

10-27-2014

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 27, 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 27, 2014" (2014). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 23.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/23

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 MEETING

10/27/2014 (3:32 - 5:02)

MTG # 1758

SUMMARY MINUTES

1. Courtesy Announcements

No members of the press were in attendance.

Interim Provost's **Licari** was not present. There were no comments from the Provost's Office.

Faculty Chair **Peters** reported that the video from the Performance Based Funding Forum is available online. He clarified the important role of faculty advisors, designated as Campus Security Authorities, in combatting sexual violence. He apologized if his skepticism of Federal bureaucracy was misconstrued and he recognized the role of faculty in addressing incidents of violence and harassment on campus. He urged faculty to look into the NCBI (National Coalition Building Institute) training seminars presented in the Spring semester.

Faculty Senate Chair **Kidd** reported from the Board of Regents Meeting last week a recommendation to increase tuition by 1.75%, which would add an estimated \$1-2 million for UNI. However, there has been a motion to freeze tuition for a third year. Looking ahead, he noted that the Senate will receive a report from the Committee to Create a Committee to Study Program Health at the next meeting.

2. The Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for Approval

The Minutes/Full Transcript of the Oct. 13 meeting was approved as distributed. (**Walter/Zeitz**)

3. Docketed from the Calendar- No new items docketed

4. New Business – None

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1263 1158 Revisions to Curriculum Handbook

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

**** Approved as amended (Cutter/O’Kane)**

1225 1121 Policy on the Assignment and Changing of Grades

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/policy-assignment-and- changing-grades>

**** Approved as amended (O’Kane/Edginton)**

Emeritus Requests

1251 1146 Emeritus Status request, Gregory Stefanich, Curriculum and Instruction, effective 6/30/14 (**Walter/Cooley**)

1252 1147 Emeritus Status request, Thomas Keefe, Social Work, effective 6/30/14 (**Walter/Cooley**)

1253 1148 Emeritus Status request, Michael Spencer, Management, effective 6/30/14 (**Walter/Cooley**)

1254 1149 Emeritus Status request, Susan Hudson, School of HPELS, effective 6/30/14 (**Walter/Cooley**)

1255 1150 Emeritus Status request, Lou Honary, Management, effective 6/30/14 (**Walter/Cooley**)

1257 1152 Emeritus Status request for Mingshui Cai, Curriculum and Instruction; Basil J. Reppas, Educational Psychology and Foundations; David Rachor, School of Music

****Approved as a group (Heston/Zeitz):**

1258 1153 Revisions to Policy 10.08 University of Northern Iowa Policy on Distributed Learning and Intellectual Property Rights

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/revisions-policy-1008- university-northern-iowa-policy-dist>

**** Motion to return to committee for further clarification (Swan/O’Kane)**

6. Motion to Adjourn by Acclamation

Next meeting:

Monday, November 10, 2014 Oak Room, Maucker Union, 3:30 p.m.

Transcript of 56 pages and 7 Addenda to follow.

Regular Meeting # 1758

UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING

October 27, 2014

Oak Room, Maucker Union

Present: NISG Rep. Paul **Anderson**, Karen **Breitbach**, Interim Assoc. Provost **Chatham-Carpenter**, Assoc. Provost **Cobb**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Barbara **Cutter**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Cyndi **Dunn**, Kevin **Finn**, Jennifer **Garrett** (alt. Lauren Nelson), Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Senate Chair Tim **Kidd**, Ramona **McNeal**, Steve **O’Kane**, Faculty Chair Scott **Peters**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Jesse **Swan**, Michael **Walter**, Leigh **Zeitz**.

Not Present: Jeff **Funderburk**, Gary **Shontz**, Gerald **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Laura **Terlip**.

Guests: Jason **Knittel**, Eric **Boisen**, NI Student Government.

3:32 Call to Order

Kidd: I’d guess we should call this meeting to order since I’m already late. Is there any press present? Okay.

Interim Provost Licari is not here. Do you have any comments?

Cobb: He’s not here because Senator **Harkin** is here.

Kidd: Sorry. So that's a better reason.

Cobb: So he's being President and Provost at the same time, although Bill (**Ruud**) is there. No remarks except Hello, what a beautiful day!

Chatham-Carpenter: And welcome to another Monday.

Kidd: These are perfect. Scott?

Peters: Two things, first the video from the Performance Based Funding Forum that Tim and Joe **Gorton** & I did last week is now online at the link I sent out. I emailed to campus late last week. In that email I updated on a couple of things, the big picture things that we're pay attention to all year: Performance Based Funding and TIER. I just have one comment in addition to that, and that is that at the last meeting I relayed information about faculty advisors, specifically advisors of undergraduate student organizations, being designated as Campus Security Authorities. When I read over the draft of the Minutes, and saw my comments in print, I felt like I let my skepticism of Federal bureaucracy cloud what should be a very clear message about our responsibilities as faculty, and everybody's responsibilities on campus to combat sexual violence. So, I apologize if my skepticism of Federal bureaucracy got in the way of that message. I think especially since...in light of events on campus over the last couple of weeks, I think it's very important that we recognize all the work that faculty members are doing; that we see very clearly that this is part of our responsibility. I know that people all across campus are doing things for violence prevention: The Center for Violence Prevention, Mentors of Violence Prevention, the "Its On

Us Campaign.” I’m registered for the NCVI training on Controversial Issues that’s tomorrow. I’d urge you to look at their seminars in the Spring semester. And of course, on November 6, the Department of Education and the Women’s & Gender Studies Program are planning the Day of Solidarity to respond to the Yik Yak controversies. I just wanted to mention that and apologize if I didn’t quite target those comments in the most productive direction possible.

Kidd: Thanks, Scott. I only have a couple of comments. One, at the Board of Regents Meeting last week, they had a standard, I guess, recommendation to increase tuition 1.75%. For UNI, that would be one or two million dollars. There’s also been a motion to freeze tuition for the third year. If that does go through, it could have a negative impact on our budget that’s already tight. Also, the committee to create a Committee to study program health has met and pretty much finalized their report. We should be getting a final draft of the report in to the Senate. We’ll distribute that electronically and Lauren (**Nelson**), she can’t be here today, she’s at a meeting, but she’ll present that and we agreed that next week we’d work on that, just so you know that’s going to be on the agenda. Aside from that, I guess, can I have a motion to approve the minutes of October 13?

Motion to Approve Oct. 13,2014 Minutes:

Walters/Zeitz No discussion All Aye

Kidd: Okay. So that's passed, so let's see. I like this a lot. So we've docketed everything. Pretty close. I don't have any New Business. Do we have any New Business? (silence) Great. Then I think we should probably turn this discussion of the Curricular Handbook Revisions over to Scott (**Peters**), because he's been in charge of this and he's really excited to not be in charge of it.

Peters: ...to be done with it.

Kidd: I'll pull up the document, if there's any areas that people would like to examine.

