

10-13-2014

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 13, 2014

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2014 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

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



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 13, 2014" (2014). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 22.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/22

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 Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

Regular Meeting
UNI Faculty Senate
October 13th, 2014 (3:29 p.m.- 4:54 p.m.)
Mtg. # 1757

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of Main Points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Kidd** called the meeting to order at 3:29 p.m.

No members of the Press were present.

Interim Provost **Licari** updated the Senate on President **Ruud**'s post surgical progress and the Academic Master Plan. Though the TIER Efficiency Study has been delayed by the need to hire a new subcontractor, he and President Ruud want the Academic Master Plan to progress, and invite Faculty feedback. The administrative team would like to see a draft of the Academic Master Plan by Fall 2015.

Faculty Chair **Peters** recently sent and posted the Faculty Roster on Faculty Senate website (<http://www.uni.edu/senate/content/faculty-roster-fall-2014>). He invites corrections to the roster and explained that it is used to determine each College's representation for Faculty Senate elections next Spring. Chair **Peters** also asked Faculty to help spread the word about Fall training and paperwork required now for any Faculty who advise student organizations. This new requirement under the Clery Act comes from the U.S. Department of Education and affects all universities.

Chair **Kidd** said that Policy #2.04, regarding faculty and financial decisions input, passed at the Sept. 22 meeting, was met with positive remarks at the Cabinet meeting, and that while some time line details need to be worked out, the policy is on it's way to President **Ruud**. **Kidd** said there were some concerns about the Mission Statement as written, but hoped faculty would have more input about this in the future. Interim Provost **Licari** added that

the Mission Statement could be changed, but would require a change in the Iowa Code.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for Approval

The Minutes/Transcript of the September 22, 2014 meeting were approved as distributed **(Nelson/Walter)**.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

****1249 BAS degree program structure**

Swan/Gould All Aye at Head of the Order 10/13/2014

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/bas-degree-program-structure>

****1259 Requiring V.I.D.S. Training for Faculty Members**

Strauss/Terlip All Aye in regular order

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/requiring-vids-training-faculty-members>

****1260 Policy change: Honorary Degrees**

Nelson/Cooley All aye in regular order

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/policy-change-honorary-degrees>

****1261 Actions to be undertaken on Receipt of Reports and Consultative Sessions** **O’Kane/Dunn** All aye in regular order

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/actions-be-undertaken-receipt-reports-and-consultative-ses>

Breitbach/Nelson All aye in regular order

****1262 Evaluation of expenditures from the General Education Fund**

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/evaluation-expenditures-general-education-fund>

****1263 Revisions to Curriculum Handbook**

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/revisions-curriculum->

Dolgener/McNeal All aye Docketed for head of the order 10/27/14

4. New Business

None

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1249 1154 BAS degree program structure (moved to head of order)

(Swan/Gould)

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/bas-degree-program-structure>

1248 1144 University Writing Committee Report and Recommendations

(Nelson/Gould)

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/university-writing-committee-report-and-recommendations>

6. Adjournment:

Next Meeting:

October 27, 2014 Oak Room Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 46 pages with 0 Addenda.

Call to Order: 3:29

Present: Karen Breitbach, Jennifer Cooley, Forrest Dolgener, Cyndi Dunn, Kevin Finn, Gretchen Gould, David Hakes, Melissa Heston, Senate Chair Tim Kidd, Ramona McNeal, Senate Vice Chair Lauren Nelson, Steve O’Kane, Faculty Chair Scott Peters, Marilyn Shaw, Gerald Smith, Mitchell Strauss, Jesse Swan, Senate Secretary Laura Terlip, Michael Walter, NISG Rep. Paul Anderson.

Guests: David Grant, Dale Cyphert, Adrienne Lamberti, Jared Heitz (Writing Committee)

Not Present: Barbara Cutter, Jeff Funderburk, Gary Shontz, Leigh Zeitz

Courtesy Announcements:

Kidd: I’d like to call this meeting to order. Do we have any press in the room? No? That makes life easy. Do we have comments from Interim Provost Licari, the man who works at UNI.

1. Call for Press Identification: No one

2. Comments from Interim Provost Licari

I just work here in a very contingent way. (refers to his role as Acting President) I need to get over to the Theatre Department and get those acting classes I need to take. I have a few things that I can share. One is President **Ruud** continues to improve and feel better. He is becoming a little bit more involved in the day-to-day stuff. He for example, he listened in by phone to the Executive Management Team meeting this morning. So, he’s starting to obviously feel better. He’s emailing me a lot, so he’s on the

mend and doing a lot better. I think he'll probably start to come back to the office for maybe ten to fifteen hours a week, probably starting next week.

I gave a quick update about the Academic Master Plan last week to Cabinet and there was some concern I know that I got. I've been getting some questions regarding the timing of the development of the Academic Master Plan and whether or not it was going to be synchronized in any way or follow from any recommendations from the Academic component of the Efficiency Study. My thought, my comments that I made in the Cabinet meeting last Monday was that I didn't want our Academic Master Plan to be held hostage to the TIER Study process. This is **our** plan, and I want it to be ours. Frankly, if one is going to drive the other, I think it should be our thoughts about what we need for an Academic Master Plan should drive our thoughts as to what's sensible coming out of the Efficiency Study for Academics, rather than the other way around. The other way around is the tail wagging the dog. I'd rather have the dog wag the tail. So that's my thinking. There was a small group of six faculty—three faculty and three administrators that I put together who worked together to draft a process. No substance, just process for developing the substantive plan—that put together a time frame that has the plan developed at some point next year. The initial draft said by the end of Spring 2016. That's a little slow I think, in terms of getting at least something down. President Ruud would like something, and I would too, by the end of Fall of '15, so a little bit more than a year from now. The TIER Academic component is still up in the air. As you well know, KH was let go. That was the subcontractor that was going

to work on the Academic component of the Efficiency Review. The Board, with DeLoitte is in the process still of identifying a new subcontractor. That process, obviously, is not going very quickly. It's already the middle of October so if you just do the math, we really won't get into this until the Spring semester. That's the other reason why I didn't want to wait on the Academic Master Plan because we're only just going to be getting going on the TIER stuff for Academics in the Spring semester. We need to be, we **can** be working on our Academic Master Plan at a much faster pace than the TIER process is going to go. The other thing about the TIER process that I can mention is of course we had the Town Hall earlier this week...last week...a week ago. That generated some good feedback at the session itself, and there's mechanisms for feedback to come in from campus. So, if you've got thoughts about those business plans, make sure that you reach out to me or to Kelly **Flege**, who's our point person for all of these Administrative Master Plans. Because the Board will meet and review these...there's a special Board meeting early in November to keep pressing forward on this Efficiency stuff, so they need to hear from us. So, if you've got some strong concerns about those particular cases, or how they arrived at those kinds of conclusions, all of that kind of stuff, don't be shy about submitting feedback. That's what I have.

Kidd: Thank you.

