning: Lee **Zeitz**

- 3- Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council: Todd **Evans**
- 4- Liberal Arts Core Committee: Jesse **Swan**
- 5- University Writing Committee – William **Koch**
- 6- Policy Review Committee – Tim **Kidd**
- 7- Gallagher-Bluedorn Performing Arts Center Advisory Committee: Leigh **Zeitz**
- 8- Senate Speaker Series Committee: Lee **Zeitz** & Michael **Walter**
- 9- Revision of the Emeritus policy and Emeritus Privileges: Lou **Fenech** & Scott **Peters**
- 10- Intercollegiate Academic Fund Committee: Laura **Terlip**

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

- 1276/1171 Receipt of Athletics Report (**Dolgener/Walter**) Received.
- 1277/1172 Receipt of Senate Budget Committee Report. Tabled until next meeting. (**Terlip/Walter**)
- 1278/1173 Receipt of Curriculum Sustainability Recommendations (**Walter/Gould**) Received.
- 1279/1174 Consideration of Changes to the Student Code of Conduct Considered.

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn (Gould/Pike**) Passed. 4:52 p.m.

Next Meeting:

Date: Monday, Sept. 28, 2015

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 51 pages, including 0 Addendum

Regular Meeting
FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Sept 14th, 2015 (3:30 p.m. - 4:52 p.m.)
Oak Room, Maucker Union
Mtg. # 1768

Present: Ann **Bradfield**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Todd **Evans**, Xavier **Escandell**, Lou **Fenech**, Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tim **Kidd**, William **Koch**, Ramona **McNeal**, Senate Chair Steve **O’Kane**, Joel **Pike**, Nicole **Skaar**, Jesse **Swan**, Senate Secretary Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter**, Leigh **Zeitz**.

Not Present: Aricia **Beckman**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Gary **Shontz**.

Guest: Susan **Hill**.

O’Kane: Good afternoon everybody. It’s right now 3:30 and it looks like we have a quorum so I’m going to call the meeting to order. We’ll start off by Press Identification. Do we have any press here today? I don’t think so. Next on the agenda is comment from Provost **Wohlpert**.

Wohlpert: Oh, that’s me. It’s a good thing there’s names on both sides. Thank you all for having me. I will make this short because I know you all have a long agenda. I’ll have a later time for a kind of Q & A with me, so I’ll keep this brief. I’ll be very provocative, but you won’t get to ask me any questions. [laughter] Not seriously. People have asked my impression in the three and a half months that I’ve been here, and the impression that I have of the University of Northern Iowa is that there are so many pockets of excellent work being done across this campus, and the thing that I see that

really is astonishing to me, I'm not surprised, is the engagement of students inside and outside of the classroom which I think is wonderful because this is part of what is being asked of us in the 21st century with all the pressures. But my concern is that some of that engagement is not necessarily intentional or developmental, so that we are thinking about making certain that students don't accidentally bump up against undergraduate research or service learning internships, but that it is part of their four-year journey; so that it builds from the first year to the second year to the third year to the fourth year. So the question that I have, that I'm going to be asking repeatedly is how can we collectively own a shared vision of that engagement so that we can come together to talk about what that means, what that would look like and then develop that as an actual model? And one of the ways that we will do that is in the open forums for the Academic Master Plan. Those will start tomorrow morning at 9:30. We have another one on Tuesday and then on the following Monday. Those dates are out there. The forums will all be the same but I encourage you all to come to those forums because that is the place that we will come together for that vision and mission; that direction for the University is. And then secondarily, but I don't think this is actually secondary, is one of the most important things that we need to figure out as an institution, is how we can get past crisis management—always being reaction, and having some control of our destiny. And the most obvious way in which it seems to me that we have been pretty much reactive is in our budget process, and response to what is going on in the State, and in turn inside of the University of Northern Iowa. So we've worked to create a new process and

it will take awhile to get that fully working. And then I would say a second place that we've been reactive is in institutional effectiveness. In terms of things like our Higher Learning Commission, accreditation and things like that. We've never done well, and I've looked at a couple of accreditations, and we've always had recommendations coming out of that. We've always had things that we needed to work on as external reviewers have come in and looked at us. And that's something that quite frankly, coming from Florida Gulf Coast University I'm not accustomed to. So we had our accreditation visit from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, right before I left FTCU, and the team left a day early. They said we were so squeaky clean that all they were going to be doing was writing commendations not recommendations. There's no question in my mind that what's happening right here at UNI deserves that kind of recognition. That's another place where I think we scramble at the last minute to throw together a report without having been thoughtful over the period of three or four or five years that we get ready for this. I am spending a lot of my time meeting with lots and lots of individuals, but I'm also going out and meeting with all the departments, all the colleges, the leadership teams and doing as much listening as I can to hear what kinds of things faculty and staff are talking about; what they want me to be thinking about and working on, so I would encourage that: Attend your department meeting and when I come, let's get into a conversation. I don't have anything else, unless there's anything in particular that you would like me to address.

O’Kane: Anybody? The Provost has agreed that at our next meeting we’ll have an extended time to have a Q & A. I see no further questions, so comments from Faculty Chair **Peters**?

Peters: Just very briefly, like Provost **Wohlpart** said, we have a lot of business today, I would just say that is going to be a pretty busy year because people keep giving us work to do: the Board, accreditors et cetera around the lines of what Provost **Wohlpart** said. He has asked me to co-chair with Kristin **Moser**, a group that will be looking at a research project that we are required to do by the Higher Learning Commission. This is kind of a new requirement in the re-accreditation process that universities are now...the Higher Learning Commission is expecting us to be...to carry out improvement projects during the time between accreditation visits, so we have to choose...our task is to choose the project so I might be calling some of you to help with that or asking you for names of people you could volunteer to help with that. Our task this year is simply to choose the project. That’s all I’ve got today. Welcome back. That’s it.

O’Kane: Welcome all of you. There’s lots of faces I don’t recognize. We’re sure happy that you’ve joined us. I wish you all a very successful academic year. You’ll notice if you look in the back of the room that Kathy **Sundstedt**, our transcriptionist is not able to be here today. She has jury duty. I’ve been ordered by Kathy rightly so, to do my best to say things like, “The Chair recognizes Senator X and to ask you guys to wait until you’re recognized because Kathy won’t know many of your voices yet, but she eventually will. Help me out with that. By the way help me out this semester. As you all

know, I kind of got plopped into the position, when Lauren **Nelson** moved into an interim department chair position. So I'm learning as we go, so bear with me. Some of you are far better parliamentarians, shall I say, than I am. So do keep me on the straight and narrow. That being said, we need to approve the minutes from our last meeting. So I'm looking for a meeting to that effect.