Peters: I guess what I'll just try to do is to explain the background and then we could just go from there and see if there's any amendments to be had or what have you. Those of you who were on the Senate know, and I think in the emails to the Senate, and I think in the Petition that I wrote on the Senate's website, I kind of explained the background of this. And that is that last spring the Senate passed a resolution to make two major changes to the Curriculum process: One, to have an annual catalog and to allow changes to curriculum to begin on an annual basis. And the second was to try to allow the UCC to focus on more big picture curriculum items by taking off of its' plate more kind of routine, what I've ended up labeling "editorial changes" in the draft you have in front of you—the proposal you have in front of you. So, when Tim (**Kidd**), and Melissa **Heston** and I worked on this over the summer trying to get these changes reflected in the Curriculum Handbook, it quickly became apparent that substantial portions of the curriculum handbook were out of date, and so it turned into pretty much an overhaul

of the Curriculum Handbook. So, just going through the changes made, the Curriculum Handbook now begins with a statement of overall policy. It then highlights some key principles that guide the process. For example that changes and proposals can only be made with the concurrent initiating body, or that every step of the way, appeals can be made to the next step up, if it's rejected. This isn't changing anything substantively. It's just putting all these things upfront, so it's very clear to guide the overall process. The definition of editorial and substantive proposals appears next, at the end of that introductory section, so the way its...Keep in mind that this draft has been circulated quite a bit, so we've had multiple drafts that's been circulated to the College Senates. You guys have seen it a couple times, I think. Now, it's been approved by the UCC and the GCCC and endorsed by the Graduate Council. The definition of a substantive proposal is "course or program changes that are not merely editorial in nature, but that affect student's educational experience by offering course content, credit hours received, prerequisites or options to dual program requirements. Editorial Proposals are: "changes to title of course, course descriptions, numbering as well as content or program restatements that: (1) don't reflect a change in course or program content; (2) don't affect the student's progress toward program completion by changing prerequisites or degree requirements, and (3) after consultation with all affected departments and colleges are shown to have minimal, if any impact outside of the proposing the department." These are only for undergraduate proposals. If something is an editorial change to a undergraduate proposal to a course or program, it would be approved by the College Senate and at that point be presumed to be approved by the UCC,

unless the UCC chose to take a more thorough look at it. It would be on a Consent Agenda-the content of that Consent Agenda would be posted on the Curricular Review website that's on the Provost's website, so actually any department or unit could object and force the UCC to give it full attention. And so then the draft simply goes through each group's responsibilities. And then we have the familiar bullet point list of each group's responsibilities that goes into much more detail. There have been governance changes in the College of Education. Those are reflected here. And then I think, finally, the other thing to go over is the overall timelines. (**Kidd** looks in document for the Curriculum Timeline).

Kidd: do you know what page that's on?

Peters: I should by now, shouldn't I? It's right after the long bulleted list. It's about page 14 or so. So, the Senate approved switching to what we sometimes might call an annual cycle, meaning the catalog will come out annually and that we'll review curriculum annually. Though, it should be pointed out that from the time that a department begins actually forming new proposals to the time it actually gets approved and in the catalog, is actually going to be more like a year and a half. Unfortunately, there's one major technical limitation that none of us knew about, when we talked about this last spring. The software we use, the course Leapfrog software—it can only have a next catalog and a current catalog. And, so you can't start entering the next year's curriculum cycle stuff until the next catalog turns into the current catalog, which means that especially for CHAS, which has 15 departments--the CHAS Senate did not think there would be nearly enough time --from the time when the new catalog goes live-- to

the spring semester--to review all department's curriculum proposals. And, so we've now basically, we'll go back to using the paper forms. Except presumably you'll not print them out. You'll draft them up electronically and circulate them. This is actually how Iowa State handles its' program. It also uses Leapfrog. This is how they handle their program changes. They do it all on paper still. And, so that is unfortunate. We're hopeful that maybe in a future revision of Leapfrog we'll be able to either have a next, next, catalog. Or this, even better, you could save stuff that wasn't approved so that you could still follow it through the workflow—the Department workflow, the College workflow and see it. But right now, as soon as you create a Next Catalog that's not approved, it gets wiped out. You can't save it and import it into the next one. We're doing the best we can with that major technological limitation. So, basically the College Senates would review in the Spring semester. The Curriculum Committees would review in the Fall Semester. The Senate would review in the Fall or very, very, early Spring semester and this would all be wrapped up to go to the Board of Regents early enough so that the catalog is approved, and this is something that the Board has asked for. Is this something the Board has asked for?

Chatham-Carpenter: Actually, there was a discussion of this at the recent Board meeting and I think the curriculum will be approved at the late February Board meeting, but there will be an early ESAC (Educational Student Affairs Committee) meeting in February that will be looking at. So, we're hoping that all the things will be approved.

Peters: So the catalog will actually be approved before students register for the Fall semester?

Chatham-Carpenter: That would be ideal. Although Iowa State had some of theirs (but this is off the record)-- they had some of theirs approved at this last meeting.

Peters: I think this has happened for a long time: That stuff gets approved and stuff is made available before it's formally approved. I think that's just something that the Board has kind of ignored for a long time.

Cobb: But they're not.

Peters: But they're not anymore. So, those are the big things. The section on consultation was kind of beefed up a little bit to reflect the increased emphasis on College Senates doing consultation, especially for those editorial changes, and it was moved to Part II. Part III is still the statement of Undergraduate Programs, Part IV is now the statement of Graduate Programs that has been largely rewritten by Shoshanna (**Coon**). And, then after that finally, we decided to take the forms out of the handbook itself so that we don't have to, anytime you want to make a change to the form, you don't necessarily have to get the whole handbook approved. But forms would be actually be available separately, for separate download, on the Curriculum Review Website. I think they already are there, on the Curriculum Review Website in the Provost's Office. So, that's the overview.

Chatham-Carpenter: Scott, I just wanted you to know, and the folks know too, that we have been having curriculum meetings. We've had two for CHAS, one for College of Ed. and one for Social and Behavioral Sciences (CBA) curriculum meetings. Anyone can attend, even if you're not in that College. If you're interested, let me know and I'll give you the date for that.

We've been giving them this particular handout, so that they can know that they can be starting to work on Curriculum Proposals now, and talking them through what the use of the forms will look like. One of the things that we're requiring this time is the Form A, that we used to require, which is a Summary Form, from every single department. So, that will be attached to the curriculum, or given to the bodies as it goes up the line, so that you'll be able to visually see—that's one thing you weren't able to see in Leapfrog necessarily. You might have to go multiple places to find changes.

Peters: Those of you who did curriculum review on the Senate last time know that there might be some strengths to Leapfrog, in that you get to see all the details of every single proposal. But by the time it got up to us, too, it was very confusing because there was no way to filter it by whether it was a major change or a minor change. Having a memo from the Chair of the UCC that directed us to the things that we needed to look at was extremely helpful, so we did rewrite each actor as a department. The College Senate, the Curriculum Committee--there was always a phrase at the end of their responsibilities that said, they reported their decisions up. But we changed that a little bit so that it says "You'll report this decision, along with a summary of the changes that you've made," so that you'll get at each level you'll get a report—a summary report-- that indicates. So basically just clicking "approve" on Leapfrog cannot constitute a report. There needs to be some other kind of communication to the next higher body saying, "This is what our Department has done. This is what our College Senate has done." Along in the document, I used the comment feature to highlight different things that were changed. So I'll just

highlight one more thing, and then I'll shut up. And that's that to the duties of the UCC, we added a requirement that at the end of every curriculum cycle, that the UCC should recommend to the Faculty Senate any changes in the process. And I think this would be a good custom to try to get into, so that when there are problems, when there are deficiencies in the Handbook, when parts of the Handbook get out of date, just as a regular matter, when the UCC is done sending its report up the Senate with all the changes, it also sends a report saying "We recommend this change or that change to the process."

Kidd: Any questions or?

Cutter: I have a question about...I'm sorry. I should have looked at this version. I'm looking at the older version. It should be somewhere on page 20 or something. We had talked, in the comment feature, about the Standard Program and Extended Program thing?

Peters: Yeah. In one of the drafts that circulated, I actually had your comments in it, and people remarked on that. Diane **Wallace** from the Registrar's Office confirmed at the UCC meeting that the wording that's currently there, "unless otherwise specified." It's under Standard Program. The current language is "Unless otherwise specified by the Program of Study, there are no restrictions on double counting of courses." Diane **Wallace** said that is the current policy.

Cutter: Okay. Because that's actually not what we decided was the policy, this was last revised around 2008. So the one thing that confuses me is if you look at the 2002 minutes, that we revised it on, it said that "unless

otherwise specified by the program of study, that restrictions on double counting of courses is eliminated.” When you look at that language... Unfortunately I didn’t go to the library and get the whole 2002 minutes, but “Unless otherwise specified by the program of study” implies that you’re talking about Departmental requirements for students. That’s what it meant to us back then. See what I mean?