3. Comments from Faculty Chair Peters: I sent around the Faculty Roster last week and have gotten a number of emails identifying errors from some of you but from people all across campus. Please look it over, please take a chance to look it over. There were a number of errors, particularly in the

School of Music, and also in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, and then there's just been a couple of random errors here and there. We're get those sorted out and as soon as we can, we'll get it finalized and it will be reposted onto the website once it's finalized. (Faculty Senate Website)

Keep in mind that the purpose of this is that it determines the representation of each College and the elections that will be held in the Spring for the Senate next year. You should have seen the announcement on the Forum the Regent's Performance-Based Funding Proposal. That will take place next Tuesday, the 21st in CBB 109. It's at 3:30. Tim (**Kidd**) and Lauren (**Nelson**) and I are going to do presentations on the current budget situation, the Regent's proposal and then a quick overview of the research on performance-based budget generally. If you have particular things you would like us to cover or questions you would like us to address, let us know. I'm trying to arrange to have it videoed, and have that for people who can't make it. We'll try to have some handouts and try make it available on the Senate's website. We'll try to get the word out there, even to people who can't make it to the presentation. One thing I have that I wanted to spread word about a little bit, that doesn't directly fall under my duties as Faculty Chair, but I advise a student organization on campus, as probably many of you do. And, if you do, you got an email that I think came from the Student Activity Office about a week, two weeks ago now maybe, saying that you are now considered--all of us who advise a student organization, are now considered, the term is, "Campus Security Authorities" under the Clery Act. I followed up on that because it seemed....well...(laughter)I followed up on that and I discovered

Chief **...Herr** responded and she contacted the Department of Education directly and this is in fact coming directly from the U.S. Department of Education: that advisors to student organizations are considered Campus Security Authorities. That means that all of us who advise student organizations, that we have to fill out a form, but we also have to go to specialized training each year, it's an hour-long training each year. This year it's right around Election Day, as I recall, so early November. So, if you could kind of help spread the word about that. As you know, this issue has been a hot political issue. The Department of Education is really increasing pressure on universities all across the country and this is unfortunately, well, I don't mean unfortunately in that the training is bad, that this is the way that it is filtering down to us. The last thing just real quick, I have to leave this meeting early, so if I get up a walk out when you're speaking, it's probably not because of anything you said.

Licari: Probably. (laughter)

4. Comments from Senate Chair Kidd: I don't think I have too many comments myself. I was at the Cabinet meeting also, so Mike covered most everything. I guess the two things were that the policy we passed involving faculty and financial decisions seemed to be met with positive remarks from most of the Cabinet, and there's some language they want to work on regarding timing of when faculty are informed of things. That, I think it would be good to go over. Generally, it seems that will be going up to the President pretty soon. And then, there's that Mission Statement—The UNI

Mission Statement, Policy 1.02, that got approved. Some people have concerns. Hopefully, the next time that rolls around we'll have more input into how that's written.

Licari: Can I jump in there, Tim? That actually follows from the Iowa Code. I think it was you, Scott (**Peters**) at the Cabinet meeting who raised some concerns about it. It is differently written than the ones for Iowa and Iowa State and so if there's an interest in changing that, we would have to change Iowa Code. That fine. That may be even easier than changing our own policies (laughter). Honestly, if there is an interest in having that changed, there's a set process for that. It does have to go through **Chuck Adelman** and off to the Board and to the Board to the folks in Des Moines. So, I just lay that out on the table. If there's a dissatisfaction with that language, to have the Code changed isn't really that big of a deal.

Kidd: Great. That's all I've got.

Swan : I think the dissatisfaction was that the Code had been changed without faculty consideration. Some faculty thought we could just change it back because as Acting President **Licari** says, there is a set process and the legislators pay attention to that process generally, so we might want to think about how we want our Mission expressed in that section of Iowa Code.

Kidd: Sure.

Breitbach: Several times over the past twenty years, I've received a form for a particular week from the Board of Regents asking me to log my hours. And the reason I'm asking if they're still doing that is because a comment

was made and it was reported again in the news, that the Board of Regents doesn't collect any data on faculty—the word wasn't "productivity," it was "how they use their time." And I thought, "Wait a minute, because I just did one several years ago." You remember that? You log everything.

Licari: We don't collect that information every single year. It's an every other year Board Report.

Breitbach: The Board then does have information about how we use our time.

Licari: Oh, yes. Because the last time we did it...

Breitbach: The Board didn't communicate that to the...

Licari: I'll refrain from commenting about the quality of the news media.
(laughter)

Breitbach: I just mean that at the meeting, there seemed to be this perception that Board of Regents doesn't collect data on how we use our time, and I thought, "Yes they do."

Licari: They do.

Breitbach: Yes they do.

Peters: I heard that same report, and I think it was more...I think a lot of the news reports about the TIER by the news reports have have been mixing up Faculty and Staff. It may be the case that the Board does not collect as detailed data about how staff people use their time.

Licari: I don't think they collect any.

Peters: ... They do with Faculty members. I took that to be talking about Staf.. In the context they were talking about what share of a Department secretary's job is spent doing, say, Human Resources tasks that could be

more efficiently done elsewhere, and I think the answer is that “We don’t know how much time really, is spent.” But, it’s entirely possible that the news report referred to “Faculty AND Staff” because I’ve seen that in several places where the news report did not distinguish between them.

Cobb: Yes, because they don’t know. We will be doing that again. We just haven’t--the three Associate Provosts who deal that, in this position. We had a conversation about it Monday, but essentially, it going to be the same kind of thing.

Brietbach: That’s done at the request of the Board?

Licari: Yes. Correct.

Cobb: Yes, and there’s a report presented by ? Mike did it last year and it will get it going again next Fall after we gather the data.

Kidd: Let’s move on to the minutes, because that’s exciting. The minutes have been passed out. If you’ve had any comments to put in to Kathy, that’s wonderful. Could I have a motion to approve them minutes from September 22?

Nelson/Walter **No discussion** **All aye**

Kidd: Motion passes. Minutes from September 22 are approved. Cool.

CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

1249: This is a report from the UCC considering the general form of the BAS degree program structure. I believe we are asked to adopt this general structure to begin working on things. A motion to...

Swan: I move to place this at the head of the docket for today’s meeting the acceptance of the UCC proposal for the BAS degree, and further to

further to send a proposal to the LAC (Liberal Arts Curriculum) for it to review and to form a recommendation as to the viability of the BAS degree in relationship to the LAC.

Kidd: Alright. That sounds very reasonable to me. Do we have a second for that motion?

Swan/Gould

Kidd: We'll look at that at the head of the order.

Swan: If we pass that. First we passed to make it at the head of the order, and then we go on.

Kidd: So let's vote to see that we have it at the head of the order

All aye.

Kidd: The second item is 1259, the NISG resolution asking for faculty members to undergo VIDS Training. This is a basically Violent Intruder...

Nelson: Violence, Incident, Defense Strategies

Kidd: This is something that Student Government has asked us to consider. Could I have a motion to consider this in regular order?

