

3-3-2014

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 3, 2014

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2014 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

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



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa, "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 3, 2014" (2014). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 30.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/30

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

Special Meeting (For postponed meeting of February 24, 2014)

UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
03/03/14 (3:31 p.m. – 4:40 p.m.)
Mtg. #1750

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Smith** called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

Press present included MacKenzie **Elmer** from the Waterloo-Cedar Falls *Courier* along with Jordan **Aune** and Amber **Rouse** from the *Northern Iowan*.

Provost **Gibson** offered comment on a recent article published in the *Waterloo Courier* which she felt inaccurately and unfairly characterized her and the Provost's Office. She wanted to go on record for her support of UNI faculty and staff and students and defended her record in various ways. Besides the inaccurate reporting published now during her period of evaluation, she noted some important areas that have not been reported on by the *Courier*. She ended her comments reiterating her love for education and working with faculty, staff, and students, thanking faculty for their hard work, and promising further information from the upcoming Meet and Confer as it becomes available.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** reminded all UNI faculty and staff to heed the information sent out by Vice President **Hager** regarding the recent breach in pay records which has resulted in identify theft, encouraging all to contact the IRS to see if their record may be affected—and to contact a 2nd time, for some have been told first they were not affected and later that they had been.

Funderburk also explained about some instances where there have been inconsistencies between the advice given by the Student Affairs Division and the Academic Affairs Division regarding curricular matters, e.g., Student Affairs waiving requirements without consulting Academic Affairs. Senate leadership [Chair **Smith**] will meet with Associate Provost **Licari** to explore this situation and will report back to the Faculty Senate.

Chair **Smith** summarized how he wanted today's meeting to proceed and then gave a summary of this morning's Cabinet meeting that he attended. The Cabinet, among other things, reviewed the Foreign Travel Proposals and essentially moved those forward with only small changes. They also considered the Policy 3.06 Class Attendance and Make-Up Work and sent it along to the Executive Management Team, essentially without change, in order to be in compliance with the Federal Government.

Chair **Smith** also noted that VP **Hager** and President **Rudd** discussed the Budget Process and FY 15 Budget Proposal in this meeting. Conservative generalities were shared with Senators that Enrollment Projections are essentially flat. With the promised money from the Governor, an Enrollment Contingency Fund will be created in case of shortfalls in numbers, and the remaining will be used for projects submitted from all over campus, which will be prioritized as the money will in no way stretch to cover all requests. Assurances were given that faculty and other constituencies will have input in this process.

Finally, the Scholarship Task Force made a presentation at the Cabinet meeting about their discussions on the best use of scholarship funds for attracting new students. Among philosophical differences expressed, a conclusion was reached that more data-based decisions will be used in making financial aid awards.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** reminded members that although the Budget Process has not been finalized, on March 24th, after docketing today, Provost **Gibson** and Vice President **Hager** will be consulting with the Faculty Senate on Budget issues.

Provost **Gibson** also noted that Town Hall meetings will be upcoming.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

The Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for February 10, 2014 was approved without changes (**Nelson/Edginton**).

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1232 Proposed Policy #2.13: Faculty Participation in University Planning and Budgeting (regular order)

Motion to docket in regular order (O’Kane/Kirmani**). Passed.

1233 Consultative Session with United Faculty President Joe **Gorton** (head of the order, 3/24/14)

Motion to docket at the head of the order on 3/24/14 (Nelson/Stauss**). Passed.

1234 Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Vice-President **Hager** (second in order, 3/24/14)

Motion to docket second in order on 3/24/14 (Strauss/Heston**). Passed.

4. New Business

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1218 1114 Extended and Separate Exam Administration (tabled pending receipt of additional information) (**Cooley/Dolgener**)

**Remains on the table.

1225 1121 Policy on the Assignment and Changing of Grades (tabled)
(**O’Kane/Edginton**)

**Remains on the table.

1228 1124 Administrative Restructuring re. Master of Public Policy
program: Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and
Interim Dean **Bass** (regular order) (**Kirmani/Walter**)

**Move to endorse the restructuring of the MPP Program and moving it
into the Political Science Department (**Peters/O’Kane**). Passed.

1229 1125 Consultative Session with Bill **Calhoun** and Dave **Mason**, UNI
Foundation (head of the order, 3/10/14) (**Edginton/Hakes**)

**On Docket for upcoming meeting.

1230 1126 Consultative Session with Scott **Ketelsen**, Director of University
Relations (second in order, 3/10/14) (**Nelson/Dolgener**)

**On Docket for upcoming meeting.

6. Old Business

Policy Review Committee (PRC) Discussion

Curricular Matters Discussion

1. Requesting Reports from UCC/GCCC
2. Fine-tuning the LeapFrog system
3. Policy-like Curricular Matters

5. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn (Edginton/Hakes**).

Time: 4:40 p.m.

Next meeting:

Date: Monday, March 10, 2014

Center for Multicultural Education (CME) 109AB
3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 41 pages, including 0 Addenda.

Special Meeting (For postponed meeting of February 24, 2014)

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

March 3, 2014

Mtg. 1750

PRESENT: Karen **Breitbach**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Chris **Edginton**, Todd **Evans**, Jeffrey **Funderburk** (also alternate for Melinda **Boyd**), Gloria **Gibson**, Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Nancy **Lippins**, Lauren **Nelson**, Steve **O’Kane**, Scott **Peters**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Gary **Shontz**, Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss** (20 present)

Absent: Barbara **Cutter**, Blake **Findley**, Tim **Kidd**, Kim **MacLin**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter** (7 absent)

CALL TO ORDER (3:31 p.m.)

Chair **Smith**: I guess we should get started, so I’ll call the meeting to order and begin with our Courtesy Announcements including or starting with Press Identification.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Smith: I see we have MacKenzie **Elmer** here from the *Waterloo Courier*. And you folks? Could you identify yourself?

Aune: Jordan **Aune**, *Northern lowan*.

Rouse: Amber **Rouse**, *Northern lowan*.

Smith: Ok. So we’ll get those names hopefully from the *Northern lowan*.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Smith: Begin with comments from Provost **Gibson**.

Gibson: I just have a few comments, and they are based on an article that was published in the *Waterloo Courier*, and I just want it to be on record that I support the faculty at the University of Northern Iowa. The title of the article, *Discontent With Requirement Penalizing UNI Faculty Doing Less Research* [http://wfcourier.com/news/local/education/discontent-with-requirement-penalizing-uni-faculty-doing-less-research/article_7c46295e-dfbc-53f6-bad0-fb799f4e7007.html], does not frame the discussion that we had in a way that I find—well, it frames it in a way in which it did not happen. The characterization of me as—or this Policy as “bludgeoning against faculty,” I find to be a statement that is very hurtful, in fact.

