

2-25-2013

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 25, 2013

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2013 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, February 25, 2013" (2013). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 39.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/39

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

Regular Meeting
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
02/25/13 (3:30 p.m. – 4:44 p.m.)
Mtg. #1729

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Peters** called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Press present included Blake **Findley** from the *Northern Iowan*, who arrived after the call for press identification and was later recognized.

Provost **Gibson** offered no comments today.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** reminded everyone of the Welcome Reception for President-select **Ruud** this coming Thursday, February 28, from 4:00 to 6:00 in the Gallagher-Bluedorn Lobby.

Chair **Peters** first recognized Vice-Chair **Smith** who polled the room about the possibility of changing meeting rooms for next academic year. Consensus ruled that the Oak Room will remain the location for Faculty Senate meetings for 2013-14.

Chair **Peters** noted that he'll use firm Robert's Rules of Order today to help the process run smoothly. He next brought up a possible issue of language to be added to the new University Relations Policy specifically enabling faculty, staff, and students to offer their own public comments at times. This may need to be visited in the future.

Peters then proceeded to ask if Senators wanted to revisit the Classroom Attendance and Make-Up Work Policy revisions they approved on 2/18/13. A section was revised but not highlighted for their consideration in the

approval process. Senators agreed, and it was later brought up in New Business.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

Minutes for February 11, 2013 were approved by acclamation with no additions or corrections offered.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

NOTE: Some docket numbers were listed incorrectly on the Agenda and are here corrected.

1172 1068 Curriculum changes—Women’s & Gender Studies Program.
Re-docketing to discuss name change to one program track
(Head of docket Feb. 25)

****Motion to docket today immediately preceding 1177/1070 [sic 1073]
(Bruess/DeBerg). Passed.**

4. New Business

1180 1076 Amending the Minutes of January 14, 2013

****Motion to docket today at the head of the docket (MacLin/Swan)
Passed.**

1174 1070 EPC Recommendation regarding changes to the Attendance
and Make-Up Work policy

****Motion to docket Reconsideration of Section A, regular order
(Kirmani/Heston). Passed.**

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1180 1076 Amending the Minutes of January 14, 2013 (**MacLin/Swan**)

**Vote to amend the previously approved Minutes by appending the email.
Passed.

1172 1068 Curriculum changes—Women’s & Gender Studies Program.
Re-docketing to discuss name change to one program track,
immediately preceding Item 1177, Docket #1070 [sic 1073].
(**Bruess/DeBerg**)

**Vote to accept the name change in the Women’s & Gender Studies MA
from *Women’s Health* to *Gender and Wellness*. Passed.

1177 1070 [sic **1073**] Curriculum changes—Geography (regular order)
(**Kidd/Bruess**)

**Motion to divide the question and consider only the undergraduate
program changes (**DeBerg/Terlip**). Passed.

**Graduate program changes tabled.

**Vote to approve undergraduate changes. Passed.

1178 1071 [sic **1074**] Curriculum changes—Math Education (regular
order) (**Kidd/Bruess**)

Question called (DeBerg**). Passed.

**Vote to approve curriculum and program changes to Math Education.
Passed.

1179 1072 (sic **1075**) Curriculum changes—Physics (regular order)
(**Kidd/Bruess**)

**Motion to divide the question between undergraduate programs and the
graduate programs and/or courses (**DeBerg/Neuhaus**). Passed.

**Graduate program changes tabled.

**Vote to approve undergraduate curriculum and program changes to
Physics. Passed.

5. Adjournment [4:44 p.m.]

****Motion to adjourn (Terlip/Edginton). Passed.**

Next meeting:

Date: 03/11/13

Center for Multicultural Education, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 51 pages, including 6 addenda.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 25, 2013
Mtg. 1729**

PRESENT: Melinda **Boyd**, Gregory **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Tim **Kidd**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Kim **MacLin**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter**, KaLeigh **White**

Absent: Karen **Breitbach**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Gary **Shontz**

CALL TO ORDER [3:30 p.m.]

Chair **Peters:** All right. I see that we do have a quorum. So let's come to order.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Peters: Call for press identification. I see no members of the press here on a curriculum-heavy day. I'm shocked that the community wouldn't want to read about the details of that—of our curriculum. [light laughter] There are no members of the press right? I'm not missing anybody? Ok. [more laughter] [Blake **Findley** of the *Northern Iowan* did arrive a little later.]

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Peters: Provost **Gibson**, do you have anything for us today?

Gibson: I don't have anything today.

Peters: Ok.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Peters: Chair **Funderburk**?

Funderburk: The only thing would be to remind everyone that we have the welcome reception on Thursday from 4:00 to 6:00 at the Gallagher-Bluedorn Lobby for President **Ruud**. The program is scheduled to start 45 seconds before 4:15, so you'll want to note that.

Peters: What? [laughter]

Funderburk: I just report it as I got it on the schedule. [laughing]

Peters: I'm going to be there with a stopwatch to make sure.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS

Peters: All right. Let's see. The next up would be me. I'll start actually by turning the floor over to Vice-Chair **Smith** who wants to talk to us a little bit about meeting places for next year.

Smith: Yes, it's been suggested that we might have our regular meetings upstairs in the Multicultural Center, which we've done before. It's a room, I think, about the size of this one. I'm not sure about the logistics of arranging things. We did have kind of an issue of displaying [by projection] that wasn't so good, but I wanted to get your sense of, you know, would that be a better, more appealing place than this? Are you happy here? Strong feelings? Which should I look to reserve for our meetings next year?

Peters: Any thoughts? [long pause]

MacLin: What's wrong with this place?

Smith: Lots of passion? [light laughter] I don't know if there's anything wrong with it.

Peters: The MCE has some windows. There's a little bit of natural light. That's kind of nice, but, you know.

Funderburk: There is one thing wrong with it, and that's the air handling for the audio recording, but I can't swear it's any better upstairs, either.

Kirmani: I think that room is smaller.

Peters: Which one?

Kirmani: That other one.

Peters: Upstairs. [voices commenting quietly to neighbors] Any other?

Smith: If I don't hear strong arguments in either direction, I'll stick with the status quo.

Peters: All right. Well, fair warning. We are going to take our bylaws and Robert's Rules of Order out for a little spin today. So you can look forward to that. That's going to be lots of fun.

A couple quick announcements. I've talked to several people about the recently enacted policy on University Relations, and as you know from an email I sent out, I think it would be in everybody's interest to have language in that policy that makes clear that while faculty, staff, and student governance groups are encouraged to use University Relations to release statements, when appropriate, that they may also release statements on their own as they deem necessary. I don't think, and I want to be very clear, that I don't think this policy was passed with the intent of doing anything to handcuff governance groups from releasing those kinds of statements, but I think it would be in everybody's interests to have that kind of policy in place, and, so far, I've faced no resistance. Nobody I've

talked to about it has given any resistance about making such a change. Maybe it will require some—a push from us in terms of a formal proposal, and if it does, we'll go down that road. But I just wanted to let you know that we have been talking about that.

The next thing is the Attendance and Make-Up Policy, and we need to decide what to do with that. As I emailed you late last week, Section A of the Attendance and Make-Up Policy was altered by the EPC [Educational Policies Commission], but in the report that came to us, our attention wasn't drawn to that change, and I have up here just a reminder of what the EPC did there. They took out the last two sentences. [see Addenda 1, 2, and 3] What's on the bottom here is what is currently in the policy. The EPC took out the last two sentences of Section A-1. I didn't notice it. I don't know if anyone else noticed it, because it wasn't highlighted by the EPC. But that's what we passed, and that's what we passed along to the Policy Review Committee, and that's what will be passed along to the President unless we indicate some desire to make changes. The University Council Tim **McKenna** drew my attention to it, so, you know, that's what we pay lawyers for—is to notice such things. So I wanted to get your sense of what we should do here. If everyone's ok with this, and maybe I'm the only one who didn't notice it, and all of you read it carefully and noticed that it had been changed, then my bad, and we'll just let things go forward. If people feel that it deserves a discussion, then the appropriate option is to introduce a motion to amend a decision previously approved, and that can just be docketed. We can introduce that in New Business, and it can just be docketed in regular order. Until we made that change, though, the proposal would go forward to the Cabinet unless we took some other action asking them not to. Mr. **Yowler**.

Yowler: [begins to speak]

Peters: Can you say your name for our transcriptionist?