Strauss/Terlip All aye Docketed in regular order

Kidd: Okay, so we'll look at this in regular order. We have a Policy change, 1260, Honorary Degrees to, I believe, increase the number of Honorary Degrees that we award each semesterr or is it year? Could I have a motion for us to consider that in regular order?

1260: Honorary Degrees

Nelson/Cooley No discussion All aye in regular order

Kidd: These are a couple of, well, one's from me and one's from the Senate Budget Committee. **Calendar Item 1261.** When I've looked at the Senate Website, I've noticed that a lot of reports that we receive are not actually posted on the Senate Website, and so I was thinking that in general, we should be more communicative with faculty and post things on the website, at the very least. Also, I thought it would be good to send a link to reports; maybe a short summary along with the Senate Minutes when we receive these for Consultative Sessions. Anyway, it's my proposal, so any discussion, Vice Chair **Nelson** should take care of. Could I have a motion to consider this in regular order?

1261 O'Kane/Dunn No discussion All aye docketed in regular order

Kidd: The next one, **Calendar Item 1262:** This is something I have talked (about) with the Senate Budget Committee. And what they have discussed is that looking at the Efficiency Study, it's focusing on academic programs to a large extent, and a lot of faculty feel that some items have **not** been looked at in a comprehensive manner, and so that a committee should be formed to do so--not just faculty, but faculty, students and administration. Any discussion? Could I have a motion to examine this in regular order?

Breitbach/Nelson All aye

Kidd: And, then we have **Calendar Item 1263,** Revisions to Curriculum Handbook. This is something that Scott's (**Peters**) been heading for quite awhile and I think we want to respond to this in a timely fashion. I think it would be good if we could get this on the Head of Docket for our next

meeting. Could I have a motion to consider this item for at the Head of the Docket at the next meeting?

Dolgener/McNeal **All aye** **Head of docket next meeting**

Kidd: Okay, so we'll look at that Head of the order next meeting. Any new business?

NO NEW BUSINESS

Kidd: So our consultation with President **Ruud** will be delayed as he's recovering. So we'll reschedule that at some point, hopefully. I guess we should take a look at this BAS proposal with the motion on the floor to have this examined by the LAC Committee. (pulls up that document) So the idea is that there is a general structure. April, did you want to say anything?

Chatham-Carpenter: Sure. When you look at the structures of the AA degree, I mean the BA and the BS degrees, and other degrees that we have, they are typically stated in a kind of form. And the UCC --there were actually several people from the Faculty Senate, at the meeting where we discussed this. We decided to put the form of the BAS degree in a similar kind of form as the other degrees are, which is a certain amount given toward LAC, a certain amount given towards the major, and a certain amount given toward electives. Since that meeting, I have done some research on the AAS degree in particular, related to what they typically come in with, with LAC requirements, and all the Community Colleges that I looked at have a foundation or a core set of courses, regardless of what their AAS degree is, the students have. They're different from Community

College to Community College, but there are anywhere from twelve to eighteen hours of courses that they all have in common, or course competencies that they have in common. So typically, it's Communication, it's SBS kinds of courses: Humanities, Math, Science and Communication, which would be both writing and oral communication. So, it's interesting, when I looked at that, how similar they were already to some of things that our students are being required to take as part of their LAC's. So I don't think they're as far as you might normally think of, with a person that's not a track that's going necessarily towards college. We determined that the AA degree would not be able to be used to transfer in for the BAS degree, because this is really supposed to be getting at a population of students that have been in the workplace for awhile, focusing in on specific kinds of careers, and they're wanting to improve their move, and have some ability to move up in their careers. We've said there should be a 120-hour minimum. The recommended hour breakdown we left, kind of, really, there's some flexibility here, depending on what the school requires that they're coming in from, as well as what their program is. We can see that students might need to take up to 30 hours in the LAC. That's why you have that as an upper end. But, you have some degrees that are coming in with lots of math and science already completed along with that core foundation of courses that's required for the AAS degree. So, some of them may not require as much in that LAC, but we assumed that most of them would need at least 21 additional hours to come in with the LAC that they would be taking here. Then the content area would be anywhere from 21-30 hours depending on what, again, on what kinds of things they would be

transferring in. I know that there's been an analysis done by Continuing Education, for example, of all the Criminal Justice kinds of programs that would be transferred in from different schools, and many of them already, because Criminal Justice is one of the areas in Sociology that's interested in doing a BAS degree. Police officers that are in the field that are wanting to move into a Chief position, for example, but they can't because they don't have a Bachelor's degree. So, they did an analysis, and many of the courses that would normally be required in their major have already been taken. But they also have a really good sense, especially in that area of Social and Behavioral Sciences of courses that go above and beyond what is required in our LAC, along with just the core set of communication, humanities, math, science, kinds of classes. So, the 21-30 hours would be content and 0-18 hours of electives. Some students might come in having zero hours of electives, if they need to make up LAC classes. Some of them however, might have a lot, or a lot of their major classes already met and so they would have 18 hours of electives or something in there where they... We did not decide on some things. We had some interesting, good discussions, I think, about foreign language requirement. And so some of these option we talked about are listed under "Still To Be Decided." We also talked about whether work history should be required for admission. We didn't come to a conclusion on that. And then, G.P.A requirements, and although we didn't vote on this, the thought was primarily that we already we have a 60-hour transfer in and a 2.0. Now if we want to raise that for these students, we could, but that is already what's there, so if we didn't want to do anything with that GPA requirement as a requirement for

admission, we would still have that as an underlying requirement. The rest of the document basically tells some kinds of next steps, who participated in the discussion, and then overall impact of having the BAS degree at UNI. I did send out to the Senate, to see if there was any feedback, and I got one person that provided some feedback, but I didn't have any other feedback that was given to me from the Senate. So.

Kidd: Thank you. Any questions or discussion?

Terlip: I was at the meeting, and I think that the proposal needs to move forward. I've waited until now, Jesse (**Swan**) to talk about your motion, which seems to suggest that the LACC should make decisions first, which I think might set things back. At the meeting, everyone agreed that the LACC could be working while Departments got started too. I guess I'm asking for clarification of your motion. Was it supposed to be linear, or did you mean they just all go together?

Swan: It seems to me, the way Interim Associate Provost, has presented it is that some departments who have ideas COULD go forward, knowing that the LACC is looking at this to see if it viable to do. If it's likely to be worked out as viable, Associate Interim Provost indicates that she believes the LACC will find a way to make it viable, but there are issues to be worked out in the LACC, and then ultimately if they can't be worked out, then it's not viable. But, if those can be worked out, then it would go forward, and those departments could... We should just move forward with that understanding. It's not settled until the LAC figures out how the LAC is going to operate for this new degree.

Terlip: Right, and any of those programs go through the regular curricular cycle, so I'm assuming if the LACC, you know, wanted to put the brakes on it, they actually could do it earlier. Do you see what I mean? So that everyone can be working at once.