I have worked very hard to support faculty the 5 years that I have been here. And I understand that not everyone agrees with decisions that I’ve made, but I have done my best to support faculty and to support students. I have not seen an article in the *Waterloo Courier* that talks about funding for the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning and the fact that I do support faculty who are teaching and who want to improve their teaching, who want to be more effective teachers. I have not seen an article in the *Waterloo Courier* that talks about the thousands of dollars that have been directed to faculty as seed funding for research. I’ve seen no article about that. I’ve seen no article in the *Courier* that talks about other funding that the Provost’s Office has directed towards faculty in their travel, in their research interests, such as the area of sustainability in areas of diversity. I have not seen any article that has talked about that support coming from the Provost’s Office. And in the years that I have been here, even in the lean years, I have always supported the hiring of faculty. I have supported the hiring of diverse faculty. I have supported the hiring of faculty in the—

of women faculty in the sciences. No one has asked me to comment on any of those issues.

I find it interesting that this article would appear during the time of my evaluation. I don't think that was a coincidence. Let me state categorically I have no reason at all to try to penalize faculty or "bludgeon" faculty. If you know me at all, that is not in my personality. That is not who I am as a person.

The President has issued a moratorium for the Fall semester on the Active Scholar Guidelines, and we are currently meeting with United Faculty to discuss how we can better improve the Guidelines or perhaps even come up with different Guidelines. We are in those discussions right now. So, to have an article that paints the Provost in such negative light, while we are in the midst of negotiations, I think is uncalled for.

So, let me just end with, it is important for me that you understand I have been in education my entire career. I love education. I love working with students. I love working with faculty and staff. And I would not be in this job if I didn't have a love of what I do. I am here to provide support. I am here to make sure that everyone—students, faculty and staff—are successful, that our University is successful. And I feel that articles like this do not help the University move forward. Once we have additional information about the Meet and Confer, that will be shared with the campus. We have a meeting tomorrow, and we will have, if we need, subsequent meetings until we can reach a resolution on the issue.

So, I thank you. I thank faculty for their work, the work that you do every day. I understand how hard you work every day, and I thank you for that.

Smith: Thank you, Provost **Gibson**.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Smith: Comments from Faculty Chair **Funderburk**?

Funderburk: Yes. First I want to encourage all the faculty and staff to follow the directions we've been given regarding the security breach that's resulted in identity theft for some of our colleagues. As one of the victims, I would strongly recommend you take the time to contact the IRS to verify if your information is yet to be used by another. Also, don't hesitate to contact the IRS more than once as some of the people who contacted them were initially told that their information was fine, and the second time they called, it had breached. So stay vigilant. I am confident that the University Administration is taking this situation seriously and is making every effort to deal with the situation going forward as well as striving to understand where the breach may have occurred. Ours is not the only institution affected. While chatting with the IRS representative, I was told, for example today, that the University of Pittsburgh Medical School is also going through a similar situation starting this week. So, it's not only us.

Now, on to another topic important to faculty related to curriculum. It has come to my attention that in some instances decisions are being made to alter curriculum requirements for some students without consultation or approval from the Academic Affairs Division. This apparently has been done routinely in some cases as a matter of policy. Given that matters of curriculum are to be addressed by the faculty, I do not believe there should ever be an instance where a curricular change or substitution should be approved without consultation and approval of the Academic Affairs division. In most cases, that should include direct consultation with faculty—that meaning the Faculty Senate. Even in cases where changes or substitutions are mandated by external sources, such as government agencies, there should be discussions between academic affairs and those in student affairs charged with maintaining student records in order to assure that solutions acceptable to both are found.

I am not suggesting that Academic Affairs must be consulted on each individual student request, but it must be consulted in order to develop policies related to any curricular substitution. Following consultations and a decision by Academic Affairs as to the appropriateness of any curricular substitutions, then substitution or waiver of classes can proceed for

affected students. In this way, both Divisions can be fully informed and offer more consistent information to students.

As it stands now, there may be instances where Student Affairs personnel are telling students one thing while members in Academic Affairs are giving different advice. The specific instance of which I am aware relates to a group of students being told by members of Student Affairs that they need not take Personal Wellness as part of their LAC requirements even though no action or consultation has happened with Academic Affairs. As I understand it, because some members of the Student Affairs Division believe this to be mandated, they saw no need to consult with Academic Affairs.

This situation cannot be allowed to continue. All curricular issues must be handled in consultation with the Academic Affairs side of the University and the faculty. Those charged with maintaining records of students must understand that all curricular matters require the approval of Academic Affairs, including those requested or mandated by external entities. I am asking that the Faculty Senate work with the Office of the Provost and the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs to address this situation in order that policies are put in place to assure that curriculum remains solely in the domain of the Academic Affairs Division. I recommend that the Faculty Senate leadership meet with representatives of the Provost's Office to discuss ways—the best ways to address the situation going forward. Thank you.

Smith: Ok, thank you, Faculty Chair **Funderburk**. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: So, is this just bad advice being given, or is somehow this requirement being waived without any sort of—without going through Student Requests or anything?

Funderburk: The second. [pause then some laughter around]

Heston: I'm on the—I'm on your blind side, I can see that. Is this in relationship to Articulation Agreement issues?

Funderburk: No. Not the instance I know of.

Smith: Let me ask Associate Provost **Licari**, have you been aware of this?
Or

Licari: I basically learned of this about the same time that Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] became aware, and to get to Senator **Peters'** question, it has created a few instances where—at least I know of—where, you know, I gave different answers to students than Student Affairs Division was giving to other students in the same situation. So, it wasn't—I don't know if it was bad or wrong or whatever. It was certainly not consistent, and obviously since they were giving different advice than I was, I would say “wrong.”
[laughs lightly]

Smith: So, the suggestion is that the Senate leadership, which, I guess, is kind of me [laughter all around], meets at the Provost's Office in order to—presumably with Associate Provost **Licari**.

Licari: Jerry, I'd be happy to sit down with you [light laughter around].

Smith: If you're comfortable with that [heads nodding], that's how we'll go, and I'll report back to you and see as things develop—up until 2 months from now when [his term as Chair ends]. Ok.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JERRY SMITH

Smith: Now, finally, Comments from Senate Chair Smith—that's me. Again, I've made many of my comments in the meeting preview e-mail I sent out on Friday. As I stated in that message, I was thinking that we'll have some time left today after we finish with the doable items on our docket. I'm not so sure of that anymore. But in addition to using that time to talk about curricular matters, which I'd suggested in that email, I'd also like us to talk about the “Policy” policy that the Policy Review Committee

recently marked up and returned to us. And I sent that back to you, and that's to my mind a little more urgent than some of the curricular things.

My only other update relates to the Cabinet meeting that was held this morning. The last part of that meeting was used in discussions of various Policy Proposals, some of which the Senate had reviewed—they finally got to the Foreign Travel Proposals, and there's a little wrangling around, but I don't know that there are any significant changes made to that. They also got to the Policy 3.06, Class Attendance and Make-Up Work, and you remember we had quite a discussion of that. And ultimately we decided to amend it to deal with the specific concerns raised by the Department of Education with regard to dealing with students who are pregnant or had children, and they—the Cabinet basically agreed with what we did given that, on the other hand, there is some concern has been expressed by students to address some other issues. “Yeah, you can do that down the road, bring them to us.” But we wanted to get into compliance with the Federal Government, and so that Policy basically was approved by the Cabinet and now will go forward to the Executive Management Team. I think it's going to be approved as we submitted it to them.