Walters: So moved.

O'Kane: So moved by Senator **Walter**, second by Senator **Kidd**. Is there any discussion? Seeing no questions or discussion items, all in favor of approving the last meeting's minutes say 'aye.' Those against say 'nay.' Anybody withholding? Abstaining-- there's the word. Okay. Seeing none, motion passes. We now have some calendar items that need to be considered for docketing. One of them as you notice is a pretty big deal. I'll say something about that when we get to it. The first item for docketing is Emeritus Requests for Fred **Halgedahl** from the School of Music, Carole Singleton **Henkin** from the Department of Social Work, Bruce **Plakke** from the Department of Communication Sciences & Disorders, Rick **Traw**, Curriculum and Instruction, and John **Wynstra** from the Rod Library. Could I have a motion to docket that in regular order?

Zeitz: So moved.

O'Kane: Moved by Senator **Zeitz**, seconded by Senator **Gould**. It will be docket #1175. Calendar item 1282 is a request to change the committee description for the Advisory Committee for the Center for Excellence in

Teaching and Learning. Hopefully you've all had a chance to look at that. I notice that neither of my word processors make an html link there, but strangely enough if you click on it anyway it takes you to the website. So expect to see that in the future. Can I have a motion to docket in regular order?

Terlip: So moved.

O'Kane: So moved by Senator **Terlip**. Second?

McNeal: Senator **McNeal**.

O'Kane: Seconded by Senator **McNeal**. Any discussion? Okay. Docketed in regular order as docket # 1176. Calendar item 1283. Oh! We didn't vote. You've got to keep me on track. All in favor of docketing, say 'aye.' Those against say 'nay.' Any abstentions? Motion passes. Calendar item 1283: You'll notice on that calendar item that it was requested, past tense, to be immediately placed at the head of the docket. These are new majors and new programs for here at UNI, and it was thought at the time that there was some need for hurry, but as it turns out, there [are] two reasons that there is no need for hurry. One of them is that the Regents... President **Ruud**, because I asked him to, spoke with the Regents about this—'Does this need to be rushed through?' They said absolutely not. It's very, very important to take your time. The second thing is there's currently a moratorium on new programs I think until the Academic Master Plan is adopted. Am I correct about that?

Wohlpart: Not the Academic Master Plan.

Cobb: TIER Initiatives.

O’Kane: It would have been tabled anyway, so what I’m looking for then is a motion to docket in regular order for our next Faculty Senate meeting. So moved by Senator **Hakes**. Seconded by Senator **Walter**. Comments? The Chair recognizes Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So, if this comes up, this is saying-- if I’m understanding this correctly-- that we would have certainly this major, one, the Criminal Justice major, but also in effect that we would be having this degree. We haven’t decided whether or not to have this degree. So in Senate last year, we agreed with administrators who working on the degree on a general working guideline to work on, but of course to bring the degree to the faculty and then to have the faculty have discussion about the degree at all levels: from department to college upward. My constituents tell me that they haven’t had the opportunity. I don’t remember having that opportunity. And then of course, once we have a degree, then we typically have majors attached to that degree. But this proposal is operating in effect—to pass it would be to passing through the back door the degree as well as the specific major that we’re looking at, so I’m not sure that’s the best way to do this.

O’Kane: What I can gather, I don’t know a whole lot about it...

Swan: Yeah.

O’Kane: But I know it’s been through UCC. It’s been through UCC.

Swan: Yeah.

O’Kane: My impression is that it’s coming before the Senate for approval, so I think that the Senate could in fact say, “We don’t want that degree.” I think that’s possible.

Peters: When these first started being discussed a little over a year ago, this was an issue. This was a new degree, and there’s actually no process on campus for creating a new degree per se. From what I can tell, I did some research on this and I could pull up, if you need the specific names, I could probably find it within a couple minutes, but there have been a handful of new degrees created over the last say twenty years. All of them up to this point have been program-specific. So, a new degree in technology for example, that really applies only to that program. And I think all but one of them have been new graduate degrees, either doctoral or master’s level degrees. And so that’s the reason. It’s exactly this kind of dilemma. How do you create a new umbrella undergraduate degree? That’s exactly the dilemma that led us at first last year to start off by coming to the Senate and saying, ‘Senate you should please pass broad guidelines that all degrees have to fit into.’ You’ll recall that that came to the Senate and did not work so well. Right?

Swan: I thought we were in the middle of that, but go ahead.

Peters: Right. So then the decision from that point, as I understood it, was that to just send it back to the programs and let the individual programs come up with specific requirements with the implicit understanding that—or maybe explicit understanding that—I don’t know, but the understanding

that by having multiple programs that come up, that would then tell us what the basic framework for the degree was.

Pike: My question: Are we primarily talking about the Bachelor of Applied Science or are we talking about all of these degrees?

O'Kane: We will be discussing all of those.

Pike: Okay, so we're talking about all of these, not just the new Bachelor of Applied Science.

O'Kane: My understanding, however is that the discussion could be split to tease out one or the other of those.

Pike: So that's my question: Is the discussion we're having about the Bachelor of Applied Science or is about all of them? It sounded to me like it was just about the Bachelor of Applied Science.

Swan: That is the question. I was expecting two proposals. There could have been six: One for a Bachelor of Applied Science degree that we would approve or reject, another one for a program in the Bachelor of Applied Science. So we do have several programs in a Bachelor of Applied Science, but we don't have a clear statement of the degree, and I think we should have a clear statement of the degree and that the whole University faculty should discuss that before...to inform our discussion as we approve it or otherwise treat it.

Kidd: Yes, and that does make sense to have a discussion. There also was discussed that without a specific program to look at, it was unclear what the form of the BAS would be. So at this point, is there only one BAS degree? I mean, coming through the curriculum through UCC? Two? Okay. I'll rephrase. There were four?

Dhanwada: Three; three that had come up to the UCC. Two were approved.

Kidd: Okay so...

Dhanwada: Criminal Justice, Tactical Emergency Services with Vulnerable Populations and Managing Businesses and Organizations.

Kidd: Okay. So IT has not gotten one through?

Dhanwada: They didn't put anything forward this cycle.

Kidd: So we have three degrees to look at so are they all...Oh two programs. That's a long name. I apologize. And so we're going to look at both of these at the same time though right? Is that correct?

O'Kane: The petition looks that way.

Dhanwada: The petition is for the BAS in Tactical Emergency Services, BAS in Criminal Justice, the two Master's degrees and the BA in Supply Chain Management: That should be the five new programs coming up for discussion.

Kidd: Okay. Thank you.