Yowler: My name is Jaime **Yowler**. I'm with Student Government. I have a statement from the EPC about the rationale behind the changes, if I could read that?

Peters: Sure.

Yowler: “The changes were made to simplify the language and give the faculty a few more days in which to distribute the policy. The older version includes language about strongly recommended policies and indicating that no penalties can be given if the policy isn’t distributed on the first day. The EPC determined that the statement in the new version makes it clear that if the attendance and make-up work policies are not distributed by the end of the week that students cannot be penalized for absences or missed work.” Thank you.

Peters: Ok. So what’s your sense on this? I need some feedback here. What should we do? Let it go through? Is anyone—if—I guess the option is—yes, Senator **Heston**.

Heston: Could we see exactly what the other language is that’s been

Peters: This is the current language in the Policy. [see Addendum 1]

Heston: Right. I want to see what the new language is. [voices clarifying]

Peters: The new language is right there.

Heston: Ok.

Peters: That’s it. That’s section 1 right there, just the one sentence. So they dropped the last two sentences, and they changed “first day of class” to “end of the first week of instruction.”

Heston: I guess my only concern is I don’t see anything that would require faculty to abide by anything that protects students from having faculty institute penalties for missed absences. It does not say in the new version that they can’t do that. It may be implicit, but

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Doesn't the subsequent language take care of that, though? I think what they did was break it up.

Heston: Did they move it down? [voices attempting to clarify]

Yowler: The penalties

Peters: Yeah, go ahead, Jaime.

Yowler: The penalties, I think, now fall under #3, and the language included in 3 was "require the professor to make sure that the student is protected from penalties if the policy wasn't distributed in the first week." [see Addendum 2]

Peters: No, I don't think it—what—section 3 is the section that deals with attendance at classwork in someone else's class and one's obligation to—a professor's obligation to allow make-up work for things that are required in someone else's class, aren't they? Isn't it? [voices weighing in] Senator **DeBerg.**

DeBerg: Ok, so the issue is whether or not it's the first day of class or the first week of class, is that the issue?

Peters: And then also these last two sentences which says [somewhat paraphrasing] "while it's strongly recommended that all faculty members have written policies, these policies are not required, but when they are not provided in writing at the start of classes understood there will be no grade-related penalties" etcetera, etcetera. [see Addendum 1]

Heston: Well, I'm fine with the end of the first week of class, but I'm concerned that the other specification that if you don't distribute something you can't hold students accountable is not part of the new policy. They can still go through the grievance policy, but I think that that opens up the potential for a lot more grievances.

Peters: Is that a concern worth discussing in more detail, I guess is my question? Can I get a sense from Senators?

Gallagher: Yes, I think so. [others voicing agreement, too]

Peters: Ok, then let's do this. When we get to New Business, I will indicate that it's appropriate at that time for a motion to amend previously approved policy by—let's have the motion state, "by restoring the old version of Section A seen here on the screen." [see Addendum 1] Does that sound right? We can docket that in regular order. We will then consider it at our next meeting. Is that ok with everyone? Ok. Any other comments or thoughts on that?

Neuhaus: Chair?

Peters: Yes, Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: You know, when you—that would still allow us to go back to that wording for that first sentence?

Peters: It would. Right. So if we would reject—if we were then to reject that motion, then this language, which we've already approved, would remain in effect.

Neuhaus: Ok.

Peters: Does that make sense? [heads nodding] I think that was all I had in terms of comment time.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Peters: The February 11, 2013, Minutes are up for approval. Everyone's had a chance to review them? Are there any additions or corrections to the February 11th Minutes? Seeing none, can we consider those approved by acclamation? If there's no objection, we'll consider them approved. [none heard]

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1172 for Docket #1068, Curriculum changes—Women’s & Gender Studies Program, Re-docketing to discuss name change to one program track (Head of the docket Feb. 25)

Peters: Next up is Items for Docketing. We have the Women’s and Gender Studies Program, as you know, to discuss a name change to one program track. We’re re-docketing it. I have a slight change in the recommendation for docketing, though. Rather than a motion to docket at the head of the docket—the reason for this will be obvious in just a moment—I’d ask for a motion to docket it immediately preceding Item 1177, Docket #1070 [sic 1073]. Can I get a motion to that effect? Senator **Bruess**, thank you. [who indicated] Is there a second. Seconded by Senator **DeBerg** [who indicated]. Is there any discussion about this? [none heard] All in favor of docketing the name to the track change in Women’s and Gender Studies program immediately preceding Calendar Item 1177, Docket #1070 [sic 1073], please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] All opposed, please say, “No.” [none heard] The motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

AMENDMENT TO MINUTES OF JANUARY 14, 2013

Peters: Now, for New Business, before we get to the Attendance and Make-Up Policy, we have another item of new business. And for that, I’ll recognize Senator **MaLin**.

MaLin: Ok, I was not at the meeting where we approved the Minutes for January 14, because otherwise this would have just been a simple thing that I would have added when we were approving the Minutes. So what I’m asking is that we amend the Minutes from January 14, 2013, by appending a copy of an e-mail from Adam **Carros**, who is the News Director of KCRG, to Cathy **DeSoto**. [see Addendum 4] This is documentation about the information she gave us that day about who told who what about contacting her for a quote for the news story. It’s a—do you—oh, there it is [now projected for all to see]. It’s a simple e-mail. I think it would have

been a simple amendment to the Minutes at the time, but I was not here at that meeting. Are there any questions?

Peters: So the motion at the moment is actually to docket this at the head of the docket today.

Swan: Second.

Peters: The motion is seconded. By our bylaws, in order to discuss something at the head of—if something is brought up in New Business to be discussed at the head of the docket that same day, it must pass with a two-thirds majority. Is there any discussion about docketing this immediately? Ok. All in favor of docketing this item for action at the head of the docket today, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] All opposed, please say, “No.” [none heard] [Assigned Calendar Item 1180, Docket 1076]

RECONSIDERATION OF APPROVED EPC RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ATTENDANCE AND MAKE-UP WORK POLICY

And then we have one more quick item of new business then. That would be the motion to amend the previously approved Attendance and Make-Up Policy by reinstating the old version of Section A, and we could do that in regular order. Can I have a motion to that effect?

Kirmani: So moved.

Peters: Senator **Kirmani**. Is there a second?

Funderburk: Clarification?

Peters: Yes, Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: Reinstating it as a clause, or “the end of the week,” they just wanted some added language.

Peters: The motion would be to amend by replacing Section A with the old version of Section A. In discussing that motion, we could then make any changes we wanted to make at that point. Is there—Senator **Heston**.

Heston: I was just going to second Senator **Kirmani**.

Peters: Thank you. The motion's been made and seconded to docket this in regular order. Is there any discussion about that? [none heard] All in favor of docketing that in regular order, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] All opposed, please say, "No." [none heard] And I will send out—when the Agenda goes out with that on it, I'll send out some kind of explanatory note and gives people a head's up so that the veterans know that this is only one part of the Policy that we're reconsidering. It has nothing to do with the decisions we made last week.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1076, AMENDING THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 14, 2013, HEAD OF THE DOCKET FEBRUARY 25, 2013 (**MacLin/Swan**)

Peters: Ok, now we get to Consideration of Docketed Items leading off with Senator **MacLin**'s motion, so I'll just go ahead and recognize you. Any further description you need to make about that?

MacLin: Do you [to all Senators] need further description of what I'm referring to?

Neuhaus: What was the date again?

MacLin: It was January 14 Minutes.

Neuhaus: Ok.

DeBerg: Can we see the text on screen?

Peters: The text of the—oh, shoot, I think I closed it. This was the text of the transcript [projected].

DeBerg: Right.

Peters: And I think I just accidentally closed the text of the email.

MacLin: In the email, Cathy [**DeSoto**] asks “who told you I was unavailable for comment?” And he [Adam **Carros**] wrote back and said, “That was Stacy **Christensen** of the Office of University Relations.”

DeBerg: And what’s the date of that email?

MacLin: That email is dated November 9th, 2012.

Peters: [email now once again projected] Is there further discussion of this? [none heard] All in favor then of amending the previously approved Minutes by appending this email, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say, “No.” [none heard] The motion carries.