The other major topics at this morning's Cabinet meeting: First off, VP **Hager** talked about the “Tax/IRS situation,” and our Faculty Chair **Funderburk** has already told you the substance of that. He did encourage us to encourage everyone to go through the steps in Michael **Hager**'s e-mail that you got this morning so—that you kind of protect yourself.

Secondly, VP **Hager** and President **Ruud** discussed the Budget Process and FY 15 Proposal. I'm not sure how much of the details of that I'm allowed to release. They tend to be very transparent, but on the other hand, these are iffy, you might know. But I'll play it conservative. What they're projecting is a very modest increase in enrollment, basically flat enrollments. And they're using that—that's conservative—that's used in the Budget Projections. Then given what the Government—Governor has recommended, they're assuming, if we get that, then, you know, given the expenses we're expecting, we would be able to set aside a certain amount of money basically as an Enrollment Contingency Fund, in the event

enrollments fell below what we were projecting, and then on top of that have a certain amount of money, a modest amount of money potentially left over that would be used to fund projects, projects that, you know, have gone kind of—needs that have gone unmet for quite a few years now. And, as part of the Budget Process, basically the Administration, the President, said, “Hey,” to everybody in every Division, “tell us what projects you have, what things that you—if you had money, what would you use it for?” And all the Administrators down through the Departments submitted stuff up. They had, you know, big bucks—kind of what people would like. We’re not going to have near that much money under any plausible scenario. So what will happen, I think it is plausible that we will have some money—I don’t think it’s—say, left over, that is over and beyond the bare rudiments of that they’re planning for, and what then will happen, and we’ve been assured is that there will be a process by which the faculty and other constituencies will be engaged, will have a voice in deciding how that should be allocated among the different Proposals that we’ve put forward. So I expect that, you know, this will happen down the road. I’m not sure how quickly it will happen. Again, I don’t know the timing, but I think that we are having an impact there. Certainly desirous of having faculty and other input, so I expect that that will happen.

Finally, there was an extensive presentation on the work of the Scholarship Task Force, which was asked to evaluate UNI’s current practices for awarding scholarships and other financial aid, and making improvement recommendations, both short- and long-term. Among the conclusions was the need to make more data-based decisions in using financial aid awards as a means of recruiting students. And there are a lot of philosophical differences on how you use scholarship money. There is a belief that we should use it more strategically as a way of addressing enrollment concerns, as a way of attracting students. And they want to do that intelligently, using data to kind of indicate when will some extra, you know, \$1000 to this student attract that student that we want here, what will attract that student to actually come here. So those are, I think, the major things that came out of this morning’s Cabinet meeting. And that concludes my comments.

We are now ready to move on to

Funderburk: Chair **Smith**? I wanted to

Smith: Yes.

Funderburk: I think the one other thing is, with the Budget Process, was the fact that, while we still don't have the Budget Process developed, that there is a plan to come before the Senate to present where we are with the Budget to see the same slides. I think that date was the 24th of March?

Smith: It's right up here [projected on the current Agenda]. I should have said it, because we've got it as an item for docketing, and that will—when we talk about it on docketing that will come up. But, you're right, Jeff, that was brought up.

Gibson: And the Town Hall meetings.

Smith: That I didn't bring up. Town Hall meetings as well, to talk about the Budget Process. So, it's good stuff. Ok, any other comments of this sort? [none heard]

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Smith: Then, I think we are ready to do our Minutes for Approval. The Agenda says we have two Minutes to approve today—two sets of Minutes. As it turns out, the 02/17/14 Minutes aren't yet ready for Senate approval. We'll get to those next week. So I would like a motion to approve the Minutes of our February 10th meeting.

Nelson: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Nelson**. Seconded by Senator **Edginton** [who indicated]. Any discussion of this? [none heard] Then I'm assuming you all had a chance to review these Minutes and to provide Sherry [**Nuss**, transcriptionist] with any suggested changes. We are ready to vote. All in favor, say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say "No." [none heard] That motion carries.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1232, Docket #1128, Proposed Policy #2.13: Faculty Participation in University Planning and Budgeting (regular order)

Smith: Which gets us to Calendar Items for Docketing of which there are 3, the first of which is Calendar Item 1232, which if docketed would be Docket #1128, Proposed Policy #2.13, Faculty Participation in University Planning and Budgeting. This relates to some things that were discussed at this morning's [Cabinet] meeting. Any discussion of the wisdom of docketing this Policy Proposal, which I distributed to you about a week or so ago? Then I would like a motion to docket this in regular order.

O'Kane: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **O'Kane**. Seconded by Senator **Kirmani**. Discussion of this. I've run this past President **Ruud**, not that he's had a chance to read it, but he is in principle quite supportive of what we're trying to do here. I've also discussed faculty input into University budgeting with Provost **Gibson**, who has agreed to meet with us in a consultative session with Vice President **Hager** –and you can see that is coming right up [second order of business March 24th]. We are going to be talking about it in a little bit. In that session, we'll talk more about these matters. But I wanted to get a draft Policy Proposal on our Docket so we can talk about it, and hopefully approve something before the end of the semester. The Policy that we proposed would handle the front-end consultative part of faculty involvement. So, what we're saying is, we'll look at budgeting and finance at this University. There's a front end where you develop a Budget,

and then there's the back-end where you monitor performance against that Budget. That back end is being handled by the Senate Budget Committee, which is currently chaired by my absent Vice-Chair Tim **Kidd**, and they are hoping to come to us sometime yet this semester with recommendations for how, on an ongoing basis, that Committee or the faculty in general can keep tabs on how the University is performing against its Budget. But what we're concerned with right now and with the specific Proposal that we're considering for docketing is the front end side—faculty participation. And the Policy that's proposed here would cover this from all levels—from the Department level on up to the University level. So, is there any discussion of the wisdom for docketing of this item? [none heard] Then I believe we are ready for a vote. All in favor of docketing Calendar Item #1232 in regular order, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say "No." [none heard] That motion carries.

Calendar Item 1233, Docket #1129, Consultative Session with United Faculty President Joe **Gorton** (head of the order, 3/24/14)

Smith: Next on our Calendar is item 1233, which would become Docket #1129, a Consultative Session with United Faculty President Joe **Gorton**. First, is there any discussion of the wisdom of docketing this item at the head of the order for our March 24th meeting? Then I need a motion to docket this in regular order [*sic*, head of the order] for that meeting.

Nelson: So move.

Strauss: Move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Nelson** . Seconded by Senator **Strauss**.

Strauss: The other way around.