Peters: I don't know if this gets to Senator Swan's concerns or not, but I did at one point last spring I think, suggest to the then-chair of the UCC that new BAS programs ought to be accompanied by whatever language would appear in the catalog that describes a BAS. So if you look in the catalog there's language that says, 'Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Liberal Arts.' The language that would go in the catalog that describes what a BAS is. That would need to be written by faculty. We should not leave that up to the Registrar, right? Because there's going to have to be language there that describes that and so, I do think that should come to us from UCC.

Swan: That's another way of directly addressing what I'm saying. What we're looking at in all of these programs, most of them, I really don't know about the MATr [Master's of Athletic Training]-- is that a new degree as well as a new program?

Dhanwada: It is a new degree. It's a Master's of Athletic Training. It's more of an applied science.

Swan: It's the so that operates the way the previous new degrees we've been creating operates in that only that program can be attached to that degree. Is that correct?

Dhanwada: That's the only one coming up at this time, yes.

Swan: In the future, another program could be attached to that?

Dhanwada: It's an applied program, so I don't think so.

Swan: Chair **Peters**, do you understand my question?

Peters: I do.

Swan: Is it the only program that can apply to that degree?

Peters: I think so.

Swan: Then across the board, no one else can do it because it's professional and applied specific like the one you mentioned, and so that's not like a Bachelor of Arts degree. That's not like the Bachelor's of Applied Science degree that we're creating. Many programs can be attached to the new BAS and we don't have an articulation of what a BAS degree is. These two programs that have developed, Chair **Peters** mentioned, they should have articulated and perhaps they did, what they think a BAS degree is. Someone needs to coordinate that and propose it, it seems to me, and then the whole campus can say, 'Yes. That's a BAS degree,' and then we could pass that and be able to evaluate programs or relationship to it. For example, one of the requirements, I understand of the BAS is that it must be, all programs to the BAS degree must be entirely online. And so we would evaluate that. We'd be able to say, 'Here's a new program. It was a BAS, but it has 20 hours of facetime. We'd say, 'No, that doesn't go into a BAS,' for example. I think Secretary **Terlip** wants to say something.

O'Kane: Secretary **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yes. While I appreciate all the discussion, this is just really...we should just be talking about whether we want to docket it. It sounds like we're talking about splitting the motion, which should be done once it's docketed.

Swan: No. We could do that now and docket separate motions and we could send it back to the proposer to come to us to docket it in a better fashion, thereby saving time, weeks of time waiting in the docket, we could capitalize on our knowledge right now and advance this.

Pike: Actually, I was going to make the suggestion that we split: that we make the BAS one separate item and then the other item for the other proposed degrees.

O'Kane: I'm not sure how one proceeds with this: whether we want the petitioners themselves, whether or not we ask the petitioner to do that, or do we do that? I don't know the answer.

Terlip: Before we can do that, we have to vote on the motion on the floor.

O'Kane: To docket?

Swan: We're still in discussion.

Terlip: I know. We're just saying...

Swan: We should decide what we want to do while we're discussing, it seems to me.

Pike: Do we have a motion on the floor?

Swan: To docket this in regular order.

Peters: It could just be a motion to divide the question to docket the other two degrees in regular order and then you could vote on that, and then you're left with what's left over.

Swan: If that's what we want to do, then we have to vote down this motion and then make that motion.

Terlip: Unless someone amends it, correct?

O'Kane: Or it can be withdrawn.

Swan: Or it can be withdrawn.

Terlip: Can it be amended?

Swan: That's very sloppy. You can just withdraw it and substitute the better motion.

O'Kane: I've forgotten who made the motion. Oh, we didn't do it yet?

Swan: We didn't? Yes we did, because I started to discuss in discussion. I wouldn't have made the motion that was made, but it was made and the discussion...

Hakes: I withdraw the motion.

O’Kane: Is that okay with the second? [**Walter** nods.] Motion withdrawn.
May I ask for a new motion or motions?

Swan: Can we ask the proposer if the proposer might be able to come up with an additional proposal that describes just the BAS degree?

Zeitz: All we’re asking for is docketing. So what we could do is docket the two halves separately.

Swan: Well we surely could docket the things that we’re ready to pass—that part. But the two BAS programs, that’s what I’m talking about here. If we could get another proposal for a BAS degree that would be very good to have, but for these others, Senator **Zeitz** is mentioning, for the other programs, I think the Senate feels ready to docket them and thereby pass them.

Kidd: I want to be comfortable if we split the motion and ask that the BAS degree would be part of the discussion. Does that make sense at all?

O’Kane: Yes. Yes it does make sense. Can I have a motion?

Swan: Does the proposer allow us to just take the non-BAS degrees and docket those?

O’Kane: I will ask Interim Associate Provost **Dhanwada**, as she is the petitioner.

Dhanwada: I am the petitioner. That's right. Yes. I think that a discussion must be had, so I'm perfectly willing to bring up the other three programs and petition for those to be discussed, but I would also like the discussion of the BAS degrees as well to happen. So if you want me to re-petition?

Swan: No, we can do it here if you're agreeable.

Dhanwada: I'm agreeable, but I want to make sure that there's discussion of both parts.

Zeitz: I move that we docket the Master's of Athletic Training, Teacher Leader International Masters and the BA in Supply Chain Management, just those three in regular order.

Swan: Second.

O'Kane: Seconded by Senator **Swan**, any further discussion on that? Okay, seeing none, all in favor say 'aye.' Those opposed say 'nay.' Any abstentions? Motion passes. The curriculum proposals, except for the BAS are to be docketed in regular order. Do I have a motion concerning the BAS?

Kidd: I move that we include the BAS degrees for discussion.

O'Kane: Do I hear a second?

Swan: Can I ask for just a clarification? Okay, for discussion, I would second that, but that would mean that we would discuss and be done with that and then need to have another proposal later.

Kidd: We would consider the BAS programs up for consideration including the BAS degree itself.

O’Kane: Do I hear a second? Seconded by Senator **Zeitz**. Just for clarification for me, you’re suggesting that we docket the item, correct-- and that it is strictly for discussion? No? Please clarify.

Kidd: It’s for consideration for passage.

O’Kane: Okay. It’s for consideration. Both items docketed.

Kidd: Yes, and it just has to include a degree and the programs.

O’Kane: Okay. Further discussion? Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So for that to happen we need to have the degree before us, and right now we don’t. Right now we have two programs before us and... without a degree. So I don’t know how we can proceed, but maybe Chair **Peters** does.

Peters: A question for Senator **Swan**. Would what I described earlier satisfy your concern? That the language that is...that whatever would appear in the catalog about a BAS degree would that satisfy? If that was reviewed, if that came to the Senate from the UCC and the Faculty Senate approved it, is that tantamount to approval of a degree?