Nelson: I have a concern that we're saying that the LACC can decide. I think that they need to consider it and provide input, but ultimately the Faculty Senate would have the final say.

Swan: Yes. If they decide. If they say they can't figure out how to work out a LAC for this program, and we wanted to then work and LAC program, we could, but typically we would have the LACC work out the LAC issues and we accept, of course accept, what our expert colleagues on the LACC indicate. For instance, the 21-30 hours, (otherwise if we don't get specifics it gets out of hand) they're going to have to figure out what that will be; what competencies would work, and this is a different procedure from any other procedure that we have. So, they do have to that before it can go forward. If a program comes up with a BAS degree, it can come up with the LAC component to it. That can't ever happen. So it will necessarily be held up until the LAC component is fixed. Now we think, and I think, that's why I proposed the motion that I did, that the LACC will work this out at the same time programs are building—departments are building their BAS programs. But they have to understand that the LAC does have to work it out or we would have to work it out.

Peters: I have more of a question that I guess would be directed to April (**Chatham-Carpenter**). Each individual program might have different LAC requirements, is that correct?

Chatham-Carpenter: I would not say they would have different LAC requirements. They would have the same LAC but what fulfills the LAC for each program may be different. There would still be different competency areas. I don't anticipate us having different competencies. When I say "Category Areas," I anticipate that Category Areas will be the same, but what a Criminal Justice person might need to count in their Social & Behavioral Sciences may be different than what a Tech Management person might be counting in the Social & Behavioral Sciences. Just as an example, they might take different courses within that

Licari: Which is how we do now.

Chatham-Carpenter: Which is how we do now. Education students take different courses within the LAC. Biology students take different courses within LAC, but they all meet the categories.

Peters: A quick follow-up: Would that imply that then some of this would be handled by which courses transferred from the AAS degree?

Chatham-Carpenter: Yes. There will be articulation. In fact at the next Board meeting, there will be discussion where Community College Presidents are there and Provosts are there as well, in which there's going to be a discussion about how do we come up with our articulation agreements from your schools for the AAS degree to something like the BAS degree here.

Peters: So, if I had an AAS degree in Criminal Justice and took the Social Sciences and also, I don't know, a Composition course or something like that, those would be transferred in, and it would be the other competency areas of the LAC I would have to fulfill in order to get to BAS here.

Chatham-Carpenter: Correct.

Peters: Thank you.

Heston: Thank you. Was there any discussion about whether having a 21 to 30 hour LAC for these BAS students had any implication for the standard LAC program that's 45 hours? Are they bringing in 15 hours and then they're tacking on up to 21 of whatever so that they have the equivalent of 45 hours or are we creating a significantly shorter LAC potentially for these students than we require of any of our other students?

Chatham-Carpenter: It shouldn't be shorter. Based on the research that I've done on the AAS degrees, the AAS degrees actually are even more stringent. They have more hours than our core. But, the AAS degrees range anywhere from 12 to 18 hours of core foundational courses that are required in the Community Colleges for that degree. You take that to 12 (at the lower limit) 12 plus 30 that we require, it's 21 to 30 hours (if they're at the upper limit of that), that's 42. Plus, we're assuming there will be at least one additional class in their major core for the AAS. In the ones that I looked at there were probably two or three major classes, plus those foundational courses that could count as LAC classes.

Heston: So there's an assumption that they will have 45 hours plus, counting from the degree, which technically can reduce your LAC or your major, depending on how you look at it.

Chatham-Carpenter: (Yes.) This is not...In some of the reading I've done, this is not an upside down degree, where they're getting their major first and the LAC here because of the way Community Colleges in the state do

their foundational courses for all of their AAS degrees. It's not like they're taking **all** their LAC here, and none of their major courses here. It doesn't work out that way.

Cooley: I have a question that may be slightly off the topic, but I consider it a practical question. When we build this, we must account for the fact that not all students who would enroll in this degree would have attended an Iowa Community College. So articulations are great, but we're going to have to structure it in such a way that you could come from Texas, you could come from L.A., you could come from wherever you did your course work and you'd find a place where your course would fit into our categories. So, we're not talking about just articulation.

Chatham-Carpenter: That's true.

Shaw: You talk about work history, and if we give them credit, if they need work history. If we give them credit for work history, some of the other colleges are doing that now, is that something that might be in the future?

Chatham-Carpenter: I suppose the LAC could look at that, or the Faculty Senate could look at that, but that is not something we considered in our discussion.

Terlip: Actually, I was going to say, we did talk about departments deciding that they wanted work history as part of their agreement, but obviously that would go through the regular curriculum process.

Chatham-Carpenter: But it wouldn't count toward academic credit.

Terlip: No. It was just work experiences as an entrance criteria. The other thing I think we all need to keep in mind is that this degree is a little bit

different, because this is for people who, as April (**Chatham-Carpenter**) pointed out at a previous meeting, are bound to a certain place, and so typically these are going to be designed as online programs, where they're going to be working with cohorts. And so we're going to kind of know ahead of time that they need a history class for this group, because they're going to know who's involved. And the LAC, and departments in the LAC would have some knowledge of what courses they would need to plug in.

Dolgener: It would seem to me, going back to the 21-30 hours of LAC, as opposed to proscribing hours, that it would be a process of what have they taken and are those transfer in meeting our current Liberal Arts Core requirements?

Chatham-Carpenter: It certainly could...

Dolgener: Just on a course-by-course basis.

Chatham-Carpenter: In some ways, that's what we're doing now with any transfer student that doesn't come in with an AA degree. They have the Admissions staff look to see what counts and comes in. But, there still needs to be some articulation agreements as to what things will count.

Dolgener: Right.

Chatham-Carpenter: Because those articulation agreements are for AA degrees in particular, so we'll still have to work on that. But, it would make the Admissions' Staff life easier if those articulation agreements are done.

Swan: Secretary Terlip I think makes an interesting point. Is the UCC proposing this BAS degree in structure for specific cohorts in fact, for specific Community Colleges? For example then, with Senator Cooley's

questions, it's not open to California Community College students to come in, or is it open, is this just like our BA degree—for anybody?

Terlip: Maybe I misspoke. I was using cohorts in the sense that we have these 15 students who will be going through the program

Swan: Yes, I know what a cohort is.

Terlip: ...and they will take these courses over four years. Now, they could come from different Community Colleges, or from other places, or cohort could be from the same group, but I don't think it excludes.

Swan: So it's actually any...its just a BAS degree that anybody could decide to take from us. That that's what we're creating?

Terlip: The plan is, you start it and you go through it with the same folks, so that the online learning could be done.

Swan: But that's not a requirement?

Chatham-Carpenter: It wouldn't have to be.

Swan: No. Anyone could say, "I'm doing BAS" for seven years.

Chatham-Carpenter: Except they have an AAS or AS degree.

Swan: Oh. Okay.