Smith: Not the way I call it. [loud laughter all around]

Strauss: If that's the way you want to be. [more light laughter]

Smith: Discussion. And again to lead off the discussion, Joe [United Faculty President **Gorton**] and I had talked last Fall about having him meet in a consultative session with the Senate. He's wanted to do this. We really didn't have the time last Fall. He indicated several weeks ago that he wanted to meet with us, for a brief time he stated, to talk about the Regents' Efficiency and Transformation Study. And he felt there was some urgency to this. That Study now, I guess, is—it's got a kick-off, I think, in the middle of March. It's kind of when they sign the contracts and get things going. So, in order to accommodate him, I propose that we have this consultative session at the start of our March 24th meeting, which is the Monday after Spring Break. Any more questions or discussion on this? [none heard] I will try to manage that time-wise, because, again, as you will see, we've got a consultative session with Provost **Gibson** and Vice President **Hager** right after that, and that will take some time, so I don't want us to, you know, go overboard with Joe [**Gorton**] and not have the time that we need with our Administrators, because they were in line first and really it's something that we really need to talk about. So if there's no further discussion, I think we are ready to vote on docketing this item. All in favor, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say "No." [none heard] It, too, carries.

Calendar Item 1234, Docket #1130, Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Vice-President **Hager** (second in order, 3/24/14)

Smith: And the final item on our Calendar, Item 1234, which would become Docket #1130, is what I've been referring to, a proposed consultative session with Provost **Gibson** and Vice-President of Finance and Administration Michael **Hager**. This would be held on 3/24, after the short session with Joe **Gorton** that we've just docketed. Is there any discussion of the wisdom of docketing this item? [none heard] Then I need a motion to do that. [to **Strauss**] Don't you want to step up here? It's your chance to have it all. [laughter around]

Strauss: So move.

Smith: All right. [some laughter] Second by Senator **Heston** [who indicated. Discussion of this. Again, Provost **Gibson** suggested having this session as a way of informing faculty about the University's Budget Process. We can also use the session to clarify, with the Provost and VP **Hager**, when and how the faculty, through the [Faculty] Senate, can and will have input into planning and budgeting decisions at the Academic Affairs and University levels. And that relates it to the Policy #2.13, which we docketed right earlier today. Further discussion of this?

Peters: Just a clarification, if it's by March 24th, it's highly unlikely that the State will have wrapped up and gone home at the Legislature. So, there are these Proposals that have bubbled up from Departmental levels, and presumably they've kind of been through the whole hierarchy, will—I mean, at this meeting will it be—will Provost **Gibson** and Vice President **Hager**, will you be sharing with us some of those options, some of those Proposals? Or will it mainly be sort of a “This is how things are going to happen once we know how much money we have.”

Gibson: Can I answer that?

Smith: Sure.

Gibson: What I plan to do is share the priorities for Academic Affairs. I would like for the Faculty Senate to understand what the Total Request Budget was—it's like this—and how much we actually have, as Jerry [Faculty Senate Chair **Smith**] has alluded to. But most importantly, for you to understand the priorities for Academic Affairs.

Peters: And just a quick follow-up, would we—would we be able to get a sense of some of those Proposals that maybe you're leaning toward and also some that you think, “Well, maybe this isn't as high on our priority list.” Because I can just say that from my own standpoint on the [Faculty] Senate, one of the things that makes it easier for us or actually one of the things I think would make it easier for us, one of the things that made it difficult for us in the past to participate in budgeting discussions is we don't

always have a sense of what the alternatives are. You know, sometimes things come before us, and it's sort of like, "Here's this one—here's this Proposal. Do you support it or oppose it?" Well, it's useful to know what the alternatives are, you know. And so I just—I think we'd have a more productive session if we can have some sense of that.

Gibson: Yeah. Yeah. I mean, what—for Academic Affairs, and I think, you know, Michael **Hager** will give an overview pretty much of the entire requests. What I will do is speak directly to Academic Affairs, and I do want you to know, as I said, what the full request was and how we have prioritized that, and that priority list is still more—will cost more than what we have. And so to get your thoughts on, you know, "Here's our—here's what I have designated as, or we have designated—Academic Affairs—as priorities. How do you feel about those priorities?" But, believe me, there are plenty of options, you know. There's just—there are a lot of requests.

Smith: Faculty Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: And just to put it in context, based on the Governor's Budget, when they get everything flushed out and there might be some new money assigned, the requests were roughly 5 times that amount of new money, so not just from Academic Affairs but from all across the campus.

Smith: Yes, and the impression I got this morning was that VP **Hager** would be sharing with us the Proposals, not just from Academic Affairs, but from all across campus, so we'd see the specific kinds of things that were—that had been generated by just about everybody on campus. But I also felt—my impression was this meeting would, in large part, also be focused on "What's the process? What are the steps where in the future—and currently, but in the future, faculty will have a chance for input at the Academic Affairs level and higher?" Ok? So, I think we are—unless there is any other discussion, we are ready to vote on docketing this item. All in favor of doing so, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say "No." And that motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

Smith: At this point it is my responsibility to ask if there is any new business that someone might want to bring before the Senate? Is there any such? Hearing none, we are ready to address the items on today's Docket.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Smith: The first two items on our Docket were both tabled at previous meetings. I'm suggesting that they remain on the table today.

DOCKET 1114, EXTENDED AND SEPARATE EXAM ADMINISTRATION (TABLED PENDING RECEIPT OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION) (**COOLEY/DOLGENER**)

Smith: I'm hoping to put together the information we need to act on #1218/1114, Extended and Separate Exam Administration. Maybe we can do that at next Monday's meeting. It depends on how my time shapes up.

DOCKET 1121, POLICY ON THE ASSIGNMENT AND CHANGING OF GRADES (TABLED) (**O'KANE/EDGINTON**)

Smith: With 1225/1121, the Policy on the Assignment and Changing of Grades. We're waiting on the EPC to respond to the comments we made on this Policy at our last meeting. When they come back to us with revisions, whatever, then we can take that up again.

DOCKET 1124, ADMINISTRATIVE RESTRUCTURING RE. MASTER OF PUBLIC POLICY PROGRAM: CONSULTATIVE SESSION WITH PROVOST **GIBSON** AND INTERIM DEAN **BASS** (REGULAR ORDER) (**KIRMANI/WALTER**)

Smith: The next item on the Docket is one we can act on today, this being Calendar 1228, Docket #1124, Administrative Restructuring of the Masters of Public Policy Program: Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Interim CSBS Dean Brenda **Bass**. Now, as you know, several years back, the [Faculty] Senate requested that it be consulted with and that it have an opportunity to provide input when Administrators propose Administrative Restructurings of Academic Units. Provost **Gibson** and Dean **Bass** have responded quite willingly to this request, hence today's consultative session. So I'm going to ask Dean **Bass** to join us at the table and with any of her colleagues that she thinks would be beneficial, and I want to turn the floor over to her and to Provost **Gibson**, for opening statements, to be followed by questioning and discussion. [to guests] And you guys can infiltrate wherever you can find chairs, I guess. [joking around and light laughter about his "military terminology" as guests move to the table] So, thank you for joining us, Brenda [**Bass**]. And you're welcome to start with an opening statement.

Bass: Well, we appreciate the opportunity to come and talk with the [Faculty] Senate. I want to talk a little bit about the reasoning behind my proposed restructuring, as well as then the process that I've taken so far, up to this point. Along with me, I've brought Donna **Hoffman**, the Department Head of the Political Science Department, as well as Carol **Weisenberger** is here, who is the Interim Director for the Public Policy Program at the moment.