Peters: Yeah. I also did not go back and look at the 2002 minutes. We could do that if we need to. There’s just a brief excerpt in the Appendix. I know you were involved in 2008 and so you did research it at that time?

Cutter: And I must have thrown away my copy at some point.

Peters: It used to say, “Double counting is permitted for any courses from the required categories, and up to three courses from elective categories.”

Cutter: I remember the thinking on that was that if you let too many LAC—courses that are LAC electives count in the major, you can create a major where the students have to be so careful to take every single correct course, that really, it’s not something that most of them are going to be able to do. So, that’s why it was limited to three of the electives. As many required as possible, and three electives. I think what’s confusing here, and I mean, maybe this was meant to apply to both. There’s double counting students can do, and then there’s double counting that you can do in creating a major, and that’s what I really thought that “unless otherwise specified in a program of study,” it’s talking about that departments can no longer restrict from double counting unless it’s specified.

Chatham-Carpenter: I actually read that as the department could restrict double counting.

Cutter: ...If they made a specific rule for it. Yeah.

Kidd: Is there a way you'd like to recommend changes for us to consider?

Cutter: Maybe we should just look at the minutes. I hate to suggest it. I know it seems tiny but it's actually University policy.

Peters: No, it's a policy issue. You're right. You're right.

Kidd: So maybe you can get that to Scott, because he's master...

Peters: They're online

Cutter: The 2002's aren't online.

Peters: All the minutes, back to 1978, or something like that, are archived in the Library.

Garrett: Under the Digital Collections.

Cutter: So they're not in the Senate Archives. If you look in the Senate Archives under 2002, they don't come up.

Kidd: No. The Senate website is special.

Peters: If we can clear everything else up, we can always table it if we need to and sort that out and have a quick vote on it the next time we meet.

Kidd: Sure. Any other thoughts?

Peters: Tim had one comment on this last draft, and that was that in order to try to avoid some of the mess we had last time, where we got UCC and GCCC, Grad. Council recommendations separately. I don't know if anyone remembers that, it ended up being kind of difficult. That we could at the end of the... That we could put something in that suggests that the Senate Chair may want to encourage the Grad Council's report to also go to UCC for purposes of integration, so that the Senate gets a single report basically. The Grad Council doesn't report to the UCC exactly, so what we thought we could add to this would be in the language about the Grad Council reporting to the Senate. The current language says that "The Grad Council will report to the University Faculty Senate all approved courses and programs and all unresolved conflicts organized by College as well as a summary of new courses and new programs, as well as a summary of issues." It would probably be "a summary of issues the Grad Council believes deserve Senate attention." And we thought that to address Tim's concern, that term we could just add a line at the end that said, "The Senate Chair may refer this report to UCCC for integration with it's report on Undergraduate Curriculum."

Swan: That's what the Senate Chair can do now. But there are lots of things that the Senate Chair can do. That's why I don't think it's good to introduce that one because then it does look like it's kind of a requirement. Because this is a policy document that has flow charts et cetera and it looks like it needs to be done, even if it says "may." Again, there are lots of things a Senate Chair may do, and it's for individual circumstances. "Oh, this year I do

need to send it over here, but lots of times, of course, I don't." So, I would just leave it to the good judgment of the Chair, rather than putting it in to such a document as this.

Kidd: The one thing that occurs, because we have a yearly Chairship, is that information doesn't get fully transferred, I don't think, and so that's why I thought a suggestion might be good to guide, as opposed to a requirement, because I don't think we can really require the Grad Council to report to the UCC.

Swan: And so really, with our governance documents, everybody thinks of this as what's required for curriculum, we create curriculum in a sense. We don't have to do this, so this is just a good way to do it, right? So, we can come up with a new program and if we had any good sense we would send it then through this program, but we don't have to. This is then to my point that it looks like it's required to do all this stuff, so if we put another suggestion, it might be good in many circumstances, the next Chair is going to think, as you're thinking, about this, that she has to do this, when she doesn't. We don't have to do any of this either. But, again when you create documents, like this, you see, it feels like I have to do all of this. It's good to do. I want us to do this, yet we don't have to. And the faculty at large can meet and change the curriculum in a meeting not going through this process, right? It's good to do. The faculty has delegated curricular authority to the Curriculum Committee, right? To work these things out, is what the Curriculum Committee has worked out as a good process as long as the Curriculum Committee says it's the process it wants to use, but the faculty can change that at any time. Again, once we put it into this document, it looks very much like it's something that has to be done. And so if it's not something that

has to be done, I think we should just realize and not put it in here, and remember, that we may want to do that in any given year. You're suggesting that you would want the Chair to every year to send GCC's report to the Senate, you would want to send it to the UCC. And, there's some Chairs who would say, "I don't think we need to. The UCC is overworked. Why send it over? There's nothing here. Why send it over?" That's why every year really can be different. If it's in here, someone is going to think, "I have to do it." And, especially if you're overworked and you just send it over, so that's why I wouldn't add another possibility. If you want to add possibilities, you could have an appendix of possibilities, right? Then I think it might have the effect of being ignored, right? And, that's what the point is. You don't have to do this if it's not helpful. But if a problem comes us a Chair could say, "Here's an Appendix of Possibilities." I would not be opposed to doing something like that.

Kidd: Yeah. That would be okay with me. So, any other discussion? So, I guess the question is would we like to include an appendix of some sort to suggest that this could be done, or is that too much of a pain?

Swan: We could also have the Senate, actually has in the past has had, little documents that go from one Chair to the next. Presumably, those are gone. Some Senate Chairs destroy things or lose it, something like that. We have had such documents but then they get to be bigger and bigger and the Senate Chair doesn't want to throw them away but doesn't want to look at all that stuff. We do have documents that suggest these possibilities, but we could create another one. We could add it to that file.

Kidd: I have not been inside the Senate Office yet.

Chatham-Carpenter: What was the reason for you wanting the change? What precipitated that?

Kidd: There are two things. One is that, last year we had an issue where we didn't know we were voting for Graduate curriculum—but we were, or we weren't, but it was confusing. And the other issue is that a lot of departments, the undergraduate courses are double-listed; the 3,000 to 5,000 courses, and so it seems appropriate to consider things like that at the same time. We change the Graduate Curriculum, oh--it's because you changed the Undergraduate Curriculum. It just seems like if you don't have all the information on hand at once. The other thing would be that since the Chair of the UCC is in the Provost's Office, The Board of Regents looks at certain things, like the number of classes, the net number of classes you have. They don't care about, very much (being at the Board of Regents meeting), if the University adds "x" number of classes above some number that they find strange or disturbing, or if you add a net number of programs. So I think you, being at the Provost's Office could give us some net number of classes, so that we would know that we were going to run afoul of the Board of Regents.

Chatham-Carpenter: And that report is going to have to be done anyway.

Kidd: Yes. Figured that.

Peters: I think what Tim is saying is that it would happen before it got to us rather than after we approved it.

Kidd: Yeah. So that way we would know any ramifications to our overall curriculum. They're supposed to be looking at the University level issues, not the Department level issues.

Swan: That does sound like an Administrative issue though. So that's why I'm glad to hear that. Of course, that report would have to be issued. It sounds like you're wanting the Administration to form a report...

Chatham-Carpenter: It sounds like to me he wants...you want the whole curriculum to be considered all at once. Not Graduate Council curriculum here, and University Curriculum Committee report here; you're wanting to look at it all together?

Kidd: Yes.

Chatham-Carpenter: Why can't you just have that just be done?

Swan: Because this body is not responsible for Graduate Curriculum: The Graduate Faculty is responsible for the integrity of the Graduate Curriculum. We represent, basically, the undergraduate curriculum. There are many people in this body who don't qualify for Graduate Faculty status, and so the Graduate Faculty has it's own Constitution, it's own procedures to insure the integrity of Graduate Education at UNI, and so that's why they're entirely separate. The Graduate Faculty reports to us to keep us informed of what's going on, if we care to take that into consideration.