Cooley: I hate to voice a question that I voiced at a previous meeting. Hopefully, I can remember it now. I'm not pursuing a BAS, hypothetical situation. I'm not pursuing a BAS, but I'm pursuing a degree in Philosophy, and I want in to that online course that cohort has, who's only pursuing a BAS, because I have a perception that that's a different kind of class. I'm going to like that fully online. I think it may be a little bit easier, because I think those BAS people have a different standard. How are we going to prevent, if we have a cohort that's set aside, that's only for BAS, a group of courses,

a cluster of courses, how are we going to prevent any UNI student from signing up for that?

Terlip: We do that now.

Licari: We wouldn't.

Cooley: Okay good.

Chatham-Carpenter: Maybe it would be richer if they would be mixed.

Licari: The only thing that would prevent it would be...changing your major into the BAS major. You couldn't do that. These are for folks with an AAS or AS degree only. So, that would not be allowed, but if you wanted to take the class, sure.

Swan: I could be wrong about this. I thought, I think I am wrong about this. I thought the foreign language exit requirement was an LAC requirement, but I think it might actually be a degree requirement, not an LAC requirement? What is it?

Licari: It is a degree requirement.

Swan: So, actually that requirement, the foreign language requirement, should not be addressed by the LACC. It should be addressed again by the UCC. That's the body that figures out what are the degree requirements, right? So they've sent us a proposal that we're accepting, the motion is to accept and send to the LAC for it to now work out what to do. But now I'm noting in discussion that the UCC has more work to do for the exit requirement of a foreign language stipulation, which the solution could be to have none for this degree, but that would have to be a recommendation from the UCC once it considers it again and not the LAC. Okay? I'll stop there because I think Secretary Terlip wants to say something about that.

Terlip: I was just saying that the proposal that we have before us says the next step, should we follow their proposal, is to get all the interested parties from each of the departments, plus the LACC to hash this out. Now, I think you might be adding the UCC into this mix. I think, all we're being asked to do is if we can live with these chunks and then the groups get together and carve this out. April, (**Chatham-Carpenter**) am I on track here?

Chatham-Carpenter: (Nods)

Terlip: Sending it to the LACC is a different process in your motion. That's where I'm coming from.

Swan: I can live with it, if the LAC says "Yes, here's how we propose..." I see that preserves the integrity of the LACC. If you want to call that "hashing out," I think it's the same thing as interested parties hashing it out. But, It is very important that the LACC make a formal recommendation based upon our saying that the UCC has proposed this structure. We basically endorse it, with the understanding that there's LAC issues to be worked out. That if they don't get worked out, our endorsement here means nothing.

Terlip: I agree with you. I was trying to let everybody work on it at the same time, rather than somehow put some sequential steps in there that may not need to be there.

Swan: That's right. People can always work on things, right? But if they want some guarantee that's not an absolute guarantee. We actually don't know what the UCC is going to say about exit requirements, for example, foreign language exit requirements. If for example, we have two departments creating a BAS degree, right, and they both say, "We don't want foreign language exit requirements." Well, the UCC might consider

that. It might say “No, for the integrity of our degrees at UNI, we need to maintain this exit requirement.” In which case, then the departments would have to rehash, to use your language, again before to satisfy the UCC. So, it doesn’t have to be absolutely linear, but if you do express it in a linear way, it’s clear what will have to happen, and I think that’s the value of what we’re doing now.

Nelson: I think that I’m more at ease with the whole thing at this point, now that we’ve had this discussion, because it sounds like the proposal is not to create a different LAC, but rather to have the LACC Committee to consider how they can operate with perhaps a new set of perhaps agreements with Community Colleges. But I don’t see how a department would have to wholesale revise what they propose based on what the Liberal Arts Core Committee decides, or what the UCC decides on the foreign language requirement, because those are requirements outside of what the department is going to want the student to do for their degree and their major. So I think I support Senator **Terlip** that departments should be encouraged to go forward in parallel with what the LACC does.

Swan: If some programs try to have a major course that they want to say is comparable to a LAC course, LAC would need to decide if that **is** comparable. They might say no, “Looking at this structure, given that its only 21 hours, we need **these** courses, not to be replaced by any others, but these courses to be in the LAC for **this** degree.”

Heston: I have reservations on the whole, about this action, but thinking about the notion that if you come in for the BAS you can’t –you can go

through the process of transferring to the regular BA degree or a regular BS degree. But ,what does that mean for that person with the BAS? On the other hand, I think it's going to be very difficult, unless it's spelled out very clearly to tell people who are here, who see a program that they like that, "You didn't get the right Community College degree, so you can't take that particular degree." I think that's a potential problem waiting to happen—that you can a priori exclude people from a particular degree because of stuff they took elsewhere. There has to be a way to make that up and join that program if they thought it was appropriate, just like they can transfer into another other degree here, once they start. We don't tell students, "No, you can't get into that degree—except Teaching, where they have to get into Teacher Ed. Do we really tell people, "No, you can't get that degree"?

Swan: Well, you have GPA requirements.

Licari: If they don't get in (it's because) they fail to meet the entrance requirements...That happens all the time, because I see that.

Swan: You have to have a certain major that is recognized as a teaching field to get into the Teaching Prep Program.

Heston: Hmm?

Swan: So that's another...

Heston: Right, that's because of licensure; they have to deal with licensure. It wouldn't be an issue.

Swan: But we do that, so that's why it's another issue.

Nelson: I'm not sure if that truly would preclude a student from changing majors, and perhaps April (**Chatham-Carpenter**) can respond to this.

Basically, they have if they come in with an AA, "You satisfied all these Liberal Arts Core requirements." If you **don't** come in with the AA, we say, "You have to satisfy all these program requirements, and the student's transcript is individually evaluated. So, if a student didn't have this AAS, (AAS--is that what it's called?) then obviously, their transcript would have to be individually evaluated for satisfying the requirements of this degree, if that's what they decide they want to pursue. And, if they don't have those requirements, they will have to meet them.

Chatham-Carpenter: There's not going to be any major on campus--Let's just take Criminal Justice, for example, that would say "If you don't have **any** background at all in Criminal Justice, you can take this shorter major and get a Criminal Justice degree." They couldn't do that. These people are coming in with 30 hours at least of Criminal Justice background. So these majors in some way, what they're getting is **more** in their major than they would have gotten, had they gotten the major here. But they--I can't imagine any student wanting to do that. That would cost them another year or two to take that additional hours. I understand your concern, but...

Heston: I see students all the time who take an extra year or two.

Chatham-Carpenter: But they would have to be, yeah...They would get out quicker if they would just get the regular Criminal Justice degree. They would have to trade...

Finn: Just one point. The last bullet on the proposal, "Overall Impact." If you read through these, it seems like all of them are positive, except for,

potentially that last one. “Eventually it would require more faculty. Faculty would develop more courses and resources.” As we shift to online, it becomes a new delivery system. And again, that’s a new training. A retraining. To some degree, if we use existing faculty, it’s a drain on their load. What’s the viability study of this? Ultimately how sustainable is it? If we go through a cohort and capture that cohort, how long will it be around? Will it be a turnover? If you offer a cohort, it’s real attractive. People get into it, but then you have a delay of a few years. So, I guess the whole point is, is that truly and impact that’s positive or is it a concern on the last bullet item?