With the retirement last year of the Director of the Public Policy Program, it brought us to a juncture—a decision juncture, if you will. Up to this point, it's been a free-standing program that was run by a Director. And so through looking at the prior Program Review, looking at all the information about the Program, as well as looking ahead, it was my determination that I thought the Program would be stronger long-term, so looking at long-term

sustainability, if it was moved into a Department, if it could have a Department home, instead of remaining freestanding.

So, at that point, I had discussions with the faculty that are involved in the Program, as well as the Interim Director, and then the Political Science Department, to see their general reactions and feelings about that. The Political Science Department was a logical choice given the strong amount of contributions they provide with the Program in terms of courses as well as faculty.

After those discussions, I also consulted with the CSBS Senate to get their input and to get their reactions, and along the way people were supportive of the idea of moving the Program into the Political Science Department. And at that point I also put together what I am calling a “Transition Team” that combines faculty and leadership from the Political Science Department as well as faculty and leadership from what has traditionally been the Public Policy Advisory Board. Is that accurate? [consults colleagues, who reply affirmatively, then with a clarification]

Weisenberger: Coordinating Committee.

Bass: Coordinating Committee, thank you, Carol. And so, to this point, I bring to you the request for a consultation of moving the Masters in Public Policy Program into the Department of Public Policy [*sic*, Political Science]. Thank you, it’s been a long day. Political Science, that’s why I have you [to a colleague] here with me.

Smith: Provost **Gibson**, do you have anything to add to that or...?

Gibson: Not really, only that Brenda [**Bass**] and I have had several discussions. She’s kept me updated, but I think the most important points are that she has had numerous conversations with the faculty and with Political Science faculty, as well as faculty in the MPP Program, and it is important that we look for how we can sustain the Program, and that was definitely stated in the Program Review which took place a couple years ago.

Smith: So, let me open the floor to questions and comments and discussion starting with Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: I wanted to know if there are any GT [Graduate Teaching] Assistantships in the MPP Program? If so, they will probably be transferred to the Political Science Department?

Bass: There are no teaching assistantships at this point. There are some research assistantships, and they would go with the Program as it stands. However, I would point to the Dean of the Graduate College, and I know that assistantships—all of these assistantships are at the granting of the Graduate College.

Licari: The supported students are not going to lose their support as a result of the administrative move.

Kirmani: That's for the current ones to not lose support.

Licari: The current students will not lose. Incoming students, of course, the admissions to the Program have been suspended, and so there are no incoming students this coming Fall [2014].

Smith: Other questions or comments? Senator **Heston**.

Heston: Yeah, if admissions have been suspended, how much confidence do you have that admissions will become a viable number, reach some viable number at a future date? And do you have an idea about when you might begin that process?

Bass: In a moment I'm going to turn to Donna [**Hoffman**] and Carol [**Weisenberger**], if Carol wishes to chime in in terms of the work that the Transition Team has been doing. We have requested—and the [Faculty] Senate's well aware, because you approved it—a one-year suspension of admissions to the Program to provide the Political Science Department what I'm calling "a little bit of breathing room." The Transition Team is

currently working on examining curriculum and making decisions about what that will look like moving forward, in addition to examining perhaps changing the delivery methods of the Program. With that, Donna [Hoffman] I'll ask you if you want to give input.

Hoffman: And the, you know, the process has been a process that we began at the beginning of this year, knowing that this move was going to take place, taking into consideration the recommendations that were made in the external report that have been looked at as well as our charge from the Dean in terms of moving this Program to the [Political Science] Department and looking at curricular issues and delivery issues. And so with the one-year suspension, that gives us time to, this year, consider these issues, put items into place for the curricular process going forward so that we can have a class the following Fall [2015] that we could admit.

Heston: I'm not sure that got—which is—my question is always when you suspend admissions, is there going to be—do you think it will be hard to get back up to a viable population of students?

Bass: Our anticipation is we're targeting a different population of students than the current Program is, and so far what we have—a certain—I mean, nothing is given, but we think there's a high enough demand out there, but we'll be targeting mostly like—and, again, I'd feel more comfortable having the Transition Team. I'm reporting secondly on what I've heard.

Hoffman: And we will know—the current Program has a Rolling Admissions Policy, which is unmanageable from my perspective as the Department Head, and so we are going to move to a Cohort Model in which there would be a cohort of students that move through the Program which would alleviate some of the administrative issues that you have with students entering at various different times. It enables us to, in fact, offer the Program with faculty that we have.

Heston: And how do the populations that you're recruiting from differ from previously?

Hoffman: This is one of the things the Transition Team is considering, and looking at the Program as it is currently where it's primarily traditional students who are on campus and looking at targeted practitioners, say people who are mid-career, professionals--this is an Applied Master's Degree; this is a Masters in Public Policy—who may be wanting to go back to school to get a Master's Degree, and given the location that we are, does it make sense to target practitioners that are across the State? Can we do that from here? Those are things that we're considering in the transition committee right now.

Smith: Any other questions? Comments? [none heard] Then I want to thank both Provost **Gibson** and Dean **Bass** and Professor **Hoffman** for consulting with us. And having done that, I'll recognize Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I move that we endorse the restructuring of the MPP Program by moving it into the Political Science Department.

Smith: Ok, Senator **Peters** has moved that we endorse this.

O'Kane: Second.

Smith: Seconded by Senator **O'Kane**. Discussion of this motion? [none heard] Then I believe we're ready to vote on it. All in favor of endorsing this Proposal, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say "No." [none heard] And that motion carries. Thank you very much.

DOCKET 1125, CONSULTATIVE SESSION WITH BILL **CALHOUN** AND DAVE **MASON**, UNI FOUNDATION (HEAD OF THE ORDER, 3/10/14)
(**EDGINTON/HAKES**)

DOCKET 1126, CONSULTATIVE SESSION WITH SCOTT **KETELSEN**, DIRECTOR OF UNIVERSITY RELATIONS (SECOND IN ORDER, 3/10/14)
(**NELSON/DOLGENER**)

Smith: The next and final two items on today's Docket, Items 1229/1125 and 1230/1126 are both consultative sessions that we'll be having next week with representatives from the Foundation and University Relations, so there's nothing we can or should do with them today, which means that we've completed our work on today's Docket. And this is, in fact, early as I had hoped.

OLD BUSINESS

POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC) DISCUSSION

Smith: However, as I said in my preview email and opening comments today, I'd like us to put the remaining time in today's meeting to good use. In addition to having several curriculum policy matters to address, from our meetings earlier this semester, we also need to respond to the PRC's—Policy Review Committee's—comments on Policy 0.00: Policy, the Policy Process thing which we approved and sent to the PRC earlier this semester. I'd like to talk about this matter before we get going on curricular issues, in part because there's more time pressure but also because we're more likely to reach closure.

And I don't know if you've had a chance to look at—I sent it—I got it from Tim **McKenna**. I sent that email—forwarded it to you all. Hopefully you've had a time--chance to review the PRC's comments and suggested changes.