Swan: I’m not sure, but I think it could be, if it went through all of the consultations; if the whole faculty had a chance to deliberate upon it. So

certainly the College Senates should talk about what is actually now going to be a BAS degree on the campus, and then the senates might want the departments to weigh in on it, to have a full consultation about the actual BAS degree that many programs, or that programs in the future can attach to. That would not be language that goes into the catalog, right, so that's why I said 'yes', but we really can't do it, it seems to me, without that further consultation.

O'Kane: Chair **Peters**.

Peters: I would just as in my role as Faculty Chair, thinking about all the work that College Senates and LACC and UCC members have put in to this over the past year now, I do think that there's a risk that ...I feel like we're now doing exactly the opposite of what we did last fall, which is if I'm on a college senate, last fall this Senate set out to create standards and people at the college level and other University committees said, 'Hey, we're not even done talking about this, who are you to create the standards when we're not done talking about this yet?' and so we said 'Fine, go to it. Create your programs.' And now they have done that—exactly what we've asked them to do, which was to go create their programs and now we're saying, 'Wait a second, you're not sending up any standards to us,' and so now I think that would be...I think that would be extremely frustrating for a lot of folks who've worked on these degrees.

O'Kane: Interim Associate Provost **Dhanwada**, have the affected departments since discussed this?

Dhanwada: Oh yeah. It's since gone through from the department's consultations, if there's courses that are interdisciplinary, all of the departments, it's gone through the college senates, through the deans and it's reached the UCC and in some cases, we're talking about the BAS so actually there is a course, a graduate level course, so it did go through the GCC, one of the BAS degrees, and then it reached the UCC and there was lots of discussion.

O'Kane: Okay. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So with what Chair **Peters** said, I agree it would be terribly frustrating if we did it that way, so I'm not saying that the two programs that have programs, they're done. They've done what they're supposed to do. The other part that hasn't been done, and last year was being done by administrative officers, was to now say, 'Okay, here's the BAS degree.' Now we have two programs. They've come up. They were saying, 'We need to do this.' Now they've done it. Now we can look and stop saying, 'Here's a working structure,' and say, 'Here's the structure.' And then with that structure, the whole University is supposed to look at it. Last year the University looked at the working structure and they said, through the Faculty Senate, 'Fine. That's a working structure.' Several people said, 'Let's have programs. Work with it. They've done it.' Those are cogent programs, now we just need a definition of the structure that everyone looks at and says, 'This is the proposal.' And presumably that structure would work with these two programs, if the administrative officers or other people come up

with a structure that doesn't work, with one or both of the programs that have been approved, that's another problem, right? But we need that structure as a definite proposal, because then every program is always rewriting the degree. We never do that. The BA—you don't rewrite the BA every time you come up with a new program, you attach to a stable BA program. I want the stable BAS structure program presented to the faculty, through us for approval.

Pike: It seems to me, at least from the discussion, that it's really two questions that maybe need to be separated, and I think that's kind of where you're going. First, are we going to offer a Bachelor of Applied Sciences Degree? And if we are, as Chair **Peters** said, 'Let's have a description. Let's have some guidelines.' But I don't know that it needs much more than the guidelines that we have for a Bachelor of Arts or a Bachelor of Science. And then ...which is basically that description of what it entails in the catalog. I don't know that it needs to be much more structured than that. And once there's a decision that 'Yes, we're going to offer that degree, and this is kind of the requirements for it,' you simply start evaluating the second question, when you start evaluating program proposals, specific program proposals for that. It's difficult to evaluate the program proposals before having decided to offer the degree, and that's what sets it apart from the BA in Supply Chain Management. We already offer a BA, does that fit the parameters? So, it would seem, at least it doesn't seem to me, that it should be that complicated to just say, 'Yes, we're going to offer a Bachelor of Applied Sciences. Here's the description,

the guidelines,' and boom we're done, and then move on to 'Does each individual program proposal for offering that degree meet it?' just like we would address all of those other degrees that we're being asked to look at.

O'Kane: From my perspective, thinking out loud, it seems to me that the petition that's been submitted is quite detailed, and detailed enough to where we can look at it and say, 'That's what the BAS will look like, should we decide to do a BAS.' So I'm not sure that we can't address both of your questions at once.

Pike: It could be. I'm just thinking about what kind of order. The order is, first, you make a decision, 'Yeah, BAS,' and then you look at the nice detailed proposal. It's hard to make a decision, 'We're going to offer that specific program,' without having made the degree first.

O'Kane: Understood. I think that's what happened last year, that people said, 'Okay, we need to decide if we're going to have a BAS. What is a BAS? Show us the goods. What would a BAS look like?' It seems to me that the petition on the table addresses that question. That's what they're impression of what a BAS looks like.

Dhanwada: Can I just ask for clarification in terms of what you mean by 'structure' for the degree? With the BAS degrees, it's basically we're transferring in an AAS degree, right?

O’Kane: So that’s one factor of the structure that we don’t have in the BA structure.

Dhanwada: Right. So that’s within; that’s part of that degree. The other part of the degree is that there is basically up to 30 hours for your major, okay? So actually we’ve got two: One that has 21 hours of content. Then we have another one that actually has 30, so you do have a range in that program, if you will, of courses. Okay? And then you have the LAC component, which is 30 hours. And so that can be increased with electives if let’s say, the program. So is that what you mean by structure, or...?

Swan: Yes, and that you would outline that. See last year we passed a structure, a basic working structure like that and it was being worked out and that was how you got to the LAC component now. That’s not new. That part of the structure is new. That would go in the BAS structure that would be absolute--that every program would have to have.

Dhanwada: I think in the summary that I presented, and I could be more clear, that’s what I said, ‘Here’s the LAC requirement which is 30 hours, that we break that up because that’s 23 to 24 hours: You’ve six hours of a professional communication requirement and the elective hours are 0-19 because the LAC, you could actually bring in, we don’t transfer, we don’t transfer in other categories. The first category, we’re able to transfer in nine hours. So that’s all outlined, and that’s why you have that range. But all of the program going forward will have that, you know, in terms of content. It’s 21 up to 30 hours of content, that’s all you can have, and so

that's what we have put forth. Those are the two proposals. That's in the description saying that only AAS; students with AAS are eligible for this.

Swan: Can you pull that out and say, 'This is the BAS degree, the requirements of the degree,' and then both of the programs would repeat it and we could see that it matches and every other faculty who wants to have a BAS would know 'This is the degree,' but then we would pass that because there's some discussion about those factors that are not specific to the two programs.