Chatham-Carpenter: I don’t know if that impact is positive. It is a concern for me. Personally, the Provost could speak to that more in detail. I know there’s been some money that’s been requested at the Legislature to support this BAS major, because we knew that long term this would need to be some money put towards it.

Licari: I knew there would be that concern, which was the rationale behind the Legislative request. The other thing is, I think right now what we’re seeing is, you know, departments, and rightly so, being a little choosy about whether or not they want to go down this path. A few have decided that this would be something that would be interesting **and** viable for them at the moment. And so right now, those decisions are being made, kind of at the local level, which I think is smart, because if it’s just not going to work, for staffing reasons, then why create the program? In terms of professional development, we’ve got a pretty good system on campus that provides

faculty support for developing from the ground up, an online class or transitioning to a face-to-face class to an online format. We've got that in place. But, at the end of the day, when there's staffing concerns, I think those decisions are being made, right now, locally. Now, I've said this in other venues, you know if a program really takes off, and, you know, it's showing some heavy demand, there's all the reason to invest in that department; in the faculty in that department. It's a little bit of "the chicken and the egg" problem. It's not like we've got loads of money sitting around not being used. So that's...hopefully, the Legislature will come through and provide some sort of jump-start money. But absent that, if new monies are coming in because of a program that's growing or is large, then it's a little bit easier to capture those dollars and reinvest them in that program.

Chatham-Carpenter: At this point, about half of the programs that are thinking about doing it are within one department. A couple of them, I should say, there's about four right now that are thinking about this seriously, and then a couple that are interdisciplinary, so that it's a course from several different departments so that it's not real heavy on any one department.

Kidd: I'd like to point out that the Writing Committee would like to give their report today for scheduling reasons, So I'd like to see if we could end this discussion soon because I have two people, Senator **Nelson** and Senator **Cooley** and Senator **Swan**, and if there's anybody else, I think we'll just be done after that.

Nelson: I just wanted to point out that concerns about the financial viability are addressed within the Curriculum Proposal, and so any program that

would come forward like this, it would have to establish that it would be financially viable.

Cutter: I'd like to bring up a philosophical discussion for different point in time. This is a very exciting issue to talk about as in institution, because I think that offering a degree fully online, which is kind of what we're talking about, is really different. It's new and different. We don't offer a lot of degrees fully online and I think that we want to see if this in line with our mission as an institution, with the type of outcomes that we want to produce with our graduates, and we certainly don't want to do it today. But it's something that we might want to think about in a much more global sense. What does it mean to package something fully online and have a UNI degree that would be produced?

Swan: I wanted to ask Interim Associate Provost **Chatham-Carpenter**, you mentioned that the people getting this degree as proposed, BAS, would actually be spending basically 30 more hours on their major, basically, their area of expertise, and I'm curious how that works out. They still only have 120 hours, according to this structure, required. Their AAS degree would have, I don't know how many hours, 40 hours?

Chatham-Carpenter: 60 hours. About half of that.

Swan: 60? So all 60? So we'll be providing 60 hours for the BAS. So in that 60 hours. So this is how people don't see how they're spending 30 more hours. Everyone at UNI has minimum of 120 hours, and so they're only going to be doing 120 hours and only 60 at UNI.

Chatham-Carpenter: Correct. So, whereas with an AA degree, they would get 45 hours plus some additional electives that they take for their AA

degree. 60 hours they transfer in, all but their Capstone, typically, is the only thing they have to take here. And then, they take only their major classes when they come here with an AA degree. With an AAS they get approximately a third to a half of their LAC credit done, a third to a half of their major courses done at their Community College, and then they finish the other half of both of those here.

Kidd: I don't mean to totally cut off discussion, but it's...

Swan: Oh yes you do, don't you?

Kidd: Right. I don't mean to be rude about it. I do mean to cut off discussion. I apologize if that's rude. However, I think it's...

Nelson: Do we want to table the motion?

Kidd: We have a choice of either...call the question or amend the motion.

Terlip: I would like to amend the motion, actually, if Jesse will take it as a friendly amendment, I don't know. (I know there's no such thing in Robert's) But, I would like us to take the action that is listed in the report we were given, to call interested parties from each area plus the LACC, plus the UCC to work on this and move forward through the curricular process once those reports come through.

Swan: I would allow that to be part of the motion. It could easily be part of the motion that's already made, so the LAC could be added to that. And, we could also say, "Other people (that you just listed) get together to work things out for an additional report to the Senate." Is that what you want Secretary **Terlip**?

Dunn: I have a clarifying question. Am I correct that, if a department comes up with an idea, and it goes through LACC, and goes through the University Curriculum Committee, this body still has to vote on it?

Terlip: Correct.

Dunn: So, we'll get to see it again. I think you're concerned that Departments get going, and assume they don't have carte blanche...I think people will understand that.

Swan: As long as they understand that. But, Secretary Terlip wants us to also tell them to get going on it, and we certainly could.

Terlip: That they're free to start work now. That they don't need to wait.

Swan: And that's fine to include in the motion, but I do want the LACC to work on this and give us a report back about the viability and how it could work.

Kidd: The motion is to have...

Swan: It's okay to add to the motion "and these other people get together and..." what you said, "talk things out."

Terlip: It's actually in the report that we got.

Swan: So just list it as "Next Steps" in the motion. Who is calling these people together?

Terlip: That we would accept this proposal and ask Interim Associate Vice Provost (**Chatham-Carpenter**) to call all the relevant groups together to work out...

Swan: Is that acceptable to you? (refers to **Chatham-Carpenter**)

Chatham-Carpenter: Yes.

Swan: So that's acceptable to me as part of the motion. The LAC is still going to look at this and provide us with a report, and have the Interim Associate Vice Provost **Chatham-Carpenter** to call together interested parties from each area et cetera...

Terlip: ...to move forward to develop their own programs which would go through the normal curricular process.

Nelson: It's just a friendly amendment to the motion. I call the question.

Kidd: The question's been called.

Finn/Dolgener **Motion approved.** **One opposed**

Kidd: I guess they will continue to work on this and we will see it again.

Thank you. Fortunately. So now I'd like to ask if we could go out of order again to have the Senate Writing Committee give their report. They actually made this report last Spring. I'd like us to at least look at it and hear their presentation. If we need to continue discussion at the next meeting, that's fine, but I want them to be able to present their findings. We have David **Grant**, I think.

Grant: Where should I sit? I have a report here.

Kidd: Where ever you like. I've got the report right here. Please pass it out.