There were eight comments or suggested changes. Personally, I'd be comfortable with all but one. And the one I'm not comfortable with is not

having any faculty representation on the PRC. Our Proposal had asked for two faculty reps; the PRC is offering zero. I think we can make a good argument for having one representative, and I would—hopefully would make that argument. I think President **Ruud** will support us in this, but I don't think we are going to be able to get more than one representative, and, quite frankly, I don't think we need more than one. So let's talk about this. Thoughts? Comments? Suggestions? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I totally missed that. They took out the faculty reps.? What was the—what was their rationale for that?

Smith: They're—yeah, I can go to the thing and read it for you here [searching through papers]. I could put it up, too, and will in a minute. [reading from marked-up copy of Proposed Policy from **McKenna**]

“During early versions of this revised policy, the current Cabinet, with representatives from UNI employee groups, was not part of the process (or in existence). The policy review process as outlined in this document provides opportunities for input to policy development from faculty members and the entire University community, e.g., through the University comment period(s) and Cabinet review. In light of this, the Policy Review Committee suggested additional consideration of the Committee being similar to the current make-up. All divisions of the University are currently represented on the Committee; and it is only one stage of the policy review process. In the alternative, if it is determined that Policy Review Committee membership must be increased, the Committee suggests an increase of 3 members with equal membership from each employee group, i.e., one member from the faculty, one member from Merit, and one member from P&S.”

So, they're getting on—we had proposed two and kind of suggested that, while it wouldn't be stipulated that we would probably make sure that one of those people were from United Faculty, they picked up on that—at least some people picked up on that to say, “Well, if UF's going to have a rep., then the other bargaining units should as well.” My argument would be, “No we should drop the idea of stipulating a UF rep. or even promising that,

but insist—push for having one faculty rep.” That undermines the argument involving the other bargaining units. And I also feel we could make the case the faculty in any university, this one included, aren’t just another stakeholder. They’re a pretty—very important stakeholder, and, yes, you’ve got somebody from Academic Affairs, but that was what initiated the thing in general. We felt that the Academic Affairs representative on that Committee would be more administrative slant and not necessarily the faculty kind of position, and that’s why we wanted to have faculty there. So, I feel that we should argue for having one faculty member. I think we can make a good case for that, and again, I think that the President would be supportive. He’s ultimately the guy that pulls the trigger on this. How do you feel about that? [heads nodding]

What I would propose to do—I know, Senator **Peters**, you had talked about that last thing regarding where it came from. I personally didn’t have a problem with that, and let me just go back to that. On these things, there’s an initiating kind of Body. We had listed it as the UNI faculty because we, in fact, did initiate this. They said, quote:

“The work of the Faculty Senate in putting this policy together has been exemplary and greatly appreciated. Given the university-wide nature of the subject, though, the Policy Review Committee thought the Office of the President should be listed as the originating body. Maybe there are other ways to reflect the outstanding work of the Faculty Senate with this policy, e.g., maybe the line could read, “Office of the President, in consultation with University Faculty Senate,” or something similar(?)”

And I, personally, didn’t have a big issue with that, but Scott [Senator **Peters**] had suggested that maybe we should hold out for getting ourselves there. Scott, do you want to talk to that?

Peters: Well, I mean, it’s just not true. [light laughter around] I mean, truth should matter, and the fact is this Policy originated with the Faculty Senate. At every stage of the process, it’s been the Faculty Senate that has put forward a concrete Proposal, and that’s not to say that other people haven’t been involved. They’ve been involved a lot. Once we had a

concrete Proposal, we met several times with President **Allen** and with Tim **McKenna** and with Mike [Associate Provost **Licari**], and we met once with the Policy Review Committee. So, I mean, we've been—every—people were involved in this along the way, but at each step where there required a decision to sort of get the next step moving, since there were issues like how many people should be on the Policy Review Committee?—well, we would talk and talk and talk about it, and finally it would be the [Faculty] Senate that would put forward a Proposal. There was a question about how long the period—the review period should be after a Policy gets put forward before it had to be acted upon. And we would talk and talk and talk about it. And President **Allen** and Tim **McKenna**, they didn't suggest a day—a number limit. We suggested a time period. I mean, at every stage that there was a requirement to put forward a concrete Proposal, the University Faculty Senate put forward a concrete Proposal. And so it's just not accurate to say that this originated with the President's Office.

Smith: Other comments? Faculty Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: I'm actually not as comfortable with the thing of backing back down to one rep. either since the way the faculty functions there's two clear areas the Policy might hit. There are those Policies that have primarily to do with academics, and then those Policies that may affect things that are more covered by the Master Agreement. So I also think that we should maintain our push for two representatives, if the other areas are going to have representatives. And I second the idea that I think—I like to be truthful, in a historical context in particular, but I also think that we should reiterate that we really do believe that two is an appropriate number for us.

Smith: So, if we go that route, will you be comfortable with the other bargaining units having reps. as well? Which tends to make the Committee—and this is just a—it's just to review stuff. It's just kind of administrative managing the Policy Review Process. It makes it rather big and unwieldy.

Funderburk: I agree, but I guess where we're standing now I am uncomfortable with the idea of saying that we'd write off one block of our area and would leave that argument for those other areas. In essence, they—we don't have P&S people who are not represented by the area, but we do have faculty who are not represented by the area.

Smith: But isn't it the case that if we had one faculty representative, he or she could address issues regarding faculty in the Master Agreement?

Funderburk: If we pick selectively, yes. [light laughter around]

Smith: Other discussion of this?

Heston: If I could follow up on that, it would sound like we would almost have to—if you're going to have somebody who can deal with issues of the Master Agreement in any thoughtful way, you have to have somebody from UF represent all of us on that Committee essentially, because I don't know—most of us are not immersed in the collective—the Contract—to the same degree that UF members typically are.

Smith: And would you—I'm wondering if—does the Senate feel that if we try to push for the two, are we comfortable then saying, "Ok, fine. Add other members, the members from the other bargaining units."?

Strauss: No, why do we have to do that? Why can't we just say

Smith: Because that's what they're going to come back at and say—and that's what they said here in the comment is "Hold it. If you're going to have that, then the other bargaining units want to be represented as well." Understand, I'm probably going to be the person in the Cabinet that's going to have to make this argument, and I want to have good arguments and ones that—that I can believe in as well. Faculty Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: Since we didn't say anything about the bargaining units, we tell them that's irrelevant at the moment. This is coming from the Faculty Senate. I think the reality is that, as Senator **Heston** pointed out, we're

talking—you can count the number of faculty on campus on one hand who have enough information about what’s going on here and at UF at any given moment, because of the amount of time either one of these takes. It’s just not realistic for one person to be up to speed on all of that with this kind of assignments, so I think we’re shortchanging. But I think we definitely need the faculty on there, because I suspect had there been faculty, we wouldn’t be getting the historical context changes either.

Smith: Ok, now, again. The—Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Well, so to some extent I don’t think it’s our responsibility to push for the rights of other employee groups. So

Smith: I want to be ready to kind of—yeah.