Chatham-Carpenter: You all don't vote on the Graduate curriculum at all?

Swan: We're not supposed to. People have done lots of things, but we're not supposed to do that.

Chatham-Carpenter: I didn't know that. Okay.

Swan: Some people want to do everything, right? But, no. For the curriculum, the undergraduate curriculum, is this body's domain. Now we have the cross-listed courses. I'm always wanting to call them the four... two hundred level courses. I can't remember the numbers.

Chatham-Carpenter: the 2,000-5,000 courses.

Swan: Right. They are thousands, right? So 4,000 level classes that are cross listed with 5,000. Senate Chair is saying that for Undergraduate curriculum sometimes it's important to consider what the Graduate, 5,000 level class is like. Is that correct?

Kidd: It's the same class.

Swan: No, it's not the same class. You can't have the same class, otherwise that would fail to meet graduate standards.

Chatham-Carpenter: But it meets at the same time.

Kidd: it meets at the same time

Chatham-Carpenter: Has the same time instructor.

Kidd: Same instructor and in fact its...

Swan: But it's entirely different students.

Kidd: No.

Swan: ...and entirely different requirements.

Kidd/Chatham-Carpenter: Not entirely.

Swan: You have attendance requirements as graduates. But, sometimes you don't. You say, "graduate students do not have to attend." But sometimes it is attendance the same. But if it is identical, then it wouldn't meet Graduate Faculty standards, and that's very alarming.

Kidd: In practice, there's usually an extra requirement asked of Graduate students, however, they're asked to meet the undergraduate requirements for the course. What I've seen in at least a few departments, my own included, is an additional requirement for Grad students. However, otherwise, they attend the same time, they have the same materials, they usually have an additional project or projects to have Graduate work. So, it is the same class, in essence. I'm not saying entirely the same.

Swan: There are other practices where it's entirely different. The Graduate experience is much more significant, elevated and sophisticated. Each individual case is assessed on its own merit, right? Approving a 5000-level course one area, and that's what the Graduate faculty will do, is this acceptable for this class in that area?

Kidd: They have to have the same description and the same course number, et cetera. There has to be many things the same about these courses, I know.

Chatham-Carpenter: I think to me this brings up a larger issue that's not on the agenda for today. There is no one faculty body that oversees the whole curriculum.

Swan: The Graduate Faculty is responsible for the Graduate Curriculum.

Chatham-Carpenter: I understand that. But in terms of just looking at implications across the board to have a larger picture, there's not a body that does that.

Cutter: I do have a question about that because I do recall: Hasn't it been practice for the Faculty Senate to look at the Graduate Curriculum?

Swan: We take their report and we look at it.

Cutter: We don't just ...treating it the same as the undergraduate, I thought. People ask questions about it.

Swan: The faculty can take that into consideration. If they want to revise and change the thing, and we can vote and say we don't like it, but the Graduate Faculty keeps it. That's still the Graduate Curriculum.

Heston: I kind of lost my train of thought. I wanted to follow up actually with April's (**Chatham-Carpenter**) comments. The challenge that we have that has always concerned me, is that we have these 3,000 to 5,000 level courses that can count either as Undergrad. credit for certain students and Grad. for other students who pay additional tuition because they're graduates, for the same course and more work. I guess I understand how historically that came to be, but I find myself wondering if it's not time to start a serious discussion about eliminating these common upper division/lower division graduate courses-- I don't know what to call them. They're not as Dr. Swan would say, the "elevated" purely graduate level...

Swan: Oh. I did not say they're purely graduate courses.

Heston: No, no-- They're not like an elevated graduate level course which is purely graduate students, that is kind of what you said.

Swan: Well they are. The requirements for the Grad course is different.

Heston: At any rate, I think it's something that maybe it's time to look at. It's a different era than when this process started. The other issue I think is that we don't know how to deal with what's happening at the graduate level. We don't give the same scrutiny to the Graduate level curriculum as we do to the Undergraduate level curriculum. There are fewer objections raised for whatever reason. How do we put all that together?

Swan: The Graduate Faculty scrutinizes the Graduate Curriculum every year, and they ask many questions.

Heston: I don't question that.

Swan: You just said we don't.

Heston: I know. I meant the Senate does not...

Swan: The Senate does not question.

Heston: The Senate does not do the same kind of due diligence, if you will, with the Graduate...

Swan: Because we're not supposed to.

Heston: Excuse me?

Swan: We're not supposed to.

Heston: Where does it say that in the Constitution? That's what I want to know.

Swan: It's the Graduate Faculty Constitution that covers the Graduate Curriculum. That's why we have a Graduate Faculty.

Heston: So maybe we should have a Graduate Senate?

Swan: We do.

Chatham-Carpenter: The Graduate Council is the equivalent of the Graduate Senate, that's the argument that's being made.

Heston: So we have an unacknowledged division?

Swan: Yes. It's acknowledged. We have two faculties.

Chatham-Carpenter: Thank you for bringing that to our attention.

Kidd: I think we should look into that, but probably not for today.

Peters: I was going to pick up on that. I understand, and have read the Graduate Constitution. I understand that the layout-- but it's always baffled me a little bit, because the first sentence of the Graduate Constitution says, "The Graduate Faculty is a subset of the University Faculty." And, the University Faculty's Constitution says that, "The Senate is the principal representative agency of the University Faculty." And so it does seem to me that by that logic, that we do in fact have, as the Senate, as the principal representative agency of the entire faculty, we do in fact have the ability to survey and monitor and ultimately approve changes to the curriculum set out by a subset of the University faculty, namely the Graduate faculty. And, so I understand that the Graduate education

has its own standards and challenges and for that reason has its own oversight body. But, to me the Graduate College is more akin to a College Senate, rather the Graduate Council is more akin to a College Senate, than to a sort of separate, parallel pathway of the University Faculty Senate. But, I understand the argument on the other side, and it may be worth more discussion at another meeting.

Kidd: Yes. (Puts copy of Constitution on screen) Does this define the Graduate Council?

Peters: It's the next one down.

Chatham-Carpenter: Does it refer to the University Faculty Senate?

Kidd: That's a question of governance that goes beyond even the extensiveness of Scott's handbook revisions.

Chatham-Carpenter: It does not say on number four of Faculty Senate that it's undergraduate. "It acts on all new degrees and all programs which differ from existing degrees to the extent that the University Faculty should be consulted." It does not say it's Undergraduate.

Kidd: But that's also not the Constitution.

Swan: We do have two Constitutions approved by the Board of Regents for two curricula.

Chatham-Carpenter: It might be interesting to look at the Constitution.

Kidd: That sounds like fun. So I guess it didn't seem like there was a whole lot of interest in asking the Graduate Council to, ask the Chair to, make a special report. I'll just do that myself and see how it goes. The motion is to pass the changes.

Peters: I think we have to table until we can sort out that policy issue.

Kidd: Sorry. Thanks.

Cutter: Could we just do a motion to just pass the changes except for that one?

Kidd: I think so. Yeah.

Peters: Where are we there?

Kidd: Page 14.

Peters: (Page) 22 or something. So under "Standard Programs" that's the part we're talking about? The language about double-counting?

Kidd: Yeah.

Peters: So that will just go unchanged? That would revert to whatever the prior language was?

Cutter: For now.

Peters: If in fact it's out of date, then we'll just bring it forward as a separate motion?

Cutter: That makes more sense to me. It doesn't hold us up.

Peters: We can just do that under "New Business." If necessary rather than as a petition that has to go through docketing...

Swan: The opposite or alternative path is to leave this on the docket and then when you're ready

Cutter: ...to table the motion. See, I don't really want to hold this up because people need to know.

Peters: There is a little bit of a time factor here in the sense that people want to know about this new process. I'm fine whichever way the Senate wants to go. I'll do whatever the Senate wants me to do.