Grant: It's Appendix A which you already have in the report. Dale **Cyphert**, Adrienne **Lamberti** and Jared **Heitz** from NISG, are members of the committee that have come along. I want to make it brief. You have important business to do. I'll keep it brief. I'll give you the run down. We did a study at the request of Jerry **Smith** this past winter from our 2011 survey of faculty. We just did a study of institutions, rather than of our own internal feelings. We compared several institutions, including all of our

Regents peers, and this time we've summarized this on the table that I've passed out to you. I think it's pretty clear that UNI does not offer as many courses or as many places within the curriculum that focus specifically on writing, as many institutions in the United States do. I think if we expand our study we would find very similar kinds of conclusions. We also recognize, and say in our report that there's not a whole lot of room in our LAC requirements to expand or to pop in a couple more writing courses. The discussion you guys just had speaks to that quite clearly. So, we have very vague and general kinds of proposals that we could bring forward, but, as the previous discussion also did a lot of work for us, is that we need to develop something more concrete in consultation with LACC, who has seen this report and they have also endorsed what we've done. We also need to talk to UCC and get together and figure out how do we do attention to writing in at least two other points within the curriculum; within the undergraduate curriculum. Ideally, this would be something where Cornerstone, English College Writing, Research, all the LAC I Ed courses, would be in the first year. There would be something Sophomore year, maybe early Junior year, and then something that would be much more (during Junior or Senior year) that would sort of round these things out and be very, very, focused, hopefully, in the kind of discipline or thinking—critical thinking that goes on in that area of study that that student's in. What we want at this point really is to sort of clarify. I'm a lot more clear, given the previous discussion, about how all of this might work and play itself out. But we want the endorsement from the Senate that we should proceed in this direction. Do we want to proceed in this direction? Is it

something that's going to yield some results from our committee and if we could get some sort of feedback how we might serve your needs in making these kinds of decisions. Is there data you're not getting that we need to provide? We looked both internally and externally now, instead of constantly saying, "Hey, there's things we can do." We do need a little more direction before we can meet again, and say, "Okay. Here's what needs to happen." Who are the other bodies that we need to consult with? And here's a process by which we can get behind it, so that something actually happens, rather than, "Yes, this is concerning." Is there anything that I'm forgetting Dale or Adrienne? April (**Chatham-Carpenter**) and Lauren (**Nelson**) have been on the committee, so if there's something you want to add at this point.

O'Kane: Just a clarification. The three credits there, that is required? The number of required credits?

Grant: (refers to document) On the UNI row. Yes.

O'Kane: Through Cornerstone?

Grant: Through Cornerstone, through College Writing & Research, Critical Writing about Literature , Writing Enhanced Intro to Lit, or there's a Philosophy of Religions Writing Enhanced course. There's actually about 11 different ways they can satisfy that, if you really want to know the answer to that.

O'Kane: Okay.

Terlip: Have you guys-- and forgive me if I've missed this, you may have said it, have you asked faculty in terms of...kind of what their preferences are? Are you talking about the Writing across the Curriculum thing, where

people would have to be trained, or are you looking at additional LAC requirement or...? Do we know how faculty feel about those two options already or not?

Chatham-Carpenter: There were six options, Laura, that came out of the committee. I was on it before I had this long title. The six options that majors could be certified as Writing Intensive, so if you participated in that major would meet the requirement. The second option would be that a student could take all the additional requirements as far as the existing LAC, so some sections of LAC Category Three, or Capstone could be labeled as Writing-Intensive. Actually, there up there (refers to document on screen)

Terlip: Do we have a sense of how faculty feel about those, I suppose is my question.

Lamberti: We were asked to do survey other universities this year. A couple of years ago we did a survey of writing needs and that was a report that we gave you. This year we were asked to do a survey other universities writing requirements and how we compare with them, and also what kinds of programs did people have, which is where that list was generated from. We haven't gone past that.

Terlip: It would be easier for me to tell you where to go next if we knew what people want.

Grant: These specific things we don't know. However, we do know that most of the faculty surveyed in 2011 said there was some concern about student writing. However, curiously, once they go through a program they exit, once they graduate, they think, most faculty felt that they could write

at least competently within their field. So the magic happens in there somewhere.

Swan: Two things, but let me start with what you were just talked about. So the exit requirement, that sounds to me, when I read this and when I listen, that sounds like that's the big to-do; the big recommendation. Because it's amorphous, what it's going to be, or how it's going to be filled, it seems that it's the UCC dealing with all the majors would then decide if it's practical to have all majors on campus have for a degree requirement, this as a requirement. Does that sound right to you? And then, it's not an LAC requirement...

Grant: It's a hole within the structure that we have now. We haven't really considered-- this came up a lot when we were doing Cornerstone; what's this question of transfer? Right now, we have a course, or a series of courses--Cornerstone, College Writing and so forth, and they do this thing call writing. How does that transfer up to someone who's a biologist and the kinds of writing biologists do, which would be very different from the folks who take your Milton or Shakespeare seminars. They do a very different kind of writing. As a musicologist, would do something completely different. How do we move them from very generalized notion of "Here's some writing and it might get at their early bits of the AAUP rubric, the outcomes for undergraduate, Appendix B in our report, and how do we move them from that early stages up to something more Capstone? Something they can do...have much more proficiency, and do that within the field in which they're working? And they can adopt those discourse

practices that are germane to that, rather than something that just says, "Yeah, you have this big certificate, this big pass on...You can write."

Swan: That sounds like now, and maybe this is very good, to expand LACC into all of the majors. That could be another proposal.

Grant: I don't know about expanding, but at least feeding into majors, perhaps.

Swan: Working with each major to figure out how to get this liberal arts core competency of writing best achieved to each individual student, and this is expressed ultimately in the upper division, mostly, in the major. And right now we don't usually think of the Liberal Arts Core going into majors, but it is really the core of every liberally educated person, right? Maybe we need to alter that, and so then that's why the UCC isn't necessarily the best place, because that's the one that deals with degree programs and then the majors themselves so maybe we have some hybrid going on here. Okay. I yield the floor to Vice Chair **Nelson**.

Nelson: I think the committee isn't asking us to decide on a particular approach, but rather to allow them, or endorse them going forward and getting appropriate consultation. I could see value in consulting with both LACC and UCC because of these six potential ways the program could be constituted. Some of that is more in the spirit of what you were describing as an exit requirement, but other aspects of it could actually be within the Liberal Arts Core. So, I think they would be best served by us endorsing a pathway forward where they would consult in parallel with both bodies.

O'Kane: I'm wondering if we know whether or not we actually have a deficiency. Because students may take these three hours, and by the time

they get through biology, in my courses they write a small paper twelve times. In other courses, short papers twice a week. Other professors are having term papers. I don't know that this has every been looked at. Do our students in particular for instance, have a deficiency? If they don't, why are we talking about it?

Grant: It's a good question. It may be simply that these things actually happen, but we have not formally recognized it. It would be sort of an ex post facto, we're actually doing this. There is the anecdotal...I don't know if you've heard anecdotally, businesses hiring our graduates, recruiters and what not...Anecdotal evidence says that our graduates don't excel in writing. Does that sound right?