DOCKET #1068 CURRICULUM CHANGES—WOMEN’S & GENDER STUDIES PROGRAM, RE-DOCKETING TO DISCUSS NAME CHANGE TO ONE PROGRAM TRACK, IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING ITEM 1177, DOCKET #1070 [sic 1073] (**Bruess/DeBerg**)

Peters: All right. That takes us to Women’s & Gender Studies. So, Professor **MacGillivray**, if you’d like to join us again, this should—I think it will be quick and painless. Senators are aware of the situation here that, after additional consultation since we last met, Women’s & Gender Studies and HPELS have agreed to rename what was previously referred to as the *Women’s Health Track* within the MA program to *Gender & Wellness*. Is that correct?

MacGillivray: That’s correct.

Peters: Is there—are there any questions or any discussion of that?
Senator **Heston**

Heston: I'm curious as to why there was further consultation after this Body had approved what was already put forth?

MacGillivray: I would say that this was done as a courtesy to HPELS. HPELS was concerned with the use of *Women's Health* as the name of our track, and we wanted to, as a courtesy, extend to them the possibility of discussing a change, which we did. And we came up with a title that everyone was in agreement with. So

Heston: But previously, if I understood the discussion correctly, you'd had that consultation, and they had approved the previous.....?

MacGillivray: Yes. Just to remind you, I was not in this position last semester, so I did not personally do the consult with them. Dr. Barbara **Cutter** did the consult with them, but it is my understanding, to answer your question, that, yes, a consult was done previously with them, and they did not at that time have a problem with the name, but subsequently they took issue with it, and so, as I say, as a courtesy, we were happy to try to change that, and we came up with a change that was agreeable to both parties.

Heston: And we're certain that the Wellness faculty will not object to the use of *wellness*?

MacGillivray: Well, I haven't heard anything from the Wellness faculty so far, so my fingers are crossed.

Peters: Secretary **Edginton**.

Edginton: I'd like to read a statement that will hopefully clarify this from the perspective of the School of HPELS. It was prepared by Dr. Doris **Corbett**, who is the Director of the School [of Health, Physical Education, and Leisure Services], and it has been extracted from a letter that was sent to Provost **Gibson**. And Dr. **Corbett's** asked me to read it on her behalf.

[statement read with some slight paraphrasing; for full statement, see Addendum 5]

The restructuring of the Women's and Gender Studies Master's program proposal calls for two focus areas currently being described as "women's health" and "violence prevention." While the faculty in the School of Health, Physical Education and Leisure Services (HPELS) did look this proposal over initially, they do not recall a clear title of "women's health" being used which would have been a major concern from the perspective of our faculty. Women's health is a specialization area in community health promotion, being clearly recognized as one by our professional community, and being a specialization that requires a number of fundamental competencies and skills be developed in students in order to seek employment in this area.

The proposed Master's degree will not be able to deliver these competencies as currently structured. Student's graduating with that degree will be "Women's Studies" students, not "Women's Health" graduates. Representing the degree as "Women's Health" would clearly be misleading to these students and to anyone in women's health fields seeking to hire health educators with a women's health background. When this proposal was first examined, the title was not "Women's Health," or our faculty would have not agreed to the proposal. The title includes references to international and global health and gender issues and violence, not clearly, "women's health."

The proposed title of "Gender and Wellness" is entirely acceptable to the faculty in the School of HPELS.

[end of statement read by **Edginton**; see Addendum 5 for submitted statement]

MacGillivray: I would just like to add for the record that the documents that I have seen, which I understand to be the documents that were shared in the Fall for the consult, did, in fact, clearly list that the title was *Women's Health*. Now, again, at this point, you know, I'd like to set that aside. I do

want to clarify and make a correction for the record. I don't think the statement that you just read is entirely accurate. Having said that, again, I think at this point we are all happy to just set that aside and move forward. And we are happy with the name *Gender and Wellness*, and we hope that everyone will be willing to vote in favor of the change.

Peters: And for the Senators' sake, I'll just say that, as Chair, I'm satisfied that consultation happened as it should have before the [Faculty] Senate acted.

MacGillivray: Thank you.

Peters: Is there any further discussion? [none heard] All in favor then of changing the name of the program track in Women's & Gender Studies—the Master's in Women's & Gender Studies from *Women's Health* to *Gender and Wellness*, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say, "No." [none heard] The motion carries. Thank you, and I want to thank especially—I can't even thank the number of people who had to act on this within the past week, but the CHAS Senates, the SBS Senates, the UCC, the GCCC, and the Grad Council all took email votes on this so that this could be passed by us this week, so thanks to all of those folks for doing this.

MacGillivray: Yes, thank you from us as well.

DOCKET #1070 [sic 1073], CURRICULUM CHANGES—GEOGRAPHY, REGULAR ORDER (**Kidd/Bruess**) [see: [geography_curriculum_2012_revised_ucc.pdf](#)]

Peters: All right. And now Geography is up next, so if our representatives from Geography want to join us at this table, we'd welcome you here to talk about your program changes. [guests exchange places] If you could go ahead and introduce yourselves for all the Senators who might not all know you.

Pease: I'm Patrick **Pease**. I'm the Head of the Department of Geography.

Petrov: I'm Andrey **Petrov**. I'm a Chair of Geography Curriculum.

Peters: And I think probably the simplest thing to do is to start out by summarizing the program changes for us, you know, in 5 minutes or so. Highlight anything you might want us to look at, but, you know, we've all seen the proposal, so you don't need to go into all the details, but just give us the overview.

Petrov: So we deal with BA and BS today, right?

Peters: Well, Senators should be aware that the graduate portion of the curriculum has not gone through the Graduate [College] Curriculum Committee [GCCC] or the Graduate Council. So I think the best thing to do is to have a motion to divide. We'll table the graduate stuff, and we'll deal with the undergraduate stuff.

DeBerg: Do you want that motion now?

Peters: Sure, what the heck? Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I move that we divide the motion between undergraduate programs and graduate programs.

Terlip: Second.

Peters: Seconded by Senator **Terlip**. All in favor, please say, "Aye." Or, sorry, is there any discussion about that? [none heard] All in favor then, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] All right. So, dealing with the—if there's no—if there's no—if there's no one opposed then, we will table the graduate curriculum discussion for another day. Any opposition to that? [none heard] All right. Let's—ok, if you could lead us through the undergraduate curriculum changes then, thank you.

Petrov: Yeah, thank you very much. So, we present a number of changes, and some of them more sufficient than others. So, we present changes to the Bachelor of Arts in Geography program based on last year process that

has been suspended at this time, and we proposed changes that addressed that that would sort of recast the program in a way that it sort of maintains the success that we had with the program that existed. And maybe Patrick [Pease] will tell you a little bit more what structural changes have been made and what have been improved, I guess, in that curriculum proposal.

And the second is our Bachelor of Science in Geographic Information Science. That's not major changes, just we eliminating one of the specialization areas because we lost faculty for retirement, so we don't necessarily offer all the classes available. So, I guess, and the last part is our Minor in Geography. We're just changing the name of it, since we lost our second minor in Geography. It was Geography Teaching. Our current is Geography Liberal Arts, so we don't need Liberal Arts anymore and we remove it, as well as because that name, without Liberal Arts, opens up this minor for students to achieve in GIS or Geospatial Technology, sort of opportunities in that minor that Liberal Arts does not reflect necessarily the scope of what they're doing. So these are hopefully minor changes. I think maybe Patrick [Pease] would start by explaining a little bit what we did with the Bachelor of Art in Geography.

Pease: Prior to now, our Bachelor of Arts program was divided up as emphasis areas in the Catalog. This was—we had a number of them. We had a Bachelor of Arts, Liberal Arts, one for Teaching, one for Environmental Geography, and we had a program called URSA, which was an urban regional planning program. These all had a very—they had a significant common core, but in the Catalog they were listed as different emphases and therefore listed as different programs. So, eliminating all of those, what we have done is collapse our program down into a single major. Very similar to what we had before but not exactly what we had before. So, if, I don't know—you probably don't have things in front of you, but we've redesigned the program with a common core, and then we have 3 we're calling concentration areas. We're not calling them emphases because of some difficulties with the way that structures the Catalog part of that. But our 3 concentration areas include an Environmental Systems and Sustainability, Globalization and Regional Geography, and Planning and Development, which really reflects the 3 major career paths that people go into from a Bachelor of Arts in Geography. The—can I ask, were we talking

about the Certificate program at all, or was that one out as well because it has a small Graduate component to it?