Dhanwada: Right.

Swan: Once we have this settled, that the programs themselves are not material for discussion except for experts in the relevant faculties.

Dhanwada: So you said it wasn't in the process earlier.

Swan: That's right.

Dhanwada: I will say that I don't know the discussions that happened. When I became part of the process, these were the ones that were submitted. Basically those were the rules that if you want to put a BAS degree forward, you have to think about a major up to 30 hours here and offer those, including the LAC which would be a total of 60 hours. So those are in place. So if that's something, I can certainly provide that.

Swan: If you could, then we could deliberate upon that degree. For example, one thing that I don't see is anything about language

requirements. That's something that wasn't settled. That's something that could be settled by you proposing. And there's no language requirement fact of the proposal that could be deliberated by the faculty at large and we could pass or not pass.

O'Kane: Senator **Swan**, would it be okay if I asked the petitioner to add those materials?

Swan: A second proposal BAS degree here, that would be brilliant. That would be great.

Dhanwada: So, attach another?

O'Kane: It sounds to me like Senator **Swan** is asking for that additional.

Dhanwada: A catalog copy and attach it to the...

Swan: So we would be able to vote on the BAS degree, and vote on the programs?

Dhanwada: Okay.

O'Kane: I'm sorry. Senator **Pike**?

Pike: Having been part of the process at the College level, I do know the very first thing we did was decide, 'Do we want to offer a BAS degree?' and then we went on to develop a program. You might want to put that in there too. These are the guidelines that we were looking at that when we made a decision to go ahead and write a program, having made a decision we were going to offer this degree. Just to throw that out.

Swan: That's one college that's decided that. The other colleges may or may not have decided it, even if they put forward a program that was turned down. Reading the minutes, I see that the UCC turned down a proposed program.

Dhanwada: But they did follow all those guidelines...

Swan: I don't know that that college did decide at one time if they wanted a BAS. Maybe it did, maybe it didn't. The colleges that didn't propose a BAS probably haven't decided if they want a BAS in part because they're waiting for the proposal. Last year we passed a working structure so that we would eventually get the proposal, so if that's what you want to do, that's good.

O'Kane: I'm requesting that the petitioner adds that to her material and that material needs to be sent directly to me, because I don't think the petitioner can add things later.

Dhanwada: I'll send it to you.

O'Kane: Send it to me. Anyway, we still have a motion on the table to docket in regular order or not. Are we ready for a vote? Faculty Chair **Peters?**

Peters: I have a question that I'd want a very quick answer. The Board has put a moratorium on new programs?

O'Kane: Yes.

Peters: But they approved several new programs for the University of Iowa less than a week ago. Did those just slip in under the radar, or before the deadline?

Dhanwada: That was no. Well, I can tell you, UCC went through all of this-- Did not know about the moratorium on new programs. It's a moratorium on new programs as well as to offer current programs at new locations. Okay? However in August there was basically a plan put forward by another Regent university for offering programs at a different campus; their current programs at a different campus. Nothing was said that this could not occur. There's been other things being put forward on the ICCPHSE list serve, the Coordinating Council, that again have asked for programs to occur at new locations. So I don't know. This just came about. I found out about it on Friday. So I don't know.

O'Kane: Senator **Kidd**, then Senator **Swan**.

Kidd: Just a quick comment on that. The year that I went to the Board of Regents meeting, I saw that quite a bit. I would say, proposed programs, especially because a program had begun before the moratorium had been established... if the board says 'no,' that's fine. But I would not hold back because there's some kind of moratorium other universities don't have to follow. Just go for it. Ask forgiveness.

Wohlpart: We've been told to move forward with this. There's no rush with this. You don't have to pass it today, but we've been told to move forward with this. We do believe the moratorium will be lifted when the TIER stuff is done. Those reports are out, hopefully that's within the month.

Swan: That may in part answer it, but this is a technical question now about new programs, new majors. It used to be, but it may have been changed over the summer or last year even, that the first step in proposing a new major that would be a program, was administrative and board approval. Is that still the case? This would be any majors and these other majors too.

Dhanwada: Yes, well first approval from the institution to move forward. Then it does have to go to...because these are new degree programs, we have to go to the Higher Learning commission and then we have to go to the Iowa Coordinating Council. It was supposed to be coming up to the Board of Regents Council of Provosts at their October 21st meeting. That's provisionally what the plan was, and that's why we worked hard to get everything in place.

Swan: I'm not sure that's my question though. Maybe Laura (**Terlip**) might be able to help me though with the question I have, because I know you know the curriculum handbook well. At the very beginning of the process of a new program, there's a rule about approval. This is before you even have anything worked out you know. Is that what you're talking about?

Wohlpart: It needs to be put on the list for review, and these programs are on the list. They have been on the list for six months.

Dhanwada: More than six.

Swan: So they met that approval process? That was just a technical question.

Dhanwada: Yes.

Evans: I don't know if it's an approval process or are you referring to if you're going to create a major you have to announce it to everybody to see if there's an opposition? I think that's...perhaps what you're referring to, it's just a red flag if anyone has any complaints, oppositions...I think maybe that's what you're...

Swan: That may be.

Dhanwada: The Board Office.

Evans: It's not an approval process, it's just aWe don't have a complaint process, or issues with it, so go ahead and try.

O'Kane: It seems to me that we have a lot to do yet. Can we call the question and take a vote?

Terlip: I'll call the question.

O'Kane: Question called by Senator **Terlip**.

Pike: Define the question.

Kidd: I recommended that we examine both the degree and the programs for approval; consider the degree and the programs for approval.

O’Kane: So we will split the item in that regard. Second from Senator **Zeitz**, all in favor say ‘aye.’ Opposed ‘nay.’ Abstentions? Hearing none of those, and one nay, the motion passes. This will be docketed in regular order for our next meeting. Okay. We need to move on. We have lots and lots to do. As I said earlier, I got moved from Vice Chair to Chair, so we are lacking a Vice Chair and Senator **Gould** has told me she would be glad to do that. However, I could also ask for other nominations. [pause] Seeing, none, I suggest we elect Senator **Gould** by acclamation. All in favor say ‘aye.’
Congratulations.

Gould: Thanks.

O’Kane: Wow! We got one thing done. That’s great. We just completed New Business section 2a automatically because the Committee on Committees-- one of the persons on that committee is the Vice Chair. So if we might move on the Advisory Committee for the Center For Excellence in Teaching and Learning. We need one volunteer for that.

Zeitz: I am already on the Board for that since last year. I was counted as a member. I’d continue as long as it’s okay with Sue (**Hill**).

Hill: Fine.