Heston: Does the revision to the previous language significantly change the meaning in any practical sense? Is it likely to gum up the works?

Peters: I guess what I would say is that if the previous language was in there was wrong and did not reflect current policy, we've been operating under it since 2008—whatever it was since the last changes were made and the place doesn't seem to have blown up or anything because of it.

Heston: What's motion on the floor?

Kidd: We're making one.

Cutter: I'll move to—I need help with the language--accept the proposal with the exception of the paragraph on the top of page 20 about program length.

Kidd: Yeah. That sounds good to me.

O'Kane: Second

Kidd: The motion is to accept all the revisions except for changes to this particular paragraph here (points) and that will be looked at by Scott (**Peters**). Any discussion?

Swan: I guess that was the answer to my question. So, except for that paragraph, until you, Chair **Peters**, until you bring something to us, what's the effect? What are you going to promulgate in the handbook?

Peters: First of all, I'm not doing this as Faculty Chair, I just volunteered at end of my second term, I volunteered to be on the committee that did this. But if we're looking at the motion as essentially a motion to amend, to reject those changes and revert back to the old changes...

Swan: You'll just be promulgating...

Peters: I would forward to the Provost's Office--Tim probably would be the one-- I would make the change, send it to Tim, who would forward it to the Provost's Office without the new language and it would be the old language...

Swan: ...The old language there until we change it as some point. Okay. I just wanted to be clear.

Kidd: Any other discussion? All in favor?

All Aye

Kidd: Cool. So that gets passed except for that paragraph, that stays the old way. Thanks, Scott. That was an awesome amount of work. The next thing we have up is formation of a new policy (puts on screen). The Senate Website is a little special. I'm working on changing that. Maybe. See how it goes. This one is a policy to affirm that grading is the province of the faculty. It was tabled in the spring. It came from the EPC, if my information is all correct. The question that was still there, I believe was related to the very end of this policy, under things like "extraordinary circumstances." As in, if they were poorly defined. This is what happens when the Instructor of Record is not able to supply a grade for any means. The language is written as so, "The grade assigned is the

responsibility of the instructor”...and then under extraordinary circumstances, “the judgment of others can be used in grades” and these are the extraordinary circumstances down here. And, so I guess the question was whether the policy was complete enough to take into account where there might be issues of multiple instructors who disagreed or graduate teaching assistants.

Swan: The report of extraordinary circumstances, is the department PAC –is that the Professional Assessment Committee?

Kidd: Yes that’s the tenure promotions

Swan: Has the United Faculty agreed to this assignment of duties? We don’t have any authority over the Professional Assessment Committee by the Governance structure.

Kidd: I’m sorry. I didn’t know that. So you’re saying that the PAC reports to the...

Swan: It’s an entity of the Master Agreement; it’s between Administration and United Faculty, not the shared governance, not the faculty dimension of faculty governance.

Kidd: No I doubt this has been...

Heston: But it seems that this might actually might well have come up through, in part, concerns of faculty that had been taken to the Union, who felt their grades had been changed and they had no other way to appeal.

Swan: I'm sure the Union should and does address these matters. That's true. But we could just change PAC, to Departmental Faculty and that is ...we are the Departmental Faculty. The Departmental Faculty has responsibility to determine the circumstances.

Zeitz: We are dealing with Departmental PAC though, we're talking about people who are tenured?

Swan: We could say that. We could say departmental tenured faculty...

Zeitz: Is the decision to be made only by tenured people? Be made to the whole departmental faculty?

Swan: That's exactly right. And by "whole faculty" it would be voting faculty, if we don't stipulate, they're involved, they just wouldn't be voting. That's a very good question--to stipulate Departmental Faculty. Whereas PAC would have stipulated tenured faculty. So is that what was meant, chair **Kidd**—tenured faculty of the department?

Kidd: I can say that the PAC is a convenient body in every department.

Swan: But that is the tenured faculty, so we simply could say, "the tenured faculty."

Kidd: I think that would be appropriate. I did not know that was an instrument of collective bargain.

Zeitz: The point of using PAC though, is it does provide a certain separation from the administrative organization, because it is something that's identified by the contract.

Kidd: Yes.

Zeitz: So, and this is something to decide. Although they are tenured people, it is an organization that is not controlled by the Administration. Isn't that the whole reason that we're looking at this? Because we're worried about whether the Administration is going to make the decision as to how these grades are administered? Are we trying to show a certain amount of separation?

Swan: That's right. And that's why for us, the faculty governance structure at UNI, we would say tenured faculty; it is tenure that insures academic freedom and shared governance –the tenure quality does that.

Dunn: One distinction, at least in my department is that the Department Head is not part of PAC. The Head is part of the Department of Faculty. So if you give it to the PAC, it means the decision is made separate from the Department Head. The Department Head doesn't sit in on the discussion, doesn't have a voice in it. It would be the Department faculty, the head would be present, although presumably the majority of the faculty, their decision would go, regardless.

Swan: That's right. That's right.

Heston: It could be written to exclude Department Heads.

(group voices)

Kidd: Does this look okay? Cindy?

Zeitz: Put it in parentheses.

Dunn: I have another question or issue under Roman III, Number Four: “incomplete/research continued that extended the maximum time limit for completion automatically turn into an ‘F’ letter grade.” That makes it sound like, it may become an “F,” even if you finished the work, and presumably what we’re really trying to say there is, “if you don’t finish the work, with the new extended deadline, it becomes an ‘F’.” So, I guess I would suggest amending to say it would automatically turn into an “F” letter grade after the extended deadline, or words to that effect.

Kidd: Okay, so what would you suggest? I’m sorry.

Dunn: Grade after the extended deadline.

Kidd: Any comments on this proposal? I understand. It does look that way to mean when I read it. Yes. But I’m not sure that doesn’t still quite...I don’t know.

Dunn: Is that still confusing?

Kidd: For me, but I’m pretty simple. Do you guys like it?

Swan: Exceed, rather than extends, the maximum time. If it exceeds the time limit, it turns to an ‘F’. (on the first line)

Dunn: That’s probably what was actually intended. I suspect that that’s what they intended to write and didn’t. Cut my stuff in yellow. You don’t need it anymore.

Kidd: Let me take a look back a little bit, because I want to be sure.

O’Kane: Get rid of the second yellow.

Kidd: I can do that.

Dolgener: I hesitate a little bit to bring this up. But under Number Two, Assignment of Grades, Number One, it says that the faculty member has the sole responsibility for assigning grades, but when you get down to grade changes, under Number Three, 2A, my question is: Why does the department head have to approve it if there is a grade change? If it is in fact, the sole responsibility of the faculty person to assign the grade, why wouldn’t it be their sole responsibility to change it?

Cobb: Because it has to go through a system. It’s after the deadline, and everything, the Registrar is not going to just do it.

Dolgener: But we changed it so it didn’t have to have Department Head approval, and then it would be consistent.

Cobb: So then would it go straight to the Registrar? Is that what you’re saying?

Dolgener: Yes.

Swan: Our grades go straight to the Registrar. Even if we’re blocked out, we don’t go to our Heads, we go to the Registrar.

Cutter: The Registrar would have to be told by the Administration that these things would no longer require the approval of the Department Head, but if they were told that, then they would just approve them.

Peters: As a point of clarification, we're proposing a change to University Policy, right?

Kidd: Right.

Peters: This would be a new policy that would guide the Registrar. It is an interesting observation, that when we turn in our grades originally, the Department Head doesn't have to sign off on them, why does the Department head have to sign off if we change a grade afterwards?

Cooley: Because it's unusual. There might be some unusual circumstance You might want the backing of your....you might need to have that third party there to soften the blow.

Dunn: Let's say that when I make a grade change, it's actually good that in some sense I have to justify this to my Department Head. "I messed up and did the math wrong, it's my fault, or there is some circumstance," because you did get under pressure, "Please, won't you just let me pass the course," and I think it's actually good to have to provide a reason why you're making a change and have somebody sign off on it. So I personally, even though I agree you don't need it to assign grades, I think a change of grade should have an extra level of oversight and I'm comfortable with the Department Head being that extra oversight.