Peters: But—so, I mean—and I will say that when we first proposed this over a year ago, October of 2012, I emailed AFSCME [American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees], the President of S&C Council [Supervisory and Confidential Council], the President of P&S Council [Professional and Scientific Council], you name it. If it was a governing group on campus, they got a copy of our initial proposal. Not one of them asked for a seat on the Policy Review Committee, not one. Now, if they want to ask for it now, that’s fine, but at some ext—to some extent I sort of feel like, you know, it’s not our job to assert other people’s rights. That said, if—I guess, if what I hear you saying, Jerry [Faculty Senate Chair **Smith**], is that the Senate should understand that if we push hard on saying we want 2 people on the Policy Review Committee, then one possible outcome of that is that the Policy Review Committee includes not only faculty but it also ends up, not that we’re proposing it, but that the President or someone else could say, “Well, ok, fine. If you’re going to do that, that’s fine. The faculty gets some seats, but so do P&S or whoever else.”?

Smith: Yeah, and I think that’s what will happen, unless—I mean, the other kicker here is if Tim **McKenna** says, “Oh, my goodness. It’s hard enough to manage this Committee the way it is. And we put two more faculty reps.

on and a P&S and the other reps. on, it's going to be much harder to—the Committee becomes unwieldy and dysfunctional, and then that's going to have to be taken into account.” So

Peters: I guess my sense would be we kind of hashed this out. We thought two faculty members was the right thing to do. The PRC has suggested that no faculty members is the right thing. I mean, I don't know what harm there is in us saying, “No, we're still pretty sure that two faculty members is the right thing.”

Smith: Ok.

Peters: And then it falls onto President **Ruud**'s desk, and he's got both rationales in front of him, and you guys can have a conversation in the Cabinet about it and see what happens.

Smith: Ok. So what I would suggest I'll do is I'll redraft our Policy taking their comments into account, but what—the two that I will not change are the one regarding who wrote it—it's us rather than the Office of the President—and I'll leave standing our request for two members. And then the other things that they've requested I think they were mainly procedural things, and they were taking account—we had—we had kind of wanted this very fast process, and from what you see it just doesn't happen fast. And they're being more realistic about timeframes on this, so I—and I mean, I assume that we're comfortable with those. But if we rewrite it to grant all their recommendations with the exception of those two, you'd be comfortable with that? [heads nodding] And then I'll bring that to the Senate next week. We're meeting next week. And we can pass that or, you know, talk to that, approve that. And then we can get back into—back to the PRC. Are you comfortable with that way of dealing with it? Good enough. Thank you.

CURRICULAR MATTERS DISCUSSION

1. Requesting Reports from UCC/GCCC

Smith: Then, now, we can move on to curricular matters. And first off, I want to make a distinction between policy matters, some of which came to light during our recent review and discussion of curriculum proposals, and a process or procedural matter, one of which also reared its ugly head at that time. And the process or procedural matter I'm referring to is that of making sure that the Senate has convenient access to the information it needs to discharge its responsibilities vis-à-vis curriculum proposals. And I'd like us to address that first because I think it's the one that's going to be the easiest for us to decide on. What I believe we found out earlier this semester is that the University's on-line curriculum system doesn't adequately serve our purposes. It may work fine for other bodies and earlier stages in the curriculum process, but it doesn't enable us to easily review the curriculum proposals as a whole, or to identify the specific proposals that deserve extra Senatorial attention. So, I think we should formulate our needs in this regard, communicate them to the UCC and GCCC, our predecessors in the process, in the hope that they'll be able, in the future, to provide us with the information we need to review and approve curriculum proposals. And my own sense is that the Senate should have the following information when it deals with curriculum packages:

- Minutes of those two bodies'—the UCC and GCCC—meetings at which those proposals were addressed. And I know Associate Provost **Licari** did provide us with UCC minutes. The GCCC minutes were available on their website. I was able to get them, but apparently lots of you weren't aware of that and didn't get them.
- In addition, I think we should ask for summary comments by the UCC and GCCC chairs which highlight major topics of discussion and matters with which the Senate might be concerned. And, again, Associate Provost **Licari** did a very good job of providing us with that. Our—[searching for a name] oh, I'm so bad with names. [name provided by male voice] Shoshanna [**Coon**] was a little bit late in getting us the stuff from the GCCC, but she ultimately did give us

- what we needed. And so if we could have that established as regular practice.
- And finally I think we should have some summary data. And I would suggest data that indicates the number of new courses proposed, courses dropped, new programs, dropped programs, and so forth, and then with details and summaries by College and for the University as a whole, so that we can kind of fairly quickly say, “Here’s what we’re—you know, what’s happening for the curriculum as a whole.”

And I don’t know. Any other suggestions that you have? What do you think about that? About making that kind of an information or request and basically establishing that as kind of practice now for dealing with Curriculum Proposals in the future? Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: I would support that. I think it’s a good idea. Maybe we can insist on that.

Smith: Ok. Senator **O’Kane** [who indicated] does. Senator **Heston**.

Heston: I guess I would like—I know that we get a summary, but I would also like in this list of information or data, if you will—and I know we get minutes, but just a listing of places where there were people still—where objections remained. Even though the UCC voted to approve it, there were objections. And maybe there weren’t any this time, but frankly I’m not likely to go back and read a whole bunch of semester’s worth of Minutes to try and get ready, but I love a summary.

Smith: Yeah. Ok. Very good. Yes, Associate Provost **Licari**.

Licari: And I did try, and maybe I didn’t do as good of a job as I ought to have, but I did try to, in my summary of the UCC when changes

Heston: I mean, where there were issues.

Licari: I tried to identify the places where the UCC had a hard time approving something, or I indicated when the UCC maybe sent something back for Departmental review a couple of times.

Heston: I guess I'm more interested in knowing the people who were objecting.

Licari: Oh.

Heston: I want to know who's objecting to a proposal, and if that objection never gets resolved—that the UCC sends it on forward. And that may not have been an issue this year.

Licari: I don't think we had—we actually didn't have that. Sure.

Heston: So—but I would like to know always if there's a Proposal that is being objected to by some group and who that is.

Licari: So, just for my clarification, would you—if, let's say the UCC voted 42 on something, you would want the vote breakdown?

Heston: No, I don't need the vote on that. I want to know if there's a group out there of faculty who came and said, "We object."

Licari: Oh.

Heston: And the UCC, by majority vote of any kind, chose to send it forward without sending it back.

Licari: Over the objections of some. Ok.

Heston: So that we know who might, of our colleagues, be—have real concerns.

Licari: Ok. Yeah, we did not have that situation, but if we did, then we can

Heston: We have had on occasion.

Licari: Yes, we have.

Smith: Other comments? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: That makes—I think what you’re proposing makes sense, and also, if you think about it, it’s—I mean, basically what you’re saying is that the Curriculum Proposals will come to us as Reports from the Committees, really. And so that all the Undergraduate Curriculum comes as a Report from the UCC, which really makes sense, because we’re next in line as a Report from the UCC. And we’re voting to approve their recommendations or not to approve their recommendations, in essence. That’s kind of how it would be framed as a parliamentary matter. That makes it a little bit—I suppose if you think of it like that, it might make it a little bit trickier because maybe that would mean you should treat the Graduate stuff separately?

Smith: Yeah, it sounds like—I’m sorry—so instead of doing it College by College Packages, we would do an Undergraduate and a Graduate Package with Reports from those two predecessor Committees

Peters: Maybe.