Peters: I would say that anything with a Graduate component we should probably save for another day.

Pease: Ok. Then the changes we have to the BS program are rather small. We are, as Dr. **Petrov** mentioned—we had 4, what we call, Career Tracks with that. The Bachelor of Science in Geographic Information Sciences has a very large core of primarily computer-based classes in GIS, Remote Sensing, GPS, those sorts of classes. But then there were application areas where—that reflected the major fields in which those technologies and tools are applied. Of the 4, one of them was not particularly popular, and coincidentally and perhaps fortunately, it's also the area where loss of faculty reflect an inability to offer the courses which made it distinct from the other 3. So, in an effort to deal with that, we simply streamlined the program and removed that one focus area, and then reshuffled—what small number of courses existed in that, we reshuffled them back to the other career tracks.

And then the minor is really simply a name change, as Dr. **Petrov** had mentioned. I don't think there's much more to say about that. The—well, I will say something else about it. The minor is largely open, as many minors are. There's only a small number of required courses, which is what Dr. **Petrov** was talking about in terms of opening it up. Traditionally, that would—the minor would have only been students taking Liberal Arts-types of Geography courses, but the name change, I think, opens it up to market it for students that may be looking for a minor in some of the technology-based classes to couple with whatever their major is elsewhere on campus.

Peters: So, just to be clear, we're looking at the—the undergraduate components here are the BA in Geography, the BS in GIS, and then the Minor in Geography.

Pease: Correct.

Peters: And then you had—was there what? One additional course that you had to add?

Petrov: Yes, so as a part of the revisions to BS in GIS, we're replacing the Visual Basic course, originally a Computer Science course, with a Geography—a new course GIS Programming. This is a course that is designed to serve our majors for the most part. That's—the change is associated with two things. One is that Geospatial Technology has moved away from Visual Basic. It is no longer basically utilized for GIS programming. And we have an opportunity, a necessity to—in order to make sure that our program is, of course, the best in the State—offer the specific course that focuses on programming for GIS purposes, meaning that developing GIS interfaces, GIS programs, streamlining, automating GIS processing. This is an important course. I think it's an important addition to curriculum, but, again, it's not really kind of new spot for it. We're replacing the Visual Basic, which is essentially no longer relevant to our students.

Pease: And we have taught the course in 2 cycles already as experimental.

Peters: Are there questions? Vice-Chair **Smith**.

Smith: Two questions. First off, what's your diagnosis of the causes of past enrollment problems with these programs? And the second question is, how or why should we believe that the changes you are proposing will respond effectively to those causes?

Pease: Well, I'll disagree with you of the premise of your question primarily. The problem with the enrollments was the structuring—a significant problem of structuring the Catalog and the splintering of the program into multiple emphases. When you look at that as a collective whole, the enrollments were fairly reasonable. In fact, well, we made a chart. Our enrollments were going up [held up piece of paper; see Addendum 6] up until the time when the program was cut. Now, we're still a small program, but in the length of this period from 2006 until the cut in Spring 2012, we had doubled the size of our majors, doubled the number of majors. Now, of course, this is spread between several emphases, but

collectively, which the new program should reflect this kind of a structure, we don't see this as a particular issue. We were moving in the right track, and we intend to continue to move on the correct track.

Smith: So, the solution essentially is to consolidate from multiple emphases into one and thereby avoid problems with enrollment caps or whatever you want to call them.

Pease: Well, correct, but we're also—we also think it is appropriate for marketing purposes. We think that it might make it easier to coherently market the program rather than trying to market multiple programs. So it is sort of a two-fold solution.

Smith: You anticipate additional marketing efforts?

Pease: Well, we market all the time. We have a—marketing ends up—recruitment ends up being very important for us. We have a very high turnover rate because we graduate typically about 35% of our Department every year, which means we have to build that back up every year. And in order to have the growth that we've had, we've had to build it up plus some. So, it ends up being very important. Since we are a “found major,” most of our students spend 4-5 semesters with us. Some—well, 4-5, yeah, that's about right. They go through the program very quickly, so they usually show up with their Liberal Arts Core finished, and they really are focusing just on finishing the major and university electives. So, they finish fairly quickly. So we have this very high turnover rate, and so it's very important for us to keep recruiting students in. Because of that, we—any disruptions in recruitment do show up very, very quickly. And you see that very, very fast in the—let's look at this one. You see it very quickly, even in this graph [holding up sheet of paper; see Addendum 6], so if you extend it out two more semesters, see that precipitous drop, but it's simply because we were unable to recruit last Spring. Without recruiting—so we lose 35% of our Department. Without being able to build that 35% back by recruitment, then it ends up showing—the blip shows very, very quickly. So, we'll have to market to fill that back up. We do expect it's going to take a couple of years to get back to where we were.

Peters: Secretary **Edginton**.

Edginton: I have a question for Professor **Pease** and Provost **Gibson**. What will present—prevent the Registrar’s Office from identifying emphasis areas as a degree program as opposed to identifying concentrations, you know? I mean, are we really just changing language here? And what will prevent him from, in the future, identifying those concentrations as degree programs? And I guess an added question for the Provost is, “Do we have a structure in place that is coherent so that we can have emphasis areas and not have those count as a degree program?” Because, I mean, we have this running across multiple programs throughout the University and significant revisions taking place because there’s no coherence on that definition or that structure.

Pease: Well, I’ll speak to our end of it. First, I do think it’s important to remember that we—in the restructuring, we did change the characteristics of the program from the individual emphases. They’re not those prior emphases simply collapsed down back in the program. There was some restructuring that was important. The second part of that is our BS program is structured in a similar way. We actually modeled it after the structure of the BS program, which seems to be ok in the Catalog structure in the way they did that. We refer to those various elective blocks as “career emphasis” or “career focus” areas. And so it seems to be ok, but then again I can’t really speak to the future of how that might be divided out.

Petrov: But, sorry, if I could add this. Important to that new program is a structure as a common core of courses and then the concentration areas are basically, you know, different combination of electives, which was not the case. They had their own course. The emphasis got their own things.

Pease: Yeah, each of the prior or previous ones had a core of requirements and then groups of electives, so Dr. **Petrov** is right. Each—everything now has one single common core. And I think that may be part of the difference in the way it’s structured.

Peters: Provost **Gibson**.

Gibson: I don't think that that should be an issue for the Registrar's Office. In my mind, it's more simplistic than it was previously, so I don't think that there should be challenges for students. I mean, that would be my concern, that students would understand the emphasis areas, and I know that there was, you know, not only with this program but other programs, there were some concerns there. So, I don't really see this is as an issue for the Registrar or for the Catalog.

Edginton: Well, the Registrar did define in the past, you know, these emphasis areas as separate degrees, and then when we got into the review process, Academic Program Review process, the number of heads in each one of those areas was diminished by the, you know, the fact that those were separated out, even if there was a common core in place, for all of those emphasis areas. So, it seems to me that, you know, as long as we treat the concentrations differently than we treated emphasis areas, or if there's some general guideline about having a common core and then the concentrations, then I think we'll be ok. But I get a little bit nervous about that because we went through major restructuring in Health and in Leisure to try to deal a way with that issue, and both those programs had a common core in place and then what were defined as emphasis areas. And they got caught up on the rhetoric rather than the nomenclature rather than the substance of really what was going on inside those degree programs.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg** and then Senator **Heston**.

DeBerg: Well, I wanted to comment how helpful it was to really talk about some majors as being "found majors," because that's what our majors [in Philosophy and World Religions] are, and these majors are really different in many ways than majors that people come to the University for. They do have more rapid turnover. You do oftentimes get people who start them their junior year and have to finish quite quickly. The majors tend to, of course, see their students through to graduate, though. Graduate high percentages of the people who do elect that major. So they're really good homes once people find them. But I think we always need to keep in mind the differences in how people end up in majors. What it means for the

major in terms of having to play catch-up after each graduation cycle, for example. So—and I'd never heard them called "found majors" before, so I wanted to thank you for that term, and I want to highlight them, because there are clearly found majors at our University and not-found majors at our University.

Peters: Senator **Heston**.