Kidd: Do you think we should vote on this proposal?

Dolgener: I just made an observation.

Kidd: Yeah. I know there's no motion yet. So I was wondering.

Dunn: So I guess one other question, the teaching assistant...does it already say somewhere or because we say Instructor of Record, is it understood what happens if there's a Teaching Assistant who's assigning the grade? Do we need to say anything about that here? Or is it already covered?

Swan: If the T.A. is the Instructor of Record

Dunn: If the T.A. isn't the Instructor of Record, then the Instructor has to approve the grades before they're submitted anyway.

Swan: Yes. That's right.

Dunn: I move we approve the document as written...As amended.

Kidd: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

Heston: Second

Kidd: Second by Senator Heston. Moved by Senator Dunn. All in favor? (All aye) Any opposed? Okay so we passed this and I believe the next step is I'll bring this to **McKenna** to get into the Public Comment period. Okay. 4:30. All right. We have Emeritus Status. Shall I go through these one at a time or move as a group? By motion I see "Move as a Group." Just let you know what I've done is I've requested Department Heads for these individuals to supply letters of support. I've attached these letters of support to the petitions, and we will attach these to the end of the minutes of this minutes if we approve these requests. Could I have a motion to approve?

Peters: I was given a letter of support for Tom Keefe, and I forgot to bring it with me.

Kidd: Can you just forward it to me?

Peters: I was an untrustworthy messenger, but if I could send it to you?

Kidd: Yeah.

Peters: It could get attached?

Kidd: Absolutely. Thank you.

Heston: There's no date for Item 1257. Do you know what that date should be? Not that it really matters to me, but it is a little different.

Kidd: Yes. I'm sorry I didn't do this because there are probably dates for each individual. I have them with me. I'll be sure to put those on. Thank you.

Heston: I move to approve the requests for docketed items 1145-1152

Kidd: There's a motion by **Heston** and second by Senator **Zeitz**. Any discussion? This would be an opportunity if anyone wished to make public comment. No? All in favor? All aye.

Kidd: Great. We have passed these requests for Emeritus Status. So it's 4:40 and we're up with this one (1258/1153) This is revisions to Intellectual Property Policy. (puts on screen) This policy actually was distributed to the Senate last spring. There were some comments made to the committee, and I believe those comments were addressed by the committee. This covers a decent amount of material-- everything from online courses to books and everything else. Does anyone have any questions or concerns about the policy as written? Okay, so the

motion would be to give Senate “blessing” to this policy. And, also if people feel like they’re not ready, we could let it sit for a meeting, that’s fine, too.

Peters: Would you mind giving us a little bit of background on it? I mean, I’ve looked at it, but...Who drafted it? What was the...

Kidd: It was drafted by committee. I was part of some of it. I tried to work with them and tried to point out faculty issues as a member of the committee. So, I think there were two things that were trying to be addressed. One is that they didn’t have a good agreement for several types of intellectual property, so there were some cases in which people had used University resources to promote or develop things, and then they did not want to share any of the returns on that investment with the University. So they tried to define that. The other issue is, I think, trying to improve the language about online coursework. I mean, I don’t want to read the whole thing, I guess. That’s kind of the idea. They tried to make it so one, that IF significant university resources were used in the development of intellectual property, be it a book et cetera, (textbooks were a special case) then there is some agreement to be signed, similar to a patent agreement, for how those royalties or whatever would be distributed to the University and the individual, and I believe it follows the standard patent agreement.

Peters: The question I’ve always had about the copyright issues with online courses...The rationale for the University...the proper language might not be “owning the copyright” but as it’s phrased here, the University, reserving the right to use the material, even after I were to leave the University, or stop teaching the course. The

rationale has always been, they gave me a grant to do this, or something like that, and I suppose it's sort of...when the federal government gives you a grant, you know you take all the strings that come attached to it, right? So, I suppose on one level, if you accept this grant, you understand the strings that are attached. The rationale has always seemed a little odd to me because ultimately, all my course development is supported by the University in one way or another when I'm under its' employ. I mean, I'm using its computers, its electricity, and yet they don't claim the same kind of control over my intellectual property. They could not seize my notes upon my leaving the University and hand them over to another professor to teach my class, and so I've never quite understood that rationale. I don't know if you have any insight into that or...

Cutter: I want to follow up on that. Another issue would be if you get a PDA and you do research, right, there's a grant, or a summer Fellowship, that doesn't mean the article you publish is owned by the University. But I also am interested in "does not rely substantially on University resources" because that's even more problematic to me in the sense that I use a Power Point for my in person class, but what does it mean: "rely on University resources?" Does that mean that it's a UNI web platform? Right? And there's a total disconnect here between what's owned by the University when we do something online, versus when we do something in person.

Cooley: I'd like to bring up another case scenario.

Kidd: May I respond to these, first? Only because I was on the committee. Is that okay?

Cooley: Yes.

Kidd: “significant University resources” So they didn’t want to make it too restrictive, as in, identify every little thing. But, general computer is not considered a significant use of resources. So if you do not actually take the money to develop the course. (They give a \$1000 per credit for course development online) then in general, I’d have to look at it more carefully to see if Blackboard is included.

Cutter: With the platform.

Kidd: Moodle is not. You’re on your own.

Cooley: I developed an online course, and I can give you two case scenarios. First, I decide to teach that course face-to-face instead. Are those materials still owned by the University?

Kidd: No.

Cooley: Or, second case course scenario. I develop an online course and then I revamp it. I completely revamp it. I throw out the textbook. I throw out all the exercises I use. I completely redesign it. Do they own the second iteration of my online course as well?

Kidd: Very good question. First off, they don’t own it per se. You own it and can do what you will with it. The question is, under certain circumstances, can the University continue to offer that course without you present? They don’t own it. They couldn’t sell it, they couldn’t do anything like that, but they could offer the class. I guess that would depend upon how much University resources were used by you to develop the course. Again, the only place I might take a look carefully is whether Blackboard might be--the platform itself might be defined as

“significant University resources.” You don’t take the money, you do it yourself: no, that’s yours. Even if you do, it’s still yours. You can still take it, go wherever you want, use your notes. Does that clarify?

Cooley: For the first iteration, not for the second iteration.

Kidd: Well the second iteration would still be yours. You still own the copyright. That’s not the issue. The issue is more, can the University use that class after you leave or have someone else teach it?

Zeitz: The way this is structured isn’t clear. I’m looking at Section B. And is it the first two sentences where it talks about “work for hire”? And then third one says “These conditions do not apply in cases where a faculty member develops and online course but is not contracted or paid specifically to do so.” In other words, if I create my own course, as you’re saying, this is not considered “work for hire”? The part where it says Number One, “UNI reserves the right to continue offering the course, if the faculty member leaves the University.” Is that the course that is “work for hire” or the course for “conditions do not apply”?

Kidd: The point of this was to designate that in ordinary conditions, the standard practice is that if you are working on something for hire, the company or entity you’re working for owns the copyright.

Zeitz: I understand that. I’m completely with you.

Kidd: So the idea is in this case, the faculty member would own the copyright.

Zeitz: Okay. So what I’m asking...

Kidd: ...however the University retains the right to offer the course.

Heston: So they have use.

Kidd: Yes. They have use. There you go.

Zeitz: So that's implied then for condition Number Three, the next sentence. "These conditions do not apply in cases in which the faculty member develops an online course." Now, in that condition, I mean I fully understand and agree with the first two. They paid me to do the work. That's work for hire. I've written books like that. That's just the way it is.

Kidd: Okay

Zeitz: Now, the second part, "that it reserves the right to continue the course if the faculty member leaves the University" Now, is that true if the first two sentences are true, or if the third sentence is true? Because I don't think those things are equal.