O’Kane: Okay. Susan **Hill.** Wow. We’re making some progress.

Swan: (to **Zeitz**) Can I ask, are you on for your college and you’re doing double duty or were on for the Senate?

Zeitz: I was selected to do that before I was on the Senate. I was selected to do that and they said they needed somebody from the Senate, so it was ‘two birds with one stone.’

Swan: That’s fine. That’s good. Double duty.

O’Kane: All right. We need a representative for the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council. I don’t know much really about that position. Does anybody know?

Dolgener: I know. It’s basically hearing from the Athletic Department relative to issues and keeping track of the academic monitoring of the athletes. Its kind of a general “what’s happening” from the athletic programs.

O’Kane: Do you have a feel for how much time commitment?

Dolgener: It’s about two hours a month, something like that. Senator Koch.

Koch: I’m the non-voting adjunct representative and I’m on this committee too and we meet once a month, the first Thursday of the month for an hour and a half. It was like you said, the different courses come in and they tell us what they do with the athletes and get a sense as to their academic

performance. We can ask any question we want. We kind of have a say as to whether things are going well or if there's a problem. The Athletic Director is there every time to talk about what's going on, stuff like that. It's not labor intensive. You get a chance to...

O'Kane: Do I have a volunteer? Senator **Evans** [raises hand]. Thank you very much. Moving on the Liberal Arts Core Committee. We have a wealth of volunteers for this one. Jesse **Swan** has volunteered to serve and so has Wendy **Hoofnagle**, if I said that name right. I'm not sure what we do. I guess there's a...

Swan: The point of the Senate position on all of these committees is to be on the Senate and the committee to have the two-way communication. We never...someone whose not on the Senate—we'd like them to attend the Senate meetings to be able to tell us anything, but then of course we don't require it. At the same time, I am on the Senate, so I would be here. I think it's better to appoint a Senator. Other people of course can run for the regular seats within which we typically have some trouble getting people to run for those seats as it is. So is there not an open seat from CHAS? There was last year.

O'Kane: I don't know.

Swan: Apparently there must not be.

O’Kane: More discussion on that? Senator **Swan** is suggesting that the person on this committee should be from the Senate. I’m not aware if that’s required or not.

Swan: Can I ask Chair **Peters**—Isn’t that why we created these positions for Senate representation for the communication from the Senate to these various committees and back and forth?

Peters: I see the advantage of having a Senator representative to facilitate that.

O’Kane: I hear people saying that we should elect Senator **Swan** for this position. All in favor? Opposed? Abstaining? Okay. Thank you Jesse. We need a person for the University Writing Committee. I also don’t know how much work that involves. I’m guessing not a whole lot.

Koch: I’m not sure, as this is my first time here on the Senate. I’d be interested in that since I teach writing.

O’Kane: Very good. Okay. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: I think Dr. **Koch** is a fine representative. I know that the writing committee wants faculty from across campus if at all possible. Of course there’s a writing expert as the chair who has lots of access to writing experts and teachers so this is a University-wide committee and it does want teachers. It’s not a writing professors committee. It’s a University-

wide it does need and want professors from across the campus. I'm just sort of throwing that out. That would be the point.

O'Kane: Further discussion or nominations? Hearing none, I think by acclaim we could select Senator **Koch**. All in favor? Sounds like you've got it. Thank you very much. All right, the next committee is the Policy Review Committee, which is a new committee. We've received a letter from President **Ruud** asking us... it's a little unclear to me what's all required of us. I know for sure that we need one faculty member appointed by the Faculty Senate, so we definitely do want to do that today, but President **Ruud** also is asking for a joint appointment, someone apparently who will work with faculty. Is that the way that you're reading that, Jim? (**Wohlpart**)

Wohlpart: Yes, so that would not have to be a Senator.

O'Kane: Senator **Kidd**.

Kidd: I believe there's three faculty members for this committee?

O'Kane: There are three. One is appointed by the United Faculty. So apparently, I'll get a hold of Joe **Gorton** and we'll chat. But for now we do need one faculty representative appointed from the Senate.

Swan: By the Senate. I think that's what Jim is saying...

O'Kane: Appointed by the Faculty Senate. So, nominations or self-nominations? I get the impression this one's not a huge amount of work?

[laughter] My bad. I just drove away all the nominations. It's very important work.

Peters: Everyone should recall that this is something that's been fought for quite awhile, to have representatives on this body. This is a body that's sort of a crucial in the policy making process before stuff goes up for public comments, it goes to this committee. This committee also sees the process going through existing policies and updating them. It is an important committee.

O'Kane: Okay. There's no rush for this. If we don't have a...Senator **Kidd**?

Kidd: I'll volunteer.

O'Kane: Thank you Senator **Kidd**. All right we've got a position to fill: The Gallagher-Bluedorn Performing Arts Center Advisory Committee. Senator **Zeitz** has already volunteered. All in favor, 'aye,' opposed, 'nay.' Good. It passes. We need somebody on the Senate Speaker Series Committee.

Peters: It's usually two people.

O'Kane: We need to appoint two?

Peters: We give away money.

O'Kane: Have you two been on it? We have volunteers in Senator **Walter** and Senator **Zeitz**. All in favor? Opposed? Very good. Thanks guys. Big help. I'm going to ask Associate Provost **Cobb** to talk about the Revision of

the Emeritus Policy and Emeritus Privileges Committee that needs two people.

Cobb: Right. We are under a policy review. We were asked to look at this very strongly by some internal auditors. We need the faculty voice in looking at this. The policy itself is going to be fairly...a few changes, but the privileges—I think this will really affect all of you if you're going to stay here for a long time. So, we need two volunteers. I don't think it will take a lot of time. I'm expecting maybe two to three meetings of an hour each.

Fenech: Can I ask a question please?

O'Kane: Senator **Fenech**.

Fenech: Why is 2i not covered by 2f? Why do we need two policy review committees?

Cobb: Okay, so, let me explain that this is trying to get at the faculty voice earlier in the process, earlier in the process. It could go...it actually could be forwarded later but our new provost would like to get faculty voice earlier.

Wohlpart: This is a particular policy.

Cobb: Yes. A particular one. What happens is...

Wohlpart: Your colleagues who get emeritus status, so it affects you.

Fenech: I'll volunteer.

Cobb: Good.

O’Kane: Faculty Chair **Peters**.

Peters: Were you planning on me being on that already?

Cobb: It would be great. We talked about this earlier.

Pike: I didn’t want to volunteer. I just had a question. Could you talk a little bit about the internal audit concern?

Cobb: There were concerns that it really involved faculty who were emeriti who were being on grants and not really being in status with the University. But then once you get into something like that, then the whole thing is, there are all sorts of other things that come up, if that makes sense. The major concern was people who were emeritus not being connected with the University, but still working at the University on grants. We needed to make sure that part of the policy fit both the University needs and the faculty needs. But then other things came up.

Terlip: Aren’t there existing emeritus faculty on the committee?

Cobb: There will be.

Terlip: Okay. Thank you.

O’Kane: So the meetings would be two or three times per year?

Cobb: No. This is a one-time committee. I think three meetings will do this unless something unexpected comes up.

O’Kane: Scott. Thank you Faculty Chair **Peters** for volunteering. It has also come to my attention that the Intercollegiate Academic Fund Committee needs a Senate representative. I’ve been on that committee and it’s fun. We meet not very often and your whole job is giving money away to students.

Terlip: I’m currently on it and I’d been appointed in the past and I’d be happy to continue but if somebody else wants to take a shot that’s okay.

O’Kane: Anybody else? [silence] Thank you for volunteering Senator **Terlip**. All in favor? Aye? Nay? Wow. We got through all of that. Amazing. On to docketed items. The first item that is docketed for the day is a simple receipt of the Athletics Report. It requires no action on our part other than to receive the report. May I have a motion to that effect? So moved by Senator **Dolgener**, seconded by Senator **Walter**. Any discussion? I could add to that I just last week received yet a newer athletic report. The report that we’re voting on is a year old but the last academic year report just hit my desk. We can expect to see that as a calendar item next time. Okay, so no discussion. All in favor say ‘aye,’ opposed ‘nay.’ Abstentions? Motion passes. Thank you. The next Docket Item 1172 is again the receipt of the Senate Budget Committee Report. However, I’m requesting that we put that one off until next time, as the committee is not quite ready to submit it. So you’ll notice there’s nothing to link to. We don’t have the report yet. So if that’s okay, we’ll postpone until next time. Do we need a motion to postpone Jesse?

Swan: We aren't supposed to postpone things once they're in the docket.

Terlip: I would move to table this until the report is received.

O'Kane: Moved by Senator **Terlip**, seconded by Senator **Walter**. Further discussion?

Swan: I would say that this is why in the calendar stage it's good not to docket without all the information before us.

O'Kane: That's what happened this time. All in favor say 'aye,' opposed, 'nay.' Abstentions? Motion passes. Docket Item 1173 is also a receipt of Curriculum Sustainability Recommendations. I was given...again, this is just the receipt of a report. Yes, Senator **Zeitz**?

Zeitz: Could you please define 'curriculum sustainability?' Does this mean that we have to recycle things?

O'Kane: I don't know that I can define it. Apparently we talked about it, but I don't know what the note is from the last meeting of the Senate is.

Zeitz: I'm looking at the page that it links to. It talks about program health and department health. In other words, what we're talking about is programs or curriculum that will continue to run.

O'Kane: Apparently.

Peters: It was created when the Senate reviewed all its curriculum processes, and in reaction to the troubles of 2012. Ultimately, the Senate created this. There was a basic finding as we looked back on that stuff, that the Senate needs better ways to link budget-related and uh...for lack of a better phrase, program health-related issues in terms of numbers to curriculum decisions and existing bodies. The Academic Program Review Committee, the University Curriculum Committees didn't feel like they had time or ability to do that, so the Senate did create this other committee. And this was I think Lauren (**Nelson**), I think maybe chaired this committee last year. I don't know if Tim (**Kidd**) remembers.

Kidd: I'm chairing it.

Peters: You're chairing it now? Okay. So I think the idea was to get feedback from the Senate on what measures that committee would use.

Terlip: Is this list exclusive because it's all very quantitative, and I know there's been some concerns about that.

Kidd: This list is one the committee came up with near the end of last spring. The idea was that Kristin **Moser** would run metrics to see how easily this information could be accessed. To my knowledge, she has not completed that yet. So we're not ready yet to see even if these metrics are doable, if that makes sense. So this is an exhaustive list. The committee decided to come up with more measures than would be necessary, but of course we are not opposed to input on additional ideas.

Terlip: But, I guess my question is when would these metrics kick in? This would be judgment of a program's viability?

Kidd: Judgment?

Terlip: Or report of a program's sustainability.

Kidd: The idea to...again this is not a defined list of metrics yet. The idea to create a list from this list with possible additions but hopefully winnowing it down to give programs a 'heads up' if they are outliers in certain areas, and to let them know well in advance of any possible issues. It's also supposed to be a method that individual departments, programs, whatever could: One, the committee would be made aware if it looks like additional resources should be allocated to such a program and it could be a committee that a department could come to and say, 'Hey, you know, we need more stuff.' It's not supposed to be punitive. It's supposed to be informational.

Terlip: I wanted to make sure that was the case.

O'Kane: Further discussion?

Wohlpart: I would add I hope that the faculty will take this seriously and again be very proactive in understanding the nature and viability of programs and again be proactive with this, and think about how this information should be used. I don't think this is the end result of this. This the beginning of a process, and I also think of the way in which this information will be used needs very serious conversation and discussion

among faculty and between the faculty and the administration, and I would see that from my perspective as provost, if we find programs that might be outliers-- low enrollments numbers-- we need to work together as a community to figure out what that means and what we will do about that. Please be proactive with this. You don't want to get to a point where something has to be done and faculty haven't been involved. I think this is awesome.

O'Kane: Did we have a motion to receive the report? So moved by Senator **Walter**, second by Senator **Gould**, last discussion on this? All in favor say 'aye,' opposed, 'nay.' Abstentions? Motion passes. The last docketed item for the day is number 1174: Consideration of Changes to the Student Code of Conduct. Is there anybody here who could speak to the pertinent points involved?

Gould: I served on the University Student Conduct Committee. I knew they were changing the process to make it more of a board than having five people on it. At least that was what I was understanding before the summer. So I'm not entirely sure about everything that was included, but they were going to change the way they've been doing it from the past.

O'Kane: Renae (**Beard**, Student & NISG Vice President) Do you know about much about that, about the Consideration of Changes to the Student Code of Conduct?

Beard: No.

O'Kane: That was prior to your tenure?

Terlip: Do you recall if that's been brought before Student Government?

Beard: Not this year.

Kidd: Is this the one that Barbara **Cutter** and Cindy **Dunn** were working on? That was a different one? Okay.

O'Kane: I know that the students had quite a bit of input. If you go to the website, there's quite a lengthy reply to the policy. Senator **Gould**?