Heston: I have a question and then kind of a broader comment for responding to Senator **Edginton**'s comments. I would like to know the concrete numbers, not the percentages, so what was your total enrollment. Don't get into emphases but total enrollment in 2006 versus what is your total enrollment in 2011 before you went on to hiatus, just so we can hear more concretely what the growth is? And I want to pick up on Senator **Edginton**'s comments and suggest that perhaps this whole notion of "what is an emphasis?", "what is a focus area?", "what is a concentration?", what is a whatever? The Catalog is full of different ways of labeling these things, and, yes, there might be a common core, but is the core a 6-hour core and then really have separate majors? Or is it a 30-hour core, and then you have 9 hours of electives that let you specialize. I think that that's a key difference. And I would suggest that this is an issue for the Curriculum Committee to take very seriously and come up with some common way or some clear way of deciding whether something is really a new major because it really has a whole lot of courses that are unique to it, or whether it's simply a good common core and it's got some electives where people can specialize. And without that guidance from the Curriculum Committee, I think we're going to face this same issue over and over again, regardless of what the Registrar does or doesn't do. So, question and then general comment.

Pease: The enrollment change was 25 to 51.

Heston: Ok. Thank you.

Pease: So slightly better than doubling.

Heston: Yeah. That's very helpful to me to know the numbers.

Pease: That was just the BA. Bear in mind that we also have a BS degree.

Heston: But there was nothing—no issue with the BS is how I understood it.

Pease: No. But it does add to the size of the Department. And there is some sharing of classes associated with those two.

Kirmani: Is that all 4 years?

Pease: Pardon?

Kirmani: Is that for all 4 years of number of students admitted?

Peters: That was total number of majors.

Kirmani: All 4 years, total number of majors.

Pease: Yes, although 4 years, no. But, yes, total enrollment in that particular major.

Kirmani: I have a couple of questions.

Peters: Senator **MacLin's** next in line, and then I'll

MacLin: My comment is a bit stale because I didn't get in line fast enough, but I would just like to reiterate that in fact Geography—as someone familiar with the marketing materials of the Departments in my College [College of Social and Behavioral Sciences], that Geography has long had very excellent marketing materials, excellent presence at the Career Fairs and the Up-Close UNI and all of those sorts of things, in some instances far and ahead of the other Departments in our College. And they've always taken marketing extremely seriously because of that found major issue. They need to inform students about how timely this degree is and, in fact, that they will get a job after graduation. The parents have been quite happy with learning more about the degree at these various fairs. And if

they are not already part of the documentation, I'd like to have those two charts that you showed appended to the Minutes. [see Addendum 6]

Peters: Could you email those to me after the meeting? Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: I wanted to know. You used to have a cross-numbered course with the Math Department, Spatial Data Analysis. Are you keeping it?

Pease: Uh huh. Yes.

Kirmani: Is it still there?

Pease: Yes.

Kirmani: Ok. The second question which I had was that does the Registrar's Office write the concentration of this in the class lists?

Peters: I don't know the answer to that.

Pease: They do in our BS degree, so I assume that they would be in here as well. It's a—the way it works with our BS is it's a degree in Geographic Information Science, but it does note the focus area.

Kirmani: Then they call the number separately in that case?

Pease: Well, the way it's actually numbered is by letters. The BS is 97A, 97B, 97C. The old structure was 970, 971, 972. It seems that using the letters it works better. I don't know what the programming reasons for these things, but it seems to work better with that common core and then using different numbering structure. The idea of the common core is very important to the way it's structuring, rather than repeating a core over and over.

Peters: Before we proceed, Sherry [**Nuss**, transcriptionist] just handed me a note. Blake [**Findley**], are you here as a reporter?

Findley: Yes.

Peters: Ok. The Minutes should reflect that Blake **Findley** from the *Northern lowan* is attending now. Thank you, Sherry. Ok, so with that interruption, where were we? Is there anyone else in the queue? Senator **East**.

East: I'd just like to double check on consultation. I notice you have Environmental Studies and Sustainability emphasis or whatever it's called. I notice that you deleted the CS class. Were those things, both those—if the Environmental and Sustainability is a new title or—I assume that consultation occurred in all of these cases?

Pease: Yes, it is a derivative from our former Environmental Geography program, but the consultations were done over email because the system was not functioning at the time when we did these things. Or maybe Dr. **Petrov** can speak more specifically to that?

Petrov: So, yeah, I mean, we did consultations, I guess, with a variety of parties, including Computer Science and they said it is kind of a necessity to replace a course, I guess, in that way. And also we had a consultation with Bill **Stigliani**. I guess that's

East: With who?

Petrov: Bill **Stigliani**, the Sustainability. We also asked his permission to add the class that he teaches, so one of the classes in that concentration is Introduction to Sustainability that he is teaching. So, we think that this program will serve a very important purpose on campus, because, we're not just looking into the environmental process but also the sustainability as a part of it. So, I think that's what we did.

East: And you also consulted with Computer Science?

Pease/ Petrov: Yes. (simultaneously)

Peters: Yeah, that was the first one up there, I think. [projected]

Petrov: Yeah, just scroll a little bit, and you will see the actual response that's my report back, yeah. So that's the latest communication I had on that.

Peters: "Has impact, No objection," it says.

East: I'm usually aware of those things, and I wasn't on this one.

Peters: Other questions? Seeing none. Shall we proceed to a vote? Oh.

Coon: [Shoshanna, Associate Dean, Graduate College] I do have a question.

Peters: Yes.

Coon: The course GIS Programming is listed as a 4000/5000 level course, along with the rest of the graduate package. GCCC and Graduate Council have not seen the course.

Peters: We've divided out the graduate—we've divided out—we're only looking at the undergraduate.

Coon: Ok. But it is included in the BS. That course is included as a required course in the BS as the replacement for Visual Basic. [see pg. 17 of document at: [geography_curriculum_2012_revised_ucc.pdf](#)]

Peters: There's a new 4000/5000 course? Is that what you

Coon: The Geography 4390 is also 5390 and is a new course.

Petrov: Yeah, it is 4390 but also 5390.

Peters: Oh, ok. I didn't see that.

Petrov: I'm sorry I forgot to enter that number.

Peters: So, this course here [on projected screen], Geography 4390 is also being listed as 5390? That's what you are saying? [**Coon** and **Petrov** both agree.] Ok.

Pease: Perhaps we can split that as well and just readdress the graduate number when we bring graduate changes?

Peters: Is there any objection to—Senator **Terlip**?

Terlip: Wouldn't that fall under Betty's [**DeBerg**] motion split the graduate off anyway?

Peters: How about if the Chair rules that?

Terlip: Ok. [laughter around] Betty agrees to _____ .

Peters: That the—we're only considering it as an undergraduate course at this time. Any other questions at this moment? Seeing none, then we'll proceed to a vote. All in favor of the undergraduate program in Geography—that would be the restructuring of the BA in Geography, the restatements of the BS in GIS, the restructuring of the Minor in Geography, and the creation of a new undergraduate course in GIS programming, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] All opposed, please say, "No." [none heard] The motion carries. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Pease: Thank you. Should I send the graphs to you? [Addendum 6]

Peters: You can send that to me, yeah, that would be fine. Thanks.

Petrov: Thank you.

DOCKET #1071 [sic 1074], CURRICULUM CHANGES—MATH EDUCATION, REGULAR ORDER (**Kidd/Bruess**) [projected through CourseLeap and not available for display here]

Peters: Next up, we have Math Ed. [guests changing seats from audience to table] Keep ‘em rollin’. And now we get to use CourseLeap [new software on campus] which I know everyone has been waiting for. [light laughter]

Neuhaus: We should have started that half an hour ago. [bit more laughter] I actually logged into this in my office, so we’ll see if it still recognizes me now that we’re here. I didn’t even think of that. [Someone says: “It’s a good test.” And it did project successfully for all to view.] Ok, we have Professors [Doug] **Mupasiri** and [JD] **Cryer** here. Wait a minute. I guess I just introduced you, so I guess you don’t need to introduce yourself. Professor **Mupasiri**, of course, is the Department Head in Mathematics. Professor **Cryer** is in—Department Head of Curriculum and Instruction?

Cryer: No. Elementary—Coordinator of Elementary Teacher Ed.

Peters: Coordinator of Elementary Teacher Ed. And, again, can we just start off the same way we did with the Geography package and have you summarize the changes for us?