Kidd: Okay, I'm sorry. Maybe it's because I was looking at this for a long time last Spring. It all makes sense to me. But..

Zeitz: If I develop it on my own, does UNI reserve the right to continue offering the course with materials that I created?

Kidd: No.

Zeitz: The problem is that you have Number One, is a subset of those three sentences in “B” and so to me, what would be useful would be to separate that section—that third sentence, because that’s a different situation. Take that third sentence and make it into a “C” or something like that.

Kidd: Great. So what this is trying to say is that conditions apply 1,2,3 et cetera, except if this is true. So I don’t want to take this and break it out to “C” because I mean it’s saying that if this is true, it’s a work for hire, then these conditions will apply.

Zeitz: Okay. So maybe on Number One, you can say, “In a work for hire situation...

Kidd: These apply for all of these.

Garrett: Could you put the conditions below? Except these conditions?

Kidd: Yeah. That’s a good idea. Does that help? And I could ask the committee to look at the language as well, I’m not sure why my formatting goes crazy, but...

Zeitz: Okay. Or maybe put it in parentheses, or something that separates it?

Kidd: Next line?

Zeitz: Because I wasn’t reading it like that. Okay.

Kidd: No. I understand. So “B” is supposed to define the conditions.

Zeitz: So, if indeed I create it myself, when I leave, then they cannot use my materials. I don’t have any problem with that. They can buy them from me, but they could not use my materials.

Kidd: Yes. Unless you agree to it.

Zeitz: Thank you.

Kidd: Sure. No, thank you. Were there any other questions or comments on this?

Cutter: I guess I would really want “rely substantially on University resources” to be defined.

Kidd: Let’s see what they say about this. (Looks for definitions) I’m sorry. I have trouble seeing the mouse cursor. I’m doing a search for it and not finding it very much. There are lots of s’s, yeah. I don’t see a very good definition there.

Hakes: While you’re on that page, “the conditions” should be “these conditions” Now that it’s been separated from...

Kidd: Thank you. Sure.

Zeitz: I have another question. It says “Online courses developed at UNI may not be offered at other institutions while the faculty member is still employed.” That means that, based on the way this is organized, if I develop it myself without getting paid, \$1000 per credit, I **can** use it with other institutions while I’m employed.

Kidd: Yes. That’s true. Yes. Alright. My feeling is that the word “substantial” needs better definition. It was supposed to be in that other document but perhaps they’re both being updated at the same time. So what I’d like to do is, what I propose that we might do, is table this discussion until we get a better definition of the word “substantial” in the document. Would that be appropriate?

Zeitz: Yes.

Kidd: Okay and I'll include the revisions suggested so far and any others you might have.

O'Kane: Is that something we might want to ask the University lawyer about?

Kidd: He's on the committee, actually.

O'Kane: He's on the committee? Okay.

Kidd: So it'll be included. Again, I thought it was defined in that other policy, but maybe that one hasn't been updated enough to reflect those changes.

Swan: Following up there with 2V2, "Online courses developed at UNI may not be offered at another University while a faculty member is still employed at UNI." How is the online course, how is that going to be defined? You could have a course that you develop in Physics, for example like "Physics for Everyday Life." You developed it here, and now for another university you've developed "Physics for Every other Day Life" (laughter) and you're saying it's different. Whereas the Dean (and that's something else I would say here) The Dean presumably is the Dean of Continuing Ed., not the Dean of CHAS, not the Dean of the Graduate College, even if it is a Graduate course, again which Dean—that's another issue—But who decides your course? Right? If it's the same course? The Dean —whoever the Dean is--would say, "I think your second course is actually the same course" and the Provost agrees, and you're insisting that it's not, and you say, "Look, they don't even have the same title" and you say there are some different activities, online activities, et cetera. There are other

situations like this. Very similar appearing courses-- how is that going to be decided with this policy?

Kidd: In this case it would be the Dean would decide, and then you could probably...

Swan: It says we the faculty are making this policy. Are we comfortable with that? That's why I'm bringing it up.

Kidd: I'm not sure the Faculty are making this policy as opposed to...

Swan: Well we of the Faculty Senate, We are saying, "Yes we agree with this." If we don't agree with it, we would say, "We don't agree with this."

Kidd: Yes. Thank you. I know the committee would say "that's a dispute for lawyers." I'm not sure what that means.

Swan: Unless we say the faculty member decides if it's the same course or not, then it's very clear.

Kidd: That would be very clear. I would like to ask for clarification on that issue. Does anyone else have any suggestions for that? Okay.

Swan: I can say I thought about this, University resources. I really thought that "substantial resources" was the pay--the direct pay. So the committee and the Dean of the Continuing Ed., they've both said, "That isn't what the intent is." Direct pay for direct, specific work is the term, so that's not what's covered?

Kidd: No. For example, substantial resources could include promotional activities, as in the University could contract with a firm for advertisement for a book, it can include use of specialized software, which is not available

elsewhere. That's why I think clarification on Blackboard might be important, however, not general computing resources. It does include things like laboratory equipment and these kind of things.

Peters: I know we're running short on time, but I think this begs Barbara's question again, which is why do we have this? Why do we have this incongruence in policy? Where the University **doesn't** own or have usage rights to my research that's conducted with the software that it buys me that's not generally available, or your research with the lab equipment that it supplies you with, but it **does** own a course, or have usage rights over a course, that I develop with the same stuff?

Hakes: I like that analogy better.

Peters: I just don't quite understand. I just don't understand the distinction there.

Kidd: The University does have usage rights over your research, like the papers you publish. It depends upon if it's a patented activity or if it's a "free to use" activity. I don't know.

Swan: I think that for Faculty Chair **Peters'** point, I think that the trouble comes in with "B," Two policy statement "B" starting with "the Board who relies especially on University resources." If that were deleted, then it would be very clear. That if you are specifically paid to produce this online class which includes a syllabus, and then they -- the University --does own that syllabus and can reproduce it with another instructor later. Online activities, I think these are listed somewhere. That those are things the University owns forever. Wouldn't necessarily own a

revision, you state that elsewhere, but that the original one that we're paid for. I think it's advisable to just drop the, "or who rely substantially" and then that helps to clarify considerably.

Kidd: That was discussed by the committee. I want to put a strike through, because I'm pretty sure that's going to meet with some opposition.

Swan: Because, it extends in a nicely—for them-- ambiguous way, to then start colonizing your research, especially if it becomes economically valuable.

Zeitz: That's why we need a definition.

Swan: That's right, or strike it.

Cutter: I really like Jesse's idea but I still do have some concerns, especially when you said, what if this becomes a precedent? What if getting a PDA then came with strings attached about ownership of research, or use of research?

Kidd: We're coming up to the close of the meeting and I think we have something we can give back to the Property Committee, and we'll get their comments back to us. Okay? So do we need a motion to table discussion?

Swan: I move to send this back to the committee with our discussion and if they choose to get back to us, that we will put it on the Calendar to consider it for future docketing.

Kidd: Sounds great. Thanks. Second?

O’Kane: Second. All aye.

Kidd: Motion by **Swan**, second by **O’Kane**. And then could I have a motion to end the meeting? Close the meeting?

Peters: We need to vote.

Kidd: Okay. All in favor? All aye. That motion passes. We’ll turn that back to the committee. Now could I have a motion to leave? We’re leaving.

5:02 Adjournment motion by Acclamation

Submitted by:

Kathy Sundstedt

Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant and Transcriptionist

Next meeting:

Monday, Nov. 10, 2014

Oak Room, Maucker Union 3:30 p.m.

Follows are **Seven** Addenda to these Minutes.

September 18, 2014

Professional Accomplishments
Thomas Keefe, DSW

Thomas Keefe earned his D.S.W. from University of Utah in 1973 and began his scholarly career at the University of Northern Iowa. He accepted the position of Assistant Professor. Here he soon distinguished himself as a scholar of Conflict and Social Reconstruction.