O'Kane: Is that our graduates, or graduates in general?

Chatham-Carpenter: Our graduates. Just an example: I was at an APR Program Review meeting in which I was asking the faculty in one of the Colleges in one of the Departments...It's not important which department. And I said, "So what are you seeing as deficiencies when your students are getting ready to graduate? What are they still needing?" "They can't write." So, okay, I ask them, so what do you doing in your department to help them learn to write? "Well, that should be done in the LAC course." and I say, "And one course is going to make them a good writer?" No. It's not really possible. That's I think the whole impetus behind this, is that we recognize that there are practice in one course, but then are they really getting continued training as they move on?

Dunn: First, thank you for this. It's an excellent report. Partly in response to Senator **O'Kane's** comment, again, anecdotally, I just had a student in my

Japan class who did not do well on his first paper and admitted that he hadn't written a paper since he was a Freshman. I would also say that even when people assign papers, and the writing experts can back me up, there's a difference between assigning papers and grading them. Versus teaching writing or providing feedback, which I admit I don't do as much as I should, and maybe some of us could benefit from more training and thinking about how to do that. I mean, I actually would, and I don't know if we need a motion for this, or if this is what's on the floor, but I'd like to charge the University Writing Committee to begin a self-study. To identify potential pilot courses and instructors, to encourage dialog in planning between various faculty governance committees, and to communicate to administration the need for resources over the next fiscal year. Start thinking about what a writing-intensive course, either in the LAC or the major might look. Talk to the LAC, talk to the UCC, and once again, it's not like we have a lot of money, but writing courses is going to mean smaller. It's going to mean money spent on faculty training, and so that's got to be a commitment too. I would like us to tell them to move forward. Is that what's currently on the floor?

Kidd: I believe so.

Cyphert: The issue is that we need to know in which direction to move forward. This list involved a whole lot of different models. And, the question is which is the model that UNI wants to go toward? Some of them offer writing courses through a professional writing department or writing center or whatever. Some of them incorporate major level courses, and this is a good example. The Econ Department, the Biology Department already

have very good writing-intensive programs, and there are probably lots of other departments. So, that's a different model that taps into those courses and essentially says, "Everybody needs to do something like that." So that all majors, in a sense, it's telling majors what to do. Those are such different ways of going about it that we don't even know who to go to. Basically, we're coming back to the Senate saying, "Okay. You tell us where we're supposed to go next." Or maybe you guys need to tell the Provost that we'd like to get some funding for something. "Where do we going from here?" is the question?

Swan: I actually don't know what motion is on the floor. Reacting to Senator **Dunn**.--that sounds fine to me, what Senator Dunn said. Tell the Writing Committee, keep working and come up with, talk to all the relevant parties, come up with some specific proposal, sounds really good to me. What I don't understand, what I understand NOT to be on the floor right now, is us passing an exit requirement. That is a big deal that we need to be clear on. If we're going to pass an exit requirement, we need to say so. I understand that we're **not** currently debating whether or not to pass an exit requirement. I understand that we're kind of talking willy-nilly. So, Chair, what is the motion on the floor?

Kidd: I think the motion by Senator **Dunn**, if you want to reread that. The very last paragraph, before the Appendix of the report. "Respond to the endorsement of recommendation by doing..."

Swan: The last page, last paragraph.

Dunn: The final paragraph. That's my motion, although it sounds like...

Swan: Wait. It sounds like you just brought it up in docket and in docket it's a committee report. The (Writing) Committee report is recommending this to us, so we vote this up or down. This would be the last paragraph that's on the page. Is that correct, Chair **Kidd**?

Kidd: I believe so. Senator **Dunn**?

Dunn: That's my intended motion. Is there a second?

Nelson: We actually don't need a second.

Swan: We don't need a motion. It's a committee report.

Dunn: Okay.

Nelson: We can utilize your motion.

Kidd: Sounds good.

Heston: This implies that already identifying courses, starting dialog, et cetera. I guess I find myself wondering what faculty even think about the notion that we should have some kind of either within-discipline exit requirements relating to writing or University-wide exit requirement relating to writing, that's assessed in some way. I know Simpson College for example, they do writing portfolios and everybody has to sit around and assess every student's writing portfolio once they're a Senior to see if they've met—or Junior- to see if they have met whatever. I guess that I would rather either have faculty respond to the six options, and kind of get a sense of where faculty think, would be a good place to go first, and whether faculty even support the notion of an exit requirement that could be done in one of these ways and, "if you were going to do one, which one would you like?" rather than initiating work that may end up with a few

courses being identified, but is hard to sustain because it doesn't have the whole faculty having had a say initially.

O'Kane: I'm going to change my request to say something to a second of that.

Kidd: Are you proposing to amend the motion?

O'Kane: No, no, I'm being facetious.

Swan: No. He was just saying "Hurray."

Chatham-Carpenter: In the report itself on Page 3; the LAC review steering committee did a University-wide survey and in the 2010 survey, 53.1% favored students taking these writing--additional courses within the LAC. 58.3% of the faculty strongly favored the idea of requiring additional writing-intensive courses within the LAC or within a student's major or minor. It goes on. There's another statistic there. So, we did, a few years ago, and it's kind of old now.

Heston: And there have been some economic issues that have come up since then.

Terlip: Two things: One, I agree we need to figure out if we have these options, which one the faculty would support. Secondly, I do teach a University Capstone class and I actually require a bunch of papers in there because the guidance I was given said the University Capstone is supposed to be writing-intensive. So, if all the University Capstones are indeed writing-intensive, then it's being met, at least at one other place in the curriculum. So maybe we just need to go back and make sure that what we agreed to is happening.

Nelson: I think that is important, but we also have to recognize that just having a course where there are a lot of papers required is not the same as writing instruction, so it was very informative for me to sit on the Committee last year. Because we actually are asking for courses that would have writing instruction, not just writing, and there is a difference.

Swan: So I understand that we are voting now, soon, on this last paragraph only, which does not include endorsing an exit requirement, but just telling the Writing Committee that we want you to go on and do this large study that you've proposed to do, maybe some pilot courses, certainly work with the relevant committees. So, if that's correct, then I call the question.

Kidd: Sounds great. Do we have a second?

Second O'Kane All Aye (in favor of calling the question).

Kidd: All in favor of the motion as written here?

All aye motion passes.

Kidd: Wonderful. Sounds great.

Grant: This is instructive. We have some direction.

Kidd: At the moment it's 4:53. Is there any other motions on the table? I don't really think we have time to discuss anything.

Heston: The Curriculum Handbook has been moved to the top of the order at the next meeting?

Kidd: Top of the order at the next meeting, yes. So unless anybody objects, could we have a motion to end the meeting?

Adjourn: Gould/Walter Adjourn All aye

4:54

Submitted by,

Kathy Sundstedt

Transcriptionist UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

Monday, October 27, 2014, Oak Room, Maucker Union 3:30 p.m.

There are 0 Addenda to these Minutes.