Mupasiri: Do you want to go first? [to **Cryer**] Or I can go. I’m sorry, one of my colleagues here had to leave. He is teaching a course in Waterloo on the overload which is offered through Continuing Ed., so it only meets once a week. He had to go. Students first, so we say. [light laughter around] So, what we have here are changes that were necessitated by a new requirement from the State of Iowa to add a content course to our Elementary Education Major. So, we used to have two math content courses and then a methods course. The requirement was that that was not enough math. We had actually been pushing for that locally here, but then the State stepped in, and what we have simply done here is to accommodate that requirement. So, the courses that you see up there [projected] listed as Mathematics Reasoning for Elementary Teachers I. That course used to be Mathematical Reasoning for Teaching I. A course

that you see listed as Mathematical Reasoning for Elementary Teachers III, used to be Mathematical Reasoning for Teaching II. What we did was to introduce a new course which is the one in the middle of those courses there. And once we did that, we couldn't use the same names, and so we had to have new numbers. And it also meant that we had to reshuffle some of the topics that were done in the first course and in the third course, because now we had a new course in the middle.

An important part of the requirement for licensure was that there be a significant amount of algebra taught in the new course, that there be a significant amount of probability and statistics taught in the new course, so we have accommodated that. But that left us still with room to bring some of the stuff that we used to do in the first course and expand that and include it in the second course and also to move some of the stuff we used to do in what used to be the second course which is now the third course.

All the other changes that we have done are really pretty much because of these changes that I've just referred to here. So we have our prerequisites, for example, now changed to reflect the new course. We are requiring all the subsequent courses we had to have to the previous course as prerequisites, so those are the changes that we made there. So that's what's happening with the Math Minor.

Now with the other, just Elementary Ed. Majors, all that's happened there is that the new course is now required for all Elementary Ed. students, so we made a similar change there. They're going to take the courses I, II, and III just as indicated there, and they have the methods course. Now, something that may be a little bit strange here was that the requirement went into effect in Fall 2011, and we had at that time a course that the students in the Minor used to take, but which didn't used to be required for just Elementary Ed. majors. And we used that course, because it had some probability and some statistics in it, as a holding course while we were setting up this new course. And then we, in fact, set up the course under a 1059 number, which was an experimental number—so we've actually run this new course now as an experimental number. And that may be the only thing that might look a little strange here. We also have reduced the number of hours in that old course that we were using as a stand-in course,

it was a 4-hour course. We reduced it to 3 hours, because it is also in the sequence for Math minors. They have to do the 3 courses and then that new course and then that old course on top of that. So, they won't need to do 4 hours as we had in the old course. So, we did a credit hour reduction there. But those are basically the changes that we made, really basically necessitated by the State requirement, and the other changes we just accommodate that requirement.

Peters: Anything to add, Professor **Cryer**?

Cryer: No. Very well done. [light laughter around]

Mupasiri: And we did this in full consultation with

Cryer: Yes, yes. And our Elementary Senate voted, and passed it.

Mupasiri: It's their major, so

Cryer: Yeah, the motion carried for us.

Peters: Questions? About the Math Ed. changes?

DeBerg: I call the question.

Peters: All in favor of proceeding to a vote, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] All opposed, please say, "No." [none heard] The motion on the table is to approve the course and program changes to Math Education. All in favor, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No?" [none heard] The motion carries. Thank you very much.

Mupasiri: Thank you very much. We appreciate your help.

DOCKET #1072 [sic 1075], CURRICULUM CHANGES—PHYSICS, REGULAR ORDER (**Kidd/Bruess**) [projected through CourseLeap and not available for display here]

Peters: And finally, Physics. [guests once again swap seats up to the table] Ok. Let me get Physics up here [on the projected screen through CourseLeap] and ready to go. Joining us at the table we have Cliff **Chancey**, the Chair of the Physics Department, and Senator **Kidd** is here as well to talk about the curriculum changes to Physics. Senators should be aware that we have a similar, though less—*serious* might not be the right word—but we have a similar situation with regard to some Grad. Council consulting with the Physics Major. But there are no program changes. There are no graduate program changes issues here. Instead, there are two cross-listed or 4000/5000 level courses that have yet to be reviewed by the Graduate [College] Curriculum Committee [GCCC] and by the Grad Council, and so what the Physics Major would ask us to do would be to approve the undergraduate program changes and the courses in so far as they can be taken by undergraduates and then we can revisit the 5000 level listing of the courses once the Grad. College has approved them.

DeBerg: Point of information. Is the Grad. Curriculum Committee and Grad. Council continuing to meet on curricula, even now?

Peters: Yes.

DeBerg: Wow.

Peters: Yes. Everyone has been working to expedite the restructuring of those programs that were slated for restructure last year. And then, of course, there—well, I guess Grad. Council might not be ready for the normal cycle quite yet, but it will get there soon. So, if we could start. Once again, I suppose we'll need a motion to divide the question and approve all the undergraduate changes and separate them from the 5000 listing of those two courses.

DeBerg: I'll move to divide the question between undergraduate programs and graduate programs and/or courses.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**. Is there a second to that motion?

Neuhaus: I'll second.

Peters: Seconded by Senator **Neuhaus**. All in favor of dividing the question, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say, "No." [none heard] And then, much like last time, is there any objection to then tabling the second part of that, the 5000 listing of those two courses for—that we will take up at a later time? [none heard] So the motion before us is the undergraduate program changes and course changes for Physics. And I'll turn it over to the two of you to give us a overview of them.

Chancey: Well, thank you. I will try to be brief. We have quite a few changes in Physics. First of all, to our BS program, with the ending of our BA program in the Spring, our attempt for the BS is to provide flexibility to the BS program, and in doing that, we have added some things that were formerly required and made those electives. Even though we do this, the BS program by hours and by course level, remains a BS program. But it has greater flexibility for those students who might want slightly less emphasis than we'd previously offered.

We have revised to a small part our—I've been just been talking about the BS Physics program. We have revised to a small part the Physics—BA Physics Teaching program to add a course in that brings the experience that Larry **Escalada** has from teaching professional development courses for teachers, to add it into our undergraduate curriculum. And that is the substance of the BA Physics Teaching change.

We are adding in two I suppose what will be called *emphases*. They are honors research emphases, both for the BS Physics and for the BA Physics Teaching programs. And for this we've taken a lead from the Biology Department. We have long in the Department prized undergraduate research, and this merely formalizes for the benefit of our students what

we do. It does not require any more work than we've already been doing. And so there would be an overlay BS Physics Honors Research and the same for the BA Physics Teaching.

We have a request for a new certificate directed to undergraduates, a Physics Teaching Certificate. [some clarifications from Senator **Kidd** about what's to be considered today and what can wait] Ok. I will take what I can get. [laughter around]

Peters: And so the honors—so, I have a question. The honors research programs then, they just have to be listed as separate programs.

Chancey: I think they'd be emphases.

Peters: Emphases within the

Chancey: Yes. And we're comfortable with that. [voices attempting to clarify the wording] Well, I can't remember what we called them, but in the Department we have been scrupulous to avoid proliferation of programs, and we have been particularly scrupulous with the BS Physics program.

Peters: Questions?

Coon: Has the question been divided on this one, too? [several voices responding "yes"; she had been away for a bit of the proceedings] I'm sorry.

Peters: That's ok. That's all right. Other questions? Yes, Senator **Heston**.

Heston: I'll ask Senator **Smith's** question [light laughter around] which is, "Presumably the issue previously that required this program to undergo revision was that there was insufficient numbers from someone's perspective. How will these changes, do you think, address the issue? What were the underlying causes, perhaps, of insufficient numbers? Was it because you had too many emphases, so there was no concentration? Or they were divided? How is this going to make things so that you have a

viable program 3 years from now or 4 years from now, if your enrollment stays the same?”

Chancey: Well, I would expect—excellent question! I would say that we have been in a growing program, though as I think Geography said, we are still small. We had a number of emphases before. Now we have the BS Physics program. As far as what will change 4 years from now, I would say that the Physics faculty have been assiduous in recruitment, whether it is to China, whether it is going out to high schools and seeing students directly. I cannot say enough about the dynamism of the Physics faculty. So, I am confident—I think reasonably confident, that we have turned the corner and are on the upswing.

Peters: You’ll—I’m sure you’ll correct me, if I am wrong, but you—Physics is in a different position than Geography in the sense that you are not a found major, right? You’re a major that actually—people—you have an attrition problem, right? You have people—I mean, not just you, but this is common in Physics programs across the country?

Chancey: Yes.

Peters: Right? That people come and then they

Chancey: We’re—I wouldn’t mind being a

Peters: So retention becomes—retention becomes more of your issue, is that correct?

Chancey: Indeed, and we have

Peters: And some of these changes were aimed at retention, correct?

Chancey: Indeed. In fact, we have a number of courses that—First Year Projects in Physics, that is a retention strategy. In fact, Senator **Kidd** attended an APS, an American Physical Society meeting last year to—Tim, would you like to say anything?

Kidd: Yeah, sure. So, Summer, I and another faculty attended a workshop hosted by the American Physical Society, and this workshop was aimed at departments—small Physics Departments, which are 90% of Physics Departments, and so recruitment and retention were the two main issues, and so I brought back some ideas to share with this program restructuring on how to improve both recruitment and retention. So, we're going to look at, like, evidence-based decisions.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: When you say most, like 90% of the Physics Departments in the country are small,

Kidd: Yes,

DeBerg: what are you talking about an average national number?

Kidd: Less than 5 majors.

DeBerg: I'd like that in the Senate Minutes. I don't think it's been there before.

Kidd: Sure. It's less than 5 graduates per year.

Chancey: And we are probably in the upper 10%.

DeBerg: I know. I'm just saying I want this in the Minutes.

Chancey: Thanks.

Peters: Other questions? Comments? Senator **East**.

East: I see up there [projected] a BS Physics Major, BS Honors Research in the Physics Major, and then 2 BA programs?

Chancey: No.

Kidd: No.

East: Honors Research in the BA?

Chancey: Yes.

East: How?

Peters: It's Physics Major Teaching.

East: Pardon?

Peters: It's the teaching major.

Chancey: The teaching major. Well, I—Senator **East**, I can only say that I have a great respect for the research done by my colleague Larry **Escalada**, which is physics education research, and

East: Well, I understand education research.

Chancey: Ok.

East: But I'm not real sure I understand two majors with respect [couple of voices attempting to clarify]. Those are just an added emphasis that you allow? That's the point?

Chancey: Yes, yes it is.

Kidd: It's a single course. The emphasis represents a single course beyond the regular major.

Chancey: A senior thesis course.

Peters: I think he's asking about the difference between the teaching major and the BS.

Kidd: Is that—well, I'm

Peters: Maybe I misunderstood.

East: I'm not sure what I'm asking other than I saw 4 programs, and I was curious about that.

Kidd: The way the Biology Department lists the Honors Research as a separate emphasis, an "emphasis of program" according to the University, so if you have any kind of—a certificate that you want to put on a student's transcript, it is a program. And so the point of this was that students have requested this kind of, I guess,

Chancey: Distinction.

Kidd: distinction, yeah, that's it. That's what I'm looking for. And so it is a way that we can offer that.

East: But we have a separate honors research for education for Physics, right?

Kidd: Same course number.

Chancey: It's the same course, but, yes, it is.

East: Both taught by Professor **Escalada**? Always taught by Professor **Escalada**?

Kidd: No.

Chancey: Or it could be Professor **Morgan**. It could be taught by me. Research projects.

East: You're an educational researcher?

Chancey: I think in all of us—are to a certain extent educational researchers.

East: I beg to differ, but ok. [laughter around; voices commenting]

Coon: I just like to interject that in the sciences I think it's incredibly important that people who go out and teach high school have done some research to understand what the field is and to, you know, have a sense of what physics research is so that they can talk to students about that, and "What would you do if you go into physics?" And so, you know, I don't think that that necessarily needs to be educational research that the Honors Research Emphasis in Physics Teaching is. I think that can easily be experimental physics research in the classical lab sense.

Chancey: In fact, it has been. There have been a number of BA Physics Teaching majors who have supplemented their undergraduate work with an experimental project, research project with a faculty member.

Peters: Vice-Chair **Smith**.

Smith: If by calling these *emphases* then you expose them in the future if we were to have another kind of round of program cuts based on enrollment, this would be exposed in the sense that you're not going to have the kinds of enrollments you need to meet reasonable cutoffs, which is an argument, and an argument I would make, that we shouldn't be evaluating programs in terms of enrollments. We should be evaluating classes. We should be looking at "Are our classes well enrolled?" And so the question comes up, "Are your classes well enrolled?"

Chancey: Yes.

Smith: "What's the typical section sizes and things like that in your courses?"

Chancey: Well, I—you know, using the 10, 15 numbers for our courses, it is a rare semester, once every 2 or 3 years, that we have a course that doesn't meet the minimum. This has been in the past. Our challenge over the last 5 years has not been in having a selection of courses that do not meet course enrollments.

Peters: Other questions? Seeing none, shall we proceed to a vote? The motion before us is to approve the undergraduate changes to the Physics programs. This includes changes to the Physics BS, the Physics Teaching BA, Honors Research designations for both of them, and 4000 level—sorry, 1100 level course for the First Year Projects in Physics, the 4990 Senior Thesis course, and then also the two 4000 level courses that also have a 5000 level component about which we will discuss more later. All in favor of approving those changes, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] All opposed, please say, “No.” [none heard] The motion carries. Thank you

ADJOURNMENT

Peters: And with that, I think we have reached the end of our business today. So, if someone wants to make a motion to adjourn.

Terlip: So moved.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**. Seconded by I don’t know, pick someone. [light laughter] Secretary **Edginton**. All right. [4:44 p.m.]

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

Date: 03/11/13

Center for Multicultural Education, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Follows are 6 addenda to these Minutes.

Addendum 1 of 6

Comparison of 3.06 Section A Revised Version versus Original/Current Version of the Classroom Attendance and Make-Up Work Policy as changed by the Educational Policies Commission but not noted at the Faculty Senate meeting held February 18, 2013. For a look at both the fully revised policy and the current policy in whole, see Addenda 2 and 3 to these Minutes.

Here's how Section A.1. looks in the policy the EPC sent to the Senate:

A. General Provisions

1. Faculty members who choose to have policies related to attendance and make-up work must distribute those policies by the end of the first week of instruction.

Here's how it looks in the current policy: (<http://www.uni.edu/policies/306>)

Policy:

A. General Provisions

Faculty members who choose to have policies related to attendance and make-up work must distribute those policies on the first day of class. While it is strongly recommended that all faculty members have written policies regarding attendance and make-up work, these policies are not required. However, when such policies are not provided in writing at the start of the class, it is understood that there will be no grade-related penalties due to absences, missed exams, missed assignments or other activities or assignments which would otherwise have an impact on a student's grade, regardless of the cause of those events.

[from: [revised attendance and make-up work epc policy sent to faculty senate.doc](#)]

UNI CLASS ATTENDANCE AND MAKE-UP WORK POLICY, 3.06 (revised)

Policies Home » Chapter 3: Student Policies

3.06 Class Attendance and Make-Up Work

Purpose:

It is the expressed focus of the University of Northern Iowa to further the educational development of each of its students. On occasion events will necessitate a student's absence from class. This policy delineates the responsibilities of faculty members and students relating to class attendance and make-up work.

Definition:

The term "faculty member(s)" when used in this policy includes all regular, full-time faculty and all part-time course instructors, regardless of any other University employee classification which applies to the individual who teaches on a part-time basis.

Policy:

A. General Provisions

1. Faculty members who choose to have policies related to attendance and make-up work must distribute those policies by the end of the first week of instruction.
2. Students must adhere to each faculty member's policies regarding attendance and make-up work.
3. Faculty members who require attendance at activities or events that may conflict with a student's otherwise regularly scheduled classes are expected to be reasonable in setting these requirements. If a faculty member will require student attendance at an activity or event outside of the regularly scheduled class period, the affected students must be provided with written notice at least 10 university class days in advance of the event during the fall or spring semester and by the third day of the course for any summer term class. The faculty member must provide each student with a notice that can be given to the faculty member who instructs another course affected by the required attendance of the student. It is then the student's obligation to notify the other faculty member. In the case of extracurricular activities, a semester-long schedule should be prepared and distributed to the participating students at the beginning of the semester. It is the student's obligation to provide the schedule to his/her other faculty members. A student may not be penalized for missing a course activity which conflicts with his/her other scheduled courses. If a faculty member has course activities which require attendance outside of scheduled class time, that faculty member must either provide the student an opportunity to make up the missed activity or event, or have in place a make-up policy that does not unjustly penalize a student for the missed activity or event.