Smith: being what we voted on. But that makes sense.

Peters: It might. It could mean, then I suppose, that you end up with—in the rare circumstance, I guess you could end up with a new course where someone has a problem with listing it as an undergraduate and a graduate, but that, I mean, that could happen anyway. I don’t know.

Smith: Yeah. Senator **Nelson**.

Nelson: We also need to consider the Graduate Council’s role, because they review the Report from the GCCC before we get it.

Peters: Yeah, that's true.

Nelson: So, we don't want to omit that.

Peters: That's true. Yeah.

Smith: Yeah, I've had some wondering about that. It's a side point. So, Associate Provost **Licari**, do you think these are reasonable requests that could—you know, do they impose an undue burden on yourself?

Licari: No, and in fact, I found it useful for my own purposes. I've got reporting requirements after the [Faculty] Senate acts, and so this helped organize my own work, so I found it to be beneficial.

Smith: Ok. So, if the Senate is on board with this, what I'll do is I'll draft a letter to both Associate Provost **Licari** and, I think, Associate Dean **Coon** saying, "Here's what we'd like. The Senate has agreed, and let me know if there are any troubles. We'll work with this. And this is kind of what we expect to be standard practice going forward." Senator **Peters**.

2. Fine-tuning the LeepFrog system

Peters: I have a question for Mike [Associate Provost **Licari**]. Is there an option to change the—or to alter or add things into the systems, into the LeepFrog system?

Licari: Maybe. [laughter around] I have yet to touch bases with Diane **Wallace** in the Registrar's Office, who just attended a working session or conference with the folks from LeepFrog, to do a couple of things. One is to express our institutional dissatisfaction with the software system, but then also to get some added features. So, there's a possibility that we could get some things added or at least have them deliver on what they promised us.

Peters: There is, from our standpoint, a hundred, hundreds of different things that you haven't followed through the whole system, that you—and most of them are minor. I mean, I'm just wondering if there would be a way to sort through—is there something we could add in there that would say, “This is an actual change in Program, not a—this isn't just, you know, we changed the number of one course, and therefore we have to relist the Program.” You know, I mean, is there some field we could put in there that would make it easier for us to sort through that stuff? I don't know.

Licari: You know, I'm not sure, so I can't answer that. My hunch would be there has to be a way to do that in order—because you can already search through the system and call up any changed Programs, any changed courses, only graduate, only undergrad. So, the fact that you can search means that the system already has these things flagged in some way, right? So I would bet there would be some additional sorting mechanism that could be done, even if it's just search on these minor changes that we've defined so that we can look at them and set them aside. It would be incumbent upon the Faculty Senate, though, to come up with those definitions of what would be quote/unquote “minor”—you know, where's the line between what is a minor change that doesn't need a full review, and what's something that's more significant. You know, is it just a catalog description change? Well, some catalog description changes are so substantial that they essentially create a new course where there wasn't one before. But that's up to you guys.

Smith: Any further discussion of this? I think we know how to go forward with that particular aspect of curriculum.

3. Policy-like Curricular Matters (e.g., zero-credit courses; distinction between BA and BS programs; subcommittees from UCC/GCCC/Faculty Senate combined; other ideas to be emailed to Chair **Smith**)

Smith: The other, and I think more difficult curricular topic is the matter of addressing policy-like matters, some of which came up this semester. And two stand out in my recollection: The need to develop a policy regarding

zero-credit courses; and a desire to formalize the distinction between BA and BS programs. I don't know if there are any others that anybody could think of?

I'm going to suggest that we broaden this out to include any other similar issues regarding curriculum policy, rather than waiting for them to arise with curriculum proposals we might encounter in the future. And I'm doing this based on my experience on the [Faculty] Senate several curriculum cycles back when I felt there were policy matters to be addressed, and indeed, at that time, I got the Senate to approve a resolution asking the UCC to study and report back on them. That never happened for various reasons. But the policy matters, to my mind, are still out there. And there may well be others.

So what I'd like to do is for us to open things up and identify any curricular matters we feel merit attention, and then decide how to go about resolving them. And what I'm hoping to do today is not so much finalize, "Here are the things that we think." I'm kind of putting that out, and think about it, and we'll talk about in the future. What I think we might want to do today is think about once we have the set of what we think are policy matters relating to curriculum, how would we want to address them? And when I'm thinking about it, it seems to me there are three possibilities: One is to have a proper subcommittee of the [Faculty] Senate do it. Another is we could ask the UCC and/or GCCC to look into the matters. We did that before with the UCC. Maybe they'd be more capable of doing it this time. And finally, since I believe the Senate will be asked to create a new committee, which will have the responsibility of managing the curriculum, we could ask this committee to take on these policy-related responsibilities as well, although that new committee is going to have a lot of work to evaluate programs, but in the short-term, yeah, I just wanted to put that out as a third possibility. So what do you think about that? Assuming we want to—and we did commit to addressing some of these policy matters about zero-credit courses—I'm suggesting we shouldn't restrict ourselves to that and the two that I talked about. Let's generate them, but right now how would we, once we have the set, how would—what would be the best way of our dealing with them? What do you think? Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: Well, there's another alternative and that's to combine, you know, the UCC and the GCCC with the work of the [Faculty] Senate to look at these collectively, because I'm not really sure that as a Body we have the full perspective that we need to, you know, offer Policy recommendations or changes or whatever would be appropriate. So, if somehow we can link all these Bodies together and subcommittees can be established, that might be the best way to go about it.

Smith: Ok, so the third option is to take members from those other two Bodies with members from the [Faculty] Senate and have it addressed. That's a good point, yeah. [a few voices agreeing "it might"] Other suggestions? [pause] We don't have to decide this today, because like I said, I'm thinking, I'm hoping that some of you will think of curriculum policy kinds of matters that should get this kind of attention, and at a subsequent meeting as we have time, we can bring those up and decide then how we want to have them dealt with. So, if you're comfortable with doing it that way, but not making a formal commitment right now—just wanted you to put it on your plate.

So, with that—ah, I hate to leave early. [laughter around]

Heston: Are you going to ask us for other issues or are we supposed to, like, email those to you? Other things we think should be considered by this group?

Smith: Yeah, email them to me, but I'll try and create opportunities in future [Faculty] Senate meetings, to also come it up—bring it up, again, if we'd have time at the end like we do today. But, yes, I mean, feel free to let me know, and I'll put together or try and put together a list, then share it with everyone. Is there anything else anybody wants to talk about besides the crummy weather? [laughter around]

ADJOURNMENT (4:40 p.m.)

Smith: Then I think we're ready to adjourn. I'll take a motion to adjourn.

Edginton: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Edginton** . Seconded by Senator **Hakes** [who indicated]. Thank you. Remember, next week we're meeting, but it is in CME 109, where we were last semester a lot. Upstairs. In the Center for Multicultural Education. I couldn't get this room for next week for this slot. So we'll be up there. See you all then.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting: Monday, March 10, 2014
Center for Multicultural Education 109AB, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.

Follows are 0 addenda to these Minutes.