Gould: They basically eliminated the hearing panels and they've now created the conduct board, and so staff, faculty and students are no longer appointed to be a representative to that committee, but they want people to apply. They want a diverse pool of applicants at all levels to apply to be on the conduct board. So that was the big change: going from hearing panels to a conduct board and not making appointments anymore. Provost **Wohlpart** just mentioned to me that there needs to be training involved.

Gould: Yes. Yes. I know that there's a lot of... I don't remember what the number was, but there was a pretty significant number of hours involved in the training.

O'Kane: So this is actually coming from the students then, I take it?

Gould: Yes.

O'Kane: Faculty Chair **Peters**?

Peters: I can't find links. The links aren't working for me.

Zeit: If you highlight the url...

Peters: Now I've got it. Right. Now it came up. The students are asking us to resolve this. They did not want the hearing panels lifted. This is a petition that's coming from NISG where they are asking us that the hearing panels NOT be eliminated. This was controversial right at the end of the school year. I know I communicated with Renae's (**Beard's**) predecessor about it. But the long and the short of this is the Department of Justice, [Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights] their office for Civil Rights, last spring they put out this long five-page (give or take) kind of question and answer, it wasn't official policy but it was guidelines for how to comply with their take on Title IX requirements, and this is I think the University's effort to comply with that. That policy never says you can't have students serving in conduct hearings. It does say that-- the words they might use are, 'we recommend that students not do it because the training is so extensive.' But they don't say there's a requirement against it. And the training, we're talking something like 30-some hours of training I think, that are necessary and so right now the way it's created, that the policy has gone through the process...it basically leaves these decisions up to administrators or a relatively small number of faculty members who would be able to go through this I think 30-plus hours of training. And so I think if we were going to do something with this, I think we'd want to wait until the current NISG administration was up to speed on this issue that was a big deal last year and see what they still think about it.

Terlip: And this hasn't gone through the Committee on Policies--The Policy Committee? It hasn't been posted for public review yet.

Peters: I believe it went straight from the Title IX officer to...I think it was out for public review. I think it went straight from the Title IX officer to through the Policy Review Committee and out for public comment. I don't think it ever went to any of the faculty's policy review committees. I don't think it went to the EPC for comment.

O'Kane: On the website, with the petition is this attachment which is basically the students saying they don't agree with this policy.

Peters: It doesn't apply to academic offenses like plagiarism and dishonesty. It's for other forms of conduct.

O'Kane: So I'm wondering if we should table this as well and let NISG get a look at it. Senator **Swan**?

Swan: We've done what the petitioner requested: We've considered it, so we're done with it. It's on the docket. There's no more to do unless NISG wishes us to do more with this, that would be a new proposal we would consider calendaring.

Peters: Actually, what they're asking is to do is schedule a consult with the Student Conduct Committee.

Swan: [rereads petition] You're right.

O’Kane: Vice-president **Beard**?

Beard: I’ve just forwarded you what I got from Allyson Rafanello just three days ago about the student conduct code, about wanting students to apply for it. So you’ll have that email now. They’re wanting students to be advisors, and it looks like there’s only going to be one student on it now.

Swan: I don’t see why...maybe Chair **Peters** can explain, maybe not, why we would want to consult about this at this time? I don’t think that we do, and I don’t think this is appropriate to our Ed Policies Commission because it’s not academic in nature. Although that Commission could consider other things, but it considers a lot already, so I’m not sure I feel good about sending them this.

O’Kane: Faculty Chair **Peters** reply?

Peters: I don’t have any reply.

Swan: So NISG is still operating on it; still working on it?

O’Kane: Senator **Terlip**?

Terlip: I guess I would be in favor of hearing from the students this year before we approve. I think when we say we’ve considered it, often it’s taken as a vote of support, and I don’t know that’s what we want to do at this point.

Swan: The Student Conduct Committee isn’t the students is it?

O’Kane: I don’t know Jesse.

Beard: A student would sit on it though.

Swan: That’s not the...the committee itself is not the students. I agree with Senator **Terlip**. We want to hear from the students, the NISG but that’s not what this is asking us to do.

Terlip: I thought it did ask for us to consult with the students.

Swan: Is that a student committee—the Student Conduct Committee?

Beard: No. A student sits on it though.

Swan: That’s right. No, I agree that we should consult with the students, but not necessarily the Student Conduct Committee at this point in time.

O’Kane: May I entertain a motion to that effect?

Swan: We’re just done with it.

Beard: I will bring it up at the Senate meeting this week. We have a Senate meeting at 8:00 this Wednesday. Just, and this is probably just me speaking out of turn, but I don’t think they we’re happy with it just being one student, but I will bring it up in the Senate.

Zeitz: On the website, it says the Student Conduct Committee is appointed by the President and is composed of six students nominated by the student government to serve two for years, four faculty members, four years and four staff members.”

Beard: That’s dated.

Terlip: That's what they're changing.

O'Kane: That's what they're changing from.

Kidd: So that is not current.

Cobb: You would need to look at the new policy, which is 3.02, and you'd actually have to scroll way down to find out, and it's one student, an administrator and a faculty member.

Wohlpart: It's three members, and one of the concerns was if a faculty member was not around, it could be two administrators, and the reason for that is something happens over the summer when faculty aren't around and you'd have to put a committee together and they'd have to be trained.

O'Kane: It's unclear to me whether we need to give approval of this or simply just consider it.

Kidd: Aren't they asking for us to schedule a consultation?

O'Kane: If what I heard from Senator **Swan** is...

Swan: Consider it and then schedule a consultation. This is what Chair **Peters** added with either the Student Conduct Committee or send it to our Education Policies Commission. And so we have considered it. That part's done. Now, do we want to schedule a consultation with a Student Conduct Committee? I'm in my speaking mode now saying, 'no' and I don't want to send this to our Ed Policies Commission right now as it is.

Kidd: I would also, because it's different now; the composition of this is very different, I would agree. But I would also ask the student government to give us more information about the particular objections.

Swan: And we can consider those and agree with you.

Beard: I don't know any more than what that resolution says because it's before my administration so we'll definitely reconsider it this year.

O'Kane: So I'm looking for a motion but we don't need one according to Senator **Swan**. Okay. If the student body would like to speak with us about it, that would be wonderful. Let me know.

Beard: Okay.

O'Kane: We'll see if we get you on the agenda. Is there any further business for the good of the order? Wow. We finished eight minutes early. It's like a miracle. Do I have a motion to adjourn? So moved by Senator **Gould**. Seconded by Senator **Pike**. All in favor? Thank you everybody.

Submitted by,

Kathy Sundstedt
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting: 3:30 p.m. Monday, Sept. 28, 2015
Oak Room, Maucker Union

Follows are 0 Addendum to the minutes.