B. Absences

Occasionally, students will have reasonable cause to miss class. In order for both faculty members and students to plan effectively for these absences, the following procedures have been developed. Faculty members are encouraged to take into account the reason for

Comment [SN1]: Changed version not highlighted in previous discussion 2/18/13.

an absence and make appropriate accommodations. Students are still responsible for demonstrating achievement of course learning goals, even when absences are necessary or reasonable. In situations with many absences, it may be most appropriate for the student to withdraw and retake the course in a future semester.

1. Required university-related absences (including but not limited to athletic games/matches/meets or their equivalent) or legally-mandated absences due to military duty, jury duty, or court subpoena must be considered excused and the student must be allowed to make up missed work, to complete an equivalent assignment, or the professor and the student may mutually agree to waive the assignment without penalty. Faculty members have the discretion to determine what constitutes an appropriate make up work or assignment. Some course requirements may not require a make-up, such as in cases where the class work has a very minimal point value or where the course requirement of minimal point value is a part of a series of dropped assignments.

a. Students participating in required university or legally mandated absences must inform each faculty member of their known and anticipated absences as far in advance as possible. Failure to inform faculty beforehand, when it is clearly possible to do so, may be treated as an unexcused absence.

b. Faculty are not required to offer make-up work for extra credit tasks or assignments.

2. Except as outlined in B1, faculty members have the discretion to determine the reasonableness of absences due to extenuating circumstances, either predetermined or unexpected. Such absences include but are not limited to: non-university sanctioned educationally appropriate events and activities (e.g. attendance at a professional conference, lecture on campus); illness; significant personal emergency; bereavement; obligatory religious observances, etc.

a. When an absence is deemed “reasonable”, the faculty member provides the student an opportunity to make up missed work, or has in place a make-up policy that does not unjustly penalize a student for the absence.

b. Remedies for missed work due to a “reasonable” absence include but are not limited to replacement assignments; policies which may allow students to drop a certain number of assignments or exams; policies which might average a score for a missed exam or account for it in other ways, etc.

c. In each of these remedies, a “reasonable” standard should apply. In determining whether a remedy is reasonable, consideration should be given to the published syllabus.

C. Make-up Work Grievances Arising from Absences

Should a faculty member refuse to allow a student to make up missed work, the faculty member’s decision can be appealed by the student using the grievance process outlined in Section 7 of 12.01 Student Academic Grievance Policy.

Faculty Senate, approved April 16, 2012

President’s Cabinet, approved July 30, 2012

ADDITIONAL EPC REVISIONS SUBMITTED TO FACULTY SENATE IN
JANUARY 2013

Comment [GMR2]: These are the sections that have been modified.

Addendum 3 of 6 [from <http://www.uni.edu/policies/306>]

Current Student Policy 3.06, approved April/July 2012

3.06 Class Attendance and Make-Up Work

Purpose:

It is the expressed focus of the University of Northern Iowa to further the educational development of each of its students. On occasion events will necessitate a student's absence from class. This policy delineates the responsibilities of faculty members and students relating to class attendance and make-up work.

Definition:

The term "faculty member(s)" when used in this policy includes all regular, full-time faculty and all part-time course instructors, regardless of any other University employee classification which applies to the individual who teaches on a part-time basis.

Policy:

A. General Provisions

Faculty members who choose to have policies related to attendance and make-up work must distribute those policies on the first day of class. While it is strongly recommended that all faculty members have written policies regarding attendance and make-up work, these policies are not required. However, when such policies are not provided in writing at the start of the class, it is understood that there will be no grade-related penalties due to absences, missed exams, missed assignments or other activities or assignments which would otherwise have an impact on a student's grade, regardless of the cause of those events.

Students must adhere to each faculty member's policies regarding attendance and make-up work.

Faculty members who require attendance at activities or events that may conflict with a student's otherwise regularly scheduled classes are expected to be reasonable in setting these requirements. If a faculty member will require student attendance at an activity or event outside of the regularly schedule class period, the affected students must be provided written notice at least 10 University class days in advance of the event during the fall or spring semester and by the third day of the course for any summer term class. The faculty member must provide each student with a notice that can be given to the faculty member who instructs another course affected by the required attendance of the student. It is then the student's obligation to notify the other faculty member. In the case of extracurricular activities, a semester-long schedule should be prepared and distributed

Comment [SN3]: Current version later modified but not noted.

to the participating students at the beginning of the semester. It is the student's obligation to provide the schedule to his/her other faculty members.

B. Absences

Occasionally, students will have reasonable cause to miss class. In order for both faculty members and students to plan effectively for these absences, the following procedures have been developed. Faculty members are encouraged to take into account the reason for an absence and make appropriate accommodations.

1. Faculty members have the discretion to determine the reasonableness of an absence.
2. When an absence is deemed "reasonable", the faculty member must provide the student an opportunity to make up missed work, or have in place a make-up policy that does not unjustly penalize a student for the absence.
3. All absences due to participation in educationally appropriate, university sponsored activities or sanctioned events must be considered reasonable, and a student must therefore not be unjustly penalized for these absences.
4. Students participating in educationally appropriate, university sponsored activities or sanctioned events must inform each faculty member of their known and anticipated absences as far in advance as possible.
5. Other types of absences due to extenuating circumstances, either predetermined or unexpected, may also be deemed "reasonable" by the faculty member. Such absences include, though are not limited to, the following: non-university sanctioned educationally appropriate events and activities (e.g., attendance at a professional conference); illness; significant personal emergency; bereavement; jury duty; military service; mandatory religious observances, etc.
6. If a faculty member assigns a mandatory activity or event that encompasses time outside of class or requires students to miss another class, that faculty member assigning the mandatory activity or event must either provide the student an opportunity to make up the missed activity or event, or have in place a make-up policy that does not unjustly penalize a student for the missed activity or event.

Make-up Work Grievances Arising from Absences

Should a faculty member refuse to allow a student to make up missed work, and should this refusal constitute an unjust penalty upon the student, the faculty member's decision can be appealed by the student using the grievance process outlined in Section G of 12.01 Student Academic Grievance Policy.

Faculty Senate, approved April 16, 2012

President's Cabinet, approved July 30, 2012

Addendum 4 of 6

Concerning the Amendment to the
approved Faculty Senate Minutes for January 14, 2013

Email exchange between Adam Carros to Cathy DeSoto:

On Fri, Nov 9, 2012 at 9:00 AM, Adam Carros <Adam.Carros@kcrg.com> wrote:
That was Stacey Christensen with the office of University Relations.

Adam Carros

News Director - KCRG

501 Second Ave. SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
(319) 368-8604
Adam.Carros@kcrg.com

From: Mary Desoto [mailto:cathy.desoto@uni.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 07, 2012 6:20 PM
To: Adam Carros
Subject: Re: Errors of Fact and Omission

Thanks for your note.
Who told you I was not available for comment?
-CD

On Wednesday, November 7, 2012, Adam Carros wrote:
Cathy,

We will not be issuing a public apology or correction for this story and stand by our reporting. However, KCRG would be interested in hearing your side of this story on camera if you are ever interested and available. We earlier attempted to contact you through the proper University channels but were told you were not available for comment. It sounds like you feel the University leadership threw you under the bus and we would be interested in sharing your side of that story.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED FROM HPELS ON
WOMEN'S AND GENDER STUDIES PROGRAM NAME
(READ BY SECRETARY EDGINTON)

The restructuring of the Women's and Gender Studies Master of Arts program proposals called for two focus areas currently being described as "women's health" and "violence prevention". While the faculty in the School of Health, Physical Education and Leisure Services (HPELS) did look this proposal over initially, they do not recall a clear title of "women's health" being used which would have been a major concern from the perspective of our faculty. Women's health is a specialization area in community health promotion, being clearly recognized as one by our professional community, and being a specialization that requires a number of fundamental competencies and skills be developed in the students in order to seek employment in this area.

This proposed Masters degree will not be able to deliver these competencies as currently structured. Student's graduating with that degree will be "Women's Studies" students, not "Women's Health" graduates. Representing the degree as "Women's Health" would be clearly misleading to these students and to anyone in the women's health fields seeking to hire health educators with a women's health background.

When this proposal was first examined, the title used was not, "Women's Health" or our faculty would not have agreed to this proposal. The title included references to international and global women and gender issues and violence, not clearly, "women's health".

The proposed title of "Gender and Wellness" is entirely acceptable to the faculty in the School of HPELS.

Geography Charts Shown at Meeting