Professor Keefe joined the University of Northern Iowa faculty in 1973 as an Assistant Professor. In his forty-one years with our department he has helped bring the Iowa program into the forefront of graduate and undergraduate studies. In many ways, his leadership has prevented our department from becoming hopelessly entrenched in any theoretical "camp."


We are indebted to Professor Keefe's foresight, as we see our peers struggling to adopt what is best described as the modern dynamic relational approach. Professor Keefe has written three major books and twenty-six articles in several respected journals.

Yet Professor Keefe's leadership is not limited to scholarly arenas; he has also carefully nurtured our Graduate Program and contributed in essential ways to curricular development, instructional innovation, and departmental governance. For example, twenty years ago, he instituted a prescient renovation of the curriculum that led to the development of a more structured and efficient educational model that exposes our students to all sides of the scholarly debate.

This strategy may have had the greatest impact on our undergraduate majors, many of whom practice critical thinking skills. His active mentoring of graduate students (via his role as MSW Director) ensured that they, too, had an understanding of not only issues germane to scholarship, but of the many issues they will face as they enter the profession. If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, our department has much to be proud of: Our peers have emulated our example on several fronts - in part because Professor Keefe's students have carried his reforms with them. As a result of his contributions, his students and colleagues credit him with raising the general level of discourse and inquiry in the field.

Professor Keefe has been an exemplary citizen of the university, chairing the most recent reaccreditation self-study. It is with great pride that we request emeritus status for our colleague, Thomas Keefe.

Sincerely,



Mary E. Boes, DSW
Undergraduate Director

School of Music University of Northern Iowa

For UNI Faculty Senate use:

Information in support of David Rachor's Emeritus Faculty Application.
John Vallentine, professor and director of the UNI School of Music:

Dr. David Rachor has had a very successful career at UNI, not only as an excellent teacher, but as a professional musician. As a bassoonist, chamber musician, and symphony player, David has excelled and participated in hundreds of performances. During a UNI career spanning from 1989-2014, Dr. Rachor has been well-respected by colleagues, students and community members alike. He served as the long-standing principal bassoonist of the *Des Moines Symphony Orchestra* and traveled and recorded with UNI's own *Northwind Quintet*. Dr. Rachor has traveled extensively throughout Europe, presenting bassoon performance master classes and historical reed-making seminars at conservatories in Hungary, Switzerland, Belgium, Romania, Germany, United Kingdom, Austria and France. Professor Rachor has taught hundreds of students who have become successful music teachers in Iowa's schools, music professors or professional musicians throughout the world.

I recommend David Rachor for full-consideration as a UNI Emeritus Faculty Member.



John Vallentine, Ph.D.
Director & Professor

Letter of support for Professor Lou Honary

by Mary L. Connerley, Professor & Head, Department of Management

Professor Lou Honary joined the Management Department in the College of Business Administration in 2000, having taught in the department of Industrial Technology since 1982. The new appointment offered a better fit for his then-new entrepreneurial endeavor to develop bio-based lubricants. In 2001 Professor Honary was named Pioneer Hi-Bred International Professor of Innovation, in recognition of his pioneering work in the field of bio-based lubricants. Dr. Honary's path-breaking work paved the way for a whole new, environmentally friendly approach to producing industrial lubricants. It actively engaged countless UNI students in hands-on learning and significantly expanded UNI's network of corporate partners. Professor Honary retired in 2014.

Letter of Support for Dr. Michael S. Spencer

by Mary L. Connerley, Professor & Head, Department of Management

Dr. Michael S. Spencer joined UNI's Department of Management in 1992 and retired in 2013 at the rank of Full Professor. In the 21 years of his tenure, Professor Spencer contributed substantially to the University community in service and teaching as well as research productivity. As a teacher, Professor Spencer was rigorous and well-regarded by his students, and he also played a substantial role in developing the MBA program and the undergraduate program in Supply Chain and Operations Management. He taught every operations course offered in the College, developed most of them, and sustained the Supply Chain specialty area until it was a sustainable program, now one of the College's most sought-after majors.

Support Letter for Dr. Greg Stefanich

Dr. Greg Stefanich has requested emeritus status for the work he has done during nearly 40 years at UNI. This includes work as a member of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction as well as a member of the Science Education faculty. I strongly recommend that his request be granted.

Dr. Stefanich has established an international reputation and following for his work regarding teaching science to students with disabilities in the middle and secondary grades. As a result, he has been invited to a variety of international conferences as keynote, as well as receiving invitations to share his research through presentations and panel discussions.

During his years at UNI, Dr. Stefanich has written several federal grants that brought millions of dollars to the university, as well as developing strong research collaborations with other institutions. Including funding his research work, these grant funds also purchased multiple pieces of equipment that schools would be unable to access because of their cost. He has provided a wealth of opportunities to colleagues at various levels to explore technology that supports teaching the sciences to students with disabilities through the grant funds. Dr. Stefanich's "working conferences" have also brought science educators to campus, as well as to pre-conference sessions at other conferences; these working conferences supported colleagues' explorations of these same materials, and provided collaboration for the practical applications of integrating the equipment into their teaching.

Dr. Stefanich has taught courses in Middle Level Education as well as Elementary Science Methods and courses for the EdD program. He is well-known among students and colleagues as engaging, providing a variety of pedagogical strategies to deliver content. In addition, Dr. Stefanich served as Acting/Interim Head of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction three different times over the past 35 years. He is the consummate faculty member, strong in teaching, scholarship and service. He will be missed by his colleagues in his retirement.

Respectfully submitted,

Jill Uhlenberg, PhD
Head, Curriculum & instruction

Dear Dr. Tim Kidd:

I am writing this letter in support of Dr. Mingshui Cai for emeritus status as a professor at the University of Northern Iowa. Dr. Cai is an internationally reknown expert in multicultural children's literature. His reputation nationally and internationally as a scholar is reflected in his publications, which are well known in the field. His knowledge and expertise have been recognized by other scholars in the field (for example, his work was prominently featured in the publication *Critical Multicultural Analysis of Children's Literature: Mirrors, Windows, and Doors* by Batelho and Rudman).

As a member of the Literacy Education faculty, Dr. Cai was instrumental in the development of advanced coursework in children's literature for both our undergraduate and graduate programs, focusing on the ideological, cultural, and sociopolitical issues in literature. As a faculty member, Dr. Cai was active in serving the department, college, and university as well as serving nationally in several professional organizations. One example of his national service and leadership involved serving a three-year term to the advisory committee on the *Orbis Pictus Award for Outstanding Nonfiction for Children*, through the National Council of Teachers of English. This prestigious appointment involved a demanding schedule of text analysis work that led to the selection of award winning books at the national level.

During his tenure at UNI, Dr. Mingshui Cai has been a valued and respected member of the Literacy Education program, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, and the College of Education. I highly recommend Dr. Cai, as do his colleagues, for emeritus status at the University of Northern Iowa.

Sincerely,

Deborah Tidwell
Professor & Coordinator - Literacy Education
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Northern Iowa
deborah.tidwell@uni.edu
[319-273-2983](tel:319-273-2983)

Support Letter for Dr. Basil Reppas

Dr. Basil Reppas retired in May 2014 after 54 years of service to UNI. He arrived at UNI in 1961 after earning his B.A. from the University of Athens (Greece), a M.A. from the American University of Beirut, and a Ph.D. from the University of Iowa in Social Foundations of Education. Dr. Reppas was one of the speakers at the dedication of the Schindler Education Center in 1972. Within the department Basil was often referred to as our resident Socrates, a nod less to his Greek ancestry and more to his love of using the Socratic method with both students and colleagues. Occasionally we felt like looking on eBay for a cup of hemlock, but feedback from students was quite positive—they reported that he helped them learn to think without being too scary about it.

We wish Basil all the best in his retirement. As a department, we support his application for emeritus status.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Boody

Head

Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations