

3-25-2013

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 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, March 25, 2013" (2013). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 42.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/42

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
03/25/13 (3:32 p.m. – 5:05 p.m.)
Mtg. #1731

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Peters** called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

No members of the press were in attendance today. Blake **Findley** will attend beginning today as Vice-President-elect of the Northern Iowa Student Government. His official position begins April 15th.

Provost **Gibson** offered no comments today.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** announced that 2 candidates will be on campus next week for the position of Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. Those names and their full schedules will be forthcoming. Public presentations with Q&A will be next Monday, April 1, and Wednesday, April 3, at 3:00 p.m. with a location to be announced soon. Monday's presentation does conflict with the newly-scheduled Faculty Senate meeting, but **Funderburk** hopes that some will be able to attend the presentation portion before coming to the Faculty Senate meeting. He also named the members of this Search Committee with their affiliations. See full transcript for those names.

Chair **Peters** stated that he has convened the Faculty Senate Nominations Committee. As per the Senate Bylaws, this Committee is composed of Senators who are leaving the Senate, those term-limited and those not running for reelection. This includes: Greg **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Phil **East**, Deb **Gallagher**, and Chris **Neuhaus**. Senator **Bruess** will chair the Committee. Anyone interested in running for Vice-Chair should contact a

Committee member. Election will take place at the last regularly scheduled meeting of the year, per custom and Faculty Senate Bylaws—April 22, 2013.

Chair **Peters** also noted that he will consider a shortened special meeting next week to allow for attendance at the presentation of a candidate for the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs position. He will let everyone know through the Agenda for next week the meeting starting time, perhaps 3:45 or 4:00.

Peters continued by outlining the goals left to accomplish this year and thus the need for extra meetings in April. He has asked everyone to keep each Monday open in case needed for a meeting.

And finally Chair **Peters** asked Senators their feelings about receiving plaques for their Faculty Senate service upon it ending. Ideas were thrown out, and he will decide how to proceed with either plaques as in the past or some other method of recognition and appreciation. Last year's leaving Senators have yet to be recognized in any way.

During this comment period, the status of the PR Guidelines and follow-up of the Winter Retreat were briefly questioned and discussed. See full transcript for details.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

No additions or corrections were offered for the Minutes for February 25, 2013, so they were considered approved and will be posted later today on the Faculty Senate website.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

One motion and second (**Bruess/DeBerg**) allowed for the docketing in regular order of the two items on the calendar for docketing.

1186 1081 Recommendation to change drop date to 10 class days after Midpoint of semester (regular order) (**Bruess/DeBerg**)

1187 1082 Request for Emeritus status, John W. Somerville (regular order) (**Bruess/DeBerg**)

4. New Business

Chair **Peters** asked that a late, time-sensitive petition, Calendar Item 1188, Recommended changes to the Proposed After-hours Building Access Policy, be docketed at the head of the docket today (for Docket #1083), and this passed after a motion and second (**Terlip/MacLin**).

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1188 1084 Recommended changes to the Proposed After-hours Building Access Policy, head of today's docket (**Terlip/MacLin**)

** Motion to accept this Report and forward it on to the Enterprise Risk Management Council (**DeBerg/Walter**). Passed.
[See Addendum 1 to these Minutes for Report]

1183 1079 Recommendations of Ad hoc Committee on Curriculum Review, regular order (**Heston/Neuhaus**)

Motion to move into Committee of the Whole (East/Kidd**). Passed.

Motion to rise from Committee of the Whole (East/Hakes**). Passed.

**Initial discussion completed. Referred back to same Committee for continued work.

[See Addendum 2 to these Minutes for Draft Proposal]

1184 1080 Recommendations of Senate Budget Committee on Allocation of Resources within Academic Affairs, regular order
(Heston/Neuhaus)

**Unanimous consent moved this discussion to the special meeting next week, April 1, 2013.

1185 1081 Regents Teaching Awards Committee Recommendations, for March 25th meeting **(East/Kidd)**

Motion to go into Closed Session for discussion **(Terlip/East). Passed.

**Motion to arise from Closed Session. [took place in Closed Session]

Motion to approve nominations for Regents Awards for Excellence **(Breitbach/Edginton). Passed.

5. Adjournment

Without objection, the meeting was declared adjourned.

Time: 5:05 p.m.

Next meeting:

04/01/13

CBB 319

4:00 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 53 pages, including 2 Addenda.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
March 25, 2013
Mtg. 1731**

PRESENT: Melinda **Boyd**, Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, David **Hakes**, Tim **Kidd**, Michael **Licari**, Kim **MaLin**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Jerry **Smith**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter**, KaLeigh **White**

Absent: Melissa **Heston**, Syed **Kirmani**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Gary **Shontz**, Mitchell **Strauss**

CALL TO ORDER (3:32 p.m.)

Chair **Peters:** Ok. Let's go ahead and come to order. We do have some folks missing, but we do have a quorum, so we'll come to order.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Peters: There are no members of the press present. Blake **Findley**, who has been here reporting for the *Northern Iowan*, is now here. He has taken his reporter hat off, and he is now here in the capacity of the Vice-President-elect of NISG, so congratulations to Blake. [applause] You take over?

White: April 15th.

Findley: April 15th.

Peters: April 15th, ok.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Peters: And so, I think with that we'll just go to Provost **Gibson**. Do you have any comments for us?

Gibson: No, not today.

Peters: Nothing today.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Peters: Chair **Funderburk**?

Funderburk: One bit of announcement. This is on behalf of the Search Committee for the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, I wanted to announce that there will be candidates on campus next week for the position. Their names and the full schedule will be announced shortly. It doesn't look like it will get out this afternoon but probably tomorrow. But you can mark your schedules now for the public presentations. Those are going to be held on Monday and Wednesday, April 1st and April 3rd, at 3:00 o'clock. The location should be announced shortly. Unfortunately, we had already scheduled the presentations before we knew we were going to have the added [Faculty] Senate meeting, but the candidates were asked to do a presentation, a very short presentation, only 15 or 20 minutes, and Q&A for the rest of the time. So, if you're free, maybe you can come for that presentation portion and then come to the Senate meeting following that. So—and I think just because some people had asked individually, the Committee membership for that is: Dean Dwight **Watson** is Chair. Associate Provost **Licari** is on the Committee. Victoria **Robinson** is Department Head in Educational Leadership & Postsecondary Education. Greg **Bruess** is the Faculty Senate rep. Michelle **Byers** from HR is there. Pat **Woelber** from the Provost Office staff. Karen **Mitchell** is there, I guess representing Administrative Fellow. And then myself as Faculty Chair. That is all I have.

Peters: Thank you.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS

Peters: All right. I have a few things for us today. First, I wanted to let the [Faculty] Senate know that I have convened the Nominations Committee. As per the [Faculty] Senate Bylaws, the Committee is composed of Senators who are leaving the Senate. This year that is a fairly large group of people who are either term-limited or who are not running for reelection: Greg **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Phil **East**, Deb **Gallagher**, and Chris **Neuhaus**. So that will be the Nominations Committee. I've asked Senator **Bruess** to Chair the Committee, and he's agreed to do that. Those of you who might be interested in running for Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, you should get in touch with a Committee member. And likewise, if you know someone else who's interested in that position, please let a Committee member know as well. Please keep in mind that newly-elected Senators are also eligible, and they should be known around the first of next week. I think the Colleges are supposed to have their elections finished by that time. As per the [Faculty] Senate's Bylaws and custom, at our final regularly scheduled meeting of the year—that would be April 22, 2013—I'll ask for the Committee's Report. It will report its recommendations, and the floor will then be open for additional nominations, after which we will proceed immediately to a vote. I reviewed about 15 years' worth of Minutes, and that's the way it had been done in all 15 years, so I think that's probably enough to establish a norm. The Committee, of course, is free to recommend one person, recommend more than one person. That's up to the Committee. Questions? Ok.

So, Jeff [**Funderburk**] just mentioned the interviews for Associate Provost of Faculty Affairs. As you know, I think we need an extra Senate meeting to take care of some of our business. With only about 6 weeks of classes left, we've only got 3 regularly scheduled meetings, counting today's, and as I explained in an email to Senators a few weeks ago, we're—as we look at

some of our major things that committees have been working on throughout the year, that's a lot to squeeze into just 2 meetings.

And for that reason, I do think we need a meeting next Monday, April 1st. The main topic of discussion there will be the criteria that the Provost should use to make decisions about how to allocate resources within Academic Affairs. But since—I'm just thinking here on the fly, but given that I think we could probably limit the topic of that meeting to that one item, perhaps we can start it later than normal, in order to accommodate the ability of people to go to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs presentation. So, let me think about that a little bit, but I'm inclined at this point to maybe say to try to have a 4:00 o'clock meeting, 3:45, 4:00 o'clock, something like that. We can come together and discuss allocation criteria and just have that one item of business. The Agenda for that will go out either later tonight or tomorrow, and the time will be prominently featured.

Today we'll be talking about another one of our major initiatives throughout the year and that's changes to the Curriculum Process, and we'll discuss that a little bit more. If we look at the 4 kinds of major goals we had for the year, one was recommending changes to the policy process. That's in the pipeline now. One is changes to the Curriculum Process, which we'll discuss for the first time today. One was recommendations on more regular and more comprehensive faculty inclusion in budgeting decisions, and we're looking for a report from the [Faculty] Senate's Budget Committee to make some recommendations on what Budget consultation should look like with the new President by the end of the year, a report on that. And then finally our 4th goal for the year was one that ended up kind of getting delegated, if you will, to United Faculty, and that was development of some kind of due process standards for faculty discipline. United Faculty negotiated on that, and therefore it was kind of off of our plate. And although I don't have the details yet or haven't seen the specific language, I have been told that the Board agreed to that. The Board agreed

DeBerg: To part of it.

Peters: To part of it, ok. And I'm going to meet with Hans **Isakson**, I think this Wednesday, to talk about what role, if any, there is for the [Faculty] Senate or for faculty governance in that process, if there's anything we need to do by the end of the year to get that ball rolling. So that might be another thing that we have to squeeze into our last few weeks of meetings as well. So, please, I won't call meetings that we don't need, but do keep in mind that I asked you to reserve those dates in April, and if we need them, we'll use them. Hopefully, we won't need—hopefully, we won't need them.

One last thing then, Sherry [**Nuss**, transcriptionist] reminded me today that we never recognized last year's departing Senators for their service, and we now have a big group of departing Senators who will be leaving this year. As I was looking at Minutes for elections, I noticed that often that was done at the last meeting of the year. Sometimes, I gather, it was done at the first meeting of the following year. Plaques have been given in the past. We have, I think, 6 plaques left sitting around the Faculty Senate office. And, I guess, what I'm curious about is is it worth—do we want to spend more money and buy more plaques? Do we just want to give certificates? Do we just want to have people here and thank them? Write them a nice letter thanking them for their service? Is there a general feeling about this? [joking with lots of laughter among Senators about receiving jewelry or wine or just fresh certificates for already owned plaques or perhaps going out for drinks after the final meeting] All right, we'll plan on trying to do some kind of recognition at the end of this year, and I'll invite those Senators who we neglected to thank last year as well. And I think that's that.

Any questions or any other things that people need to call to our attention?

Terlip: I have a question.

Peters: Yes, Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Have we heard any more about the revisions to the PR new guidelines, because we had thought to mention

Peters: In my last meeting with President **Allen**, I brought that up. I gave him language that was kind of consistent with what we had talked about. Senator **DeBerg** had drawn up a draft petition, in case we do end up needing to file a petition, and I gave him language. He said he would think about it a little bit. I'll press him on that and see if he's thought about that. And if he doesn't want to move forward with it, then we can move forward with it as a formal petition.

Terlip: Thank you.

Peters: Anything else? Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Did we have follow-up from that Retreat we had? The Retreat?

Peters: This is—the item for next week's Agenda would be one follow-up.

Gallagher: Ok.

Peters: The Budget Advisory Models which we'll hopefully discuss by the end of the year would be another—would be the other one. So, next Monday we'll talk about alloca—that was one of the topics of that Winter Retreat, was allocation of resources within Academic Affairs. Another one was Budget Advice and Consultation. And then the third one was—what was it?

Gallagher: Evaluation.

Peters: Evaluation of administrators, and Senator **Strauss** who's not here because he was—got stranded coming home from vacation, was working on that, and I'll touch base with him to see where he stands on that.

Gallagher: Thank you.

Peters: Thank you. Other questions?

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Peters: We have one set of Minutes up for approval, February 25, 2013. Are there any additions or corrections to that set of Minutes? [none heard] Seeing none, we will have the Minutes stand as approved.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1186 for Docket #1082, Recommendation to change drop date to 10 class days after midpoint of semester (Bruess/DeBerg)

Calendar Item 1187 for Docket #1083, Request for Emeritus status, John W. Somerville (Bruess/DeBerg)

Peters: We have two items for docketing that were on the Agenda. Calendar Item 1186, Recommendation to change the drop date to 10 class days after the midpoint of the semester. Current Policy simply says “10 days” after the midpoint of the semester, and the Registrar recommends that we change the Policy so that’s clear. And then we have Calendar Item 1187, Request for Emeritus status from John Somerville. If I could get one motion to just docket both of those in regular order? Senator **Bruess** [who indicated]. Seconded by Senator **DeBerg** [who indicated]. Any discussion about that? [none heard] All in favor of docketing both of those items in regular order, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No”? [none heard] The motion carries. They will be docketed in regular order.

NEW BUSINESS

Calendar Item 1188 for Docket #1084, Recommended changes to the Proposed After-hours Building Access Policy, head of the docket today (Terlip/MacLin)

Peters: We do have an item of new business. I explained in an email this is time sensitive. This would be Calendar Item 1188, Recommended changes to the Proposed After-hours Building Access Policy, and at this point I'll just ask for a motion to docket this at the head of the order today. Senator **Terlip** [who indicated]. Is there a second? Senator **MacLin** [who indicated] Any discussion about this? All in favor of docketing this at the head of the docket, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say "No"? [none heard] The motion carries. [See Addendum 1 for Report]

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1084, RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED AFTER-HOURS BUILDING ACCESS POLICY, HEAD OF TODAY'S DOCKET (Terlip/MacLin)

[Proposed Report projected for Senators to see; see Addendum 1 for Report]

Peters: And that brings us to our docketed items starting with the recommendations to change the proposed After-hours Build Access Policy. I'll just—very briefly I'll just say that I kind of bumped into Vice-President **Hager** the other day and mentioned that we are going to be sending something on about this, and he did want to make sure people understand that their intention in how they drafted this was to try to codify what already happens in terms of—many Departments already have policies for when students can get in after hours and things like that. So, with that said, Senator **MacLin** would you like to lead us in this?

MacLin: So, I hope you had a chance to look over the document. I have a couple things to add that I received over the weekend. Sociology/ Anthropology/Criminology met as a Department and drafted something similar. I'll only highlight things that didn't—that we didn't find in other comments, so they didn't make it on my master document. Let's see, there was some concern about if access—apparently some of the terminology in the Policy is that “if access is abused, it may be rescinded temporarily or permanently,” and their concern was what is the definition of said “abuse”? They had some remarks about that minimizing the number of hours improves energy and other financial resources, and they have some remarks about that. And that this Policy, in fact, does not assure anyone's safety. Another point that wasn't brought up by other Departments was that, in fact, one could consider this somewhat discriminatory in practice, that people—those needing to work after hours have to engage in those activities to do their work and, in fact, may then be subject to rules that people who work during normal daytime hours aren't subject to. They also raised some concerns about working alone. And they actually were not in favor of even having to show ID. This would appear to abridge an individual's rights, as I don't think Iowa has a “stop and identify” law, it would seem then that as a public institution being required to carry and produce ID is not well defined. And then I guess part of the Policy at some point had said that someone might be asked to provide documentation that they're allowed to be in the building, and they just remarked that many times events are not—an event or if something is not “ticketed,” you might not have anything to show that you're supposed to be there. It gets a little far afield from what—the purpose of the document I put together was really talking about people who have approved access to keys to a particular building. But I will submit these are part of the Minutes as well.

And then this was from my own Department and should have been on the Master Report. I just forgot to include it—was that our Department voted that just approving unanimously the following statement, that “The Psychology Department formally objects to the proposed adoption of the Building Access Policy as it would negatively affect faculty's ability to complete teaching, research, and service responsibilities and our students' abilities to do research, coursework, and graduate on time.”

So, assuming that you had a chance to look over the Report, I'm happy to answer any questions. I'm not the master of it all, but I did hear from a lot of people about their viewpoints. And I think that your point about how they just wanted to codify _____ that they're already doing is that—that I think the sheer volume of feedback that they're getting on email is showing that they—there may have been a bunch of unintended consequences that they did not realize, and so this is a good thing. They need to realize that they can't just make a, what is looking like a big change to many people who use the facilities after hours, without having some kickback on it, that this is a fundamental problem that we might not have realized. And they're trying to close a few loopholes here and there. And my humble opinion is this is not going to do it.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Well, I apologize, I haven't had a chance to respond to your document, but there are a couple of other issues that I think also need to be included or Departments need to be made aware of this.

MacLin: Sure.

Terlip: You are not allowed to park in many of the campus lots after hours, and so that Policy or that would also have to be dealt with. And having received a ticket for coming in too early one day [laughs], yeah, it poses some problems. The second thing is in our Department I know of at least a couple of faculty members who were working late at night doing editing, and there was actually a fire alarm, and so they went out. And then Security would not let them back in, and their ID was in their office. So, we need to make sure that all those kinds of situations are accounted for as well. This particular faculty member stood out in the cold for a long time until they reached the Department Head at home. So, I mean, everybody needs to be on the same page, not just the key issue.

MacLin: And if I had to sum it up to one phrase is—is that one that I opened the document with, is that “My key is my permission.”—is that

there are significant rules in place about who gets keys, and if anything needs to be evaluated or tightened, it's at that level. You know, keys should not be given out willy-nilly to anyone who requests them. And so—and my belief is that they are not, that Department Heads and unit organizers are very careful about who gets assigned keys. And there are temporary ones for an event or permanent distribution of keys. And so if someone has been granted access through the appropriate approvals for a key, that key is for access to their building. And then one other point that Soc. and Crim. brought up was in fact that the University houses private property of faculty and they should be able to have access to their office at any time that they choose.

Peters: Briefly, are you guys [to me and the audio student] hearing things ok with the thunderous applause next door? [State Speech Contest] [We nodded.] Ok. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, first of all I want to thank Kim [**Maclin**] for her leadership in getting all this together. I really appreciate it. I didn't know about the parking issues. I had no idea that you could get a ticket for coming early, not that I ever was in danger of that. [laughter all around] But it seems to me like we might need some kind of communication with—and I hate to raise parking because it's such a, you know, it seems like a petty issue, but if those—I mean, our parking rules also discriminate against people who use scooters and motorcycles, so don't get me started. But it seems to me like we might want to talk to Parking at some point, express some concerns to them.

The idea of showing an ID, I guess I'm kind of in favor of that, because I was kind of stalked for a while by someone who was not a student or faculty or staff member. And I appreciate at least for some people a requirement—some people with some kind of status of requirement to show an ID, so I personally would not be offended by that. And lastly, let's see, did I have anything else? [looks through papers] No, but—though I—that's, I guess, where I wanted to stop.

Peters: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: I'm not offended by the ID either, because someone could give keys to someone else, and I just—the safety issue for me, those times when I've had to go in and work, it's kind of spooky, honestly. And I like the idea of having to show an ID, yeah.

MacLin: And if I amend the Report, it will show that that was sort of like a minority opinion, for everybody I heard from said that they had a lot of problems with a lot of things, but they were ok with the ID.

Gallagher: Ok.

Peters: Senator **East**.

East: I'll just be one more in the minority. I think it's anti-American to have to show an ID, to have to carry an ID to show to the authorities, and I would prefer very much not to have to do that on my campus.

Peters: Senator **MacLin**, did you get a sense of—as you were hearing from people, did you get a sense that Departments would be amenable to coming up with some kind of requirements about how students use after hours—how students have access or use facilities after hours, if they don't already have such policies or rules.

MacLin: I think that I heard from probably 5 or 6 Departments, and I think all of them would be fine reporting about how they manage it already, and then sort of by virtue of that they would be sort of documenting their Policy.

Peters: Senator **East**.

East: I don't understand the problem with after hours and students in particular. I mean, if we—if presumably they lock the buildings and maybe do a walk-through to see that people are—or that the building is empty except for people who are authorized to be there, and so I don't understand if we have the Policy that or the idea, the notion, that a key is

my authority to be here, and the building is locked after hours, then I don't understand the Policy to have individual Department Policy, the reason to have individual Department Policies about students after hours.

Peters: Keep in mind that the proposal is coming from the Risk Management people, so it's about liability, or at least a lot of it is about liability. There was an incident—was it at Princeton?—a few years back where a, I can't remember if it was an undergraduate or a graduate student was working alone in a lab. Her hair got caught in some kind of machinery, and she died, and I think the concern about after hours—student access after hours would be—are there—is there sufficient supervision? I don't know if it necessarily has to be faculty supervision, but sufficient supervision or procedures in place for emergency situations and other things like that. I think that's where at least some of the concern is coming from. Chair **Funderburk?**

Funderburk: The School of Music has long been a problem in this area for the campus, as it is on every other campus for that matter. Part of the issue of the students is sometimes if I'm a student and I decide I'm going to have a rock band rehearsal instead of what I'm supposed to be doing, and I invite all the people in my band. So that's one of the reasons for needing to have the ID's, because it's not all—there may be a student group rehearsing, but it may not be all those people should be in that building at night. And we—it's still not working right. We have an amended set of Policies. We now have students who sit in the hallways until 2:00 o'clock in the morning monitoring everything, and it seems to have been working better. However, it is making some faculty a little upset because they are getting challenged in their offices, and "Stop what you're doing and get your ID out and show that you're supposed to be in your own office practicing." But this has been working pretty hard for 2 years for us. I think it seems to be better than it has been at least.

Peters: Senator **Hakes.**

Hakes: I just have a question. Are all the buildings on campus operating on a fob system? Or do people still have physical keys that turn a lock?

MacLin: Oh, gee. [laughter and many voices stating their situations with more laughter and deciding most do still have actual keys]

Hakes: Really? Well, then you're extremely lucky. Ok? You can actually open a door. But—and it only fails to work at 3:00 in the afternoon, but at 3:00 in the morning, I can walk in anytime. So, there's something screwy about our fob system, because it's only locked me out during the day where I've had to walk around and around and around the building to try to get someone's attention to open a door, during the middle of the day because they've decided to not work. I have no—and they took our keys, so I have no key. And the lock—they changed the locks, so the key I had is no longer a key. So I only have a fob. [voices chiming in] But I've never come at midnight and not walked in, ever.

MacLin: But if they're concerned about liability and safety, they need to fix those. [voices agreeing]

Funderburk: The same thing happened to me twice with our building, the same way. At 5:10 one time I was locked out of my building.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I have only one comment and that is that I—by having all the emails go to Kim [**MacLin**], complaints go to Kim, and by the [Faculty] Senate taking this on, have we saved the people who came up with this document the storm they created by doing so, so ham handedly?

MacLin: I hope not. I told every single person

DeBerg: Because otherwise they're not as

MacLin: who contacted me that they had to still bombard/send their comment to that public link.

DeBerg: That's good, because we still have a, you know, a new process for Policy Review and Implementation, and the more storms they create by this kind of behavior, the more likely it is that we might get a decent Policy Review Process. So

MacLin: Yeah, I told them, "You still have to submit it."

DeBerg: Good. Ok. Good.

MacLin: But I'm just compiling so the [Faculty] Senate can know what's going on.

Peters: Any other comments? Well, should we go ahead and have a motion to adopt this Report and forward it on to the Enterprise Risk Management Council?

DeBerg: I so move. I move that we accept this report

Peters: Accept, thank you.

DeBerg: and forward it to the people who originated the Revised Policy.

Peters: Ok, the motion is to accept the Report and forward it to the Enterprise Risk Management Council.

DeBerg: Is that who did it?

Peters: Yeah. Is there a second?

Walter: Second.

Peters: Seconded by Senator **Walter**.

MacLin: And then could I make some small adjustments to the document that include the stuff I received over the weekend, and then that will be the—I'll send it you. [voices agreeing with this]

Peters: Is there any objection to that? [none heard] And is there any further discussion then? Senator **East**.

East: The—do—I’m sorry, I had not looked at their recommendation, is there any sense that it mitigates safety? That it makes safety better? The sense I have is from what was said in what I got—what we saw from Kim [MacLin] is that there’s not much rationale why making—most of this makes safety any better. It just covers somebody’s butt. UNI is—I mean, maybe that’s the deal, that we want to cover our butt, but, I mean, it—we—there should be a rationale about how this is going to make things safer, and they should state that.

Peters: Senator **Kidd**.

Kidd: Just speaking from a like a research lab perspective, there are a lot of cases where if someone was around to call 911, that accidents in a lab wouldn’t be so bad, so I think that at the Department level we should have something about “students should not engage in these activities.” It’s not to say they can’t get into a room maybe, but they shouldn’t be running a lathe for sure, if they are by themselves, and stuff. [voices agreeing] But as far as safety, that’s about the only thing I saw, like “Don’t work alone at night.” There are cases where it’s dangerous.

MacLin: And that would make—that would make good sense at a Department level but not as a University Policy.

East: That is if it’s appropriate to the—I mean [voices agreeing] It makes perfect sense not to operate a lathe by yourself. It makes a lot less sense to not operate a computer by yourself.

Peters: Other comments? All in favor then of—what was the language?—accepting this Report and forward[ing] it on to the Enterprise Risk Management Council, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say “No”? [none heard] The motion carries.

1183 1079 Recommendations of Ad hoc Committee on Curriculum Review, regular order (**Heston/Neuhaus**)

[See Addendum 2 for Draft Proposal that was projected for Senators to see.]

Peters: Next up is the Report from the—initial report of recommendations from the Ad hoc Committee on Curriculum Review, and I think probably the best thing to do here, we’re not going to take any votes today. The best thing to do here is to just move into Committee of the Whole, I think, and discuss the Committee’s initial recommendations, so the Committee can get our feedback on that. And when we’re done with that discussion, we’ll refer it back to the Committee for further work. So, if that’s acceptable, can we get a motion to move into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of discussing this initial proposal?

East: So move.

Peters: Moved by Senator **East**. Is there a second?

Kidd: Second.

Peters: Second by Senator **Kidd**. Is there any discussion of that? [none heard] All in favor of moving into the Committee of the Whole, please say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No”? [none heard] Ok, the motion carries. I’ll just kind of briefly remind everyone about what this is and where it comes from. Of course, everyone knows it stems from the events of last year, but at our last Retreat in the Fall there was I think pretty much unanimous agreement among Senators that we needed to look at both University Policy and our own Curriculum Process for ways to assure that decisions about the University’s Curriculum are made by faculty members and that they’re made on an ongoing basis in terms of reviewing the viability of Programs. And at the Retreat, we agreed to put together a Committee to look at different aspects of the Curriculum Process and

suggest changes in the process and policy changes where appropriate in order to accomplish that.

The Committee included Barbara **Cutter**, Todd **Evans**, Gayle **Pohl**, Ira **Simet**, [Faculty Senate] Vice-Chair **Smith**, and Senator **Terlip**. And if you look at the various ways in which these people have been involved with faculty governance in Curriculum issues, you'll note that the Academic Colleges are all represented. We have people who have been active from the Department level through the College Senates, the Curriculum Committees, the Graduate Council, the GCCC, and, of course, the [Faculty] Senate. And they were charged with reviewing our Curriculum Process to make some recommendations about improving faculty control of Curriculum. And so they are coming to us with this initial Report. Even as we speak, Ira **Simet** is over at the College of Education's Senate meeting where they're consulting with them about their recommendations. They are going around to all the College Senates, the Curriculum Committees. They're consulting widely with this. The Provost has asked to meet with the Committee as well, as part of the consultation process, and so we will arrange for that as well. And the goal here is to bring back to the [Faculty] Senate before the end of the year a proposal that has the broad support of College Senates, Curriculum Committees, Grad. Council, the Provost, and hopefully we can get everybody on the same page and adopt some changes. And so with that, Senator **Terlip**, maybe, do you want to walk us through any of this?

Terlip: I'd like to ask Jerry [Vice-Chair **Smith**] to jump in when I leave things out as I probably will. First of all, this—we've met a lot. We reviewed Program Review. We took a look at the existing Curriculum Process, and so this is the result of that. It is intended to hopefully get us started in moving in that direction, and we think it's going to work. Basically, the Committee wants to make sure that everyone understands we're talking about the [Faculty] Senate and faculty having a Review Process for just the Curriculum. We're not talking about lines. We're not talking about Program faculty. It's just the Curriculum involved, and so that's what we focused on. In looking at what we're proposing, we're actually asking for another committee, surprise, surprise. After looking at the work that existing committees do, we didn't think that it was possible, or fair, to try to

extend the load or the burden on the Academic Program Review Committee or the UCC or the GCC, because they have a lot of work to do now. So, what we came up with was the notion of an elected committee, and the composition is in the document.

Our hope is that that group would then develop criteria that could be used to assess or monitor Program health. We're seeing this as not being something terribly cumbersome for that committee. They could use existing indicators, so that Programs could be warned that, "Hey, somebody looking from the outside is seeing a problem here," and the Departments would have a chance to respond before it got too late or before, you know, you had 7 years in a Program Review cycle, that may be midway through there would be some indication.

The [Faculty] Senate would also serve as the point where the Department or the Program could appeal that, and we hope that if we did this, then the [Faculty] Senate ultimately would be able to sort of have some good information to use with the Budget Committee, because this Committee would be saying—identifying areas that were really growing and saying "There's not enough resources here," as well as "This is falling off. What's going on?" so that Departments would actually have a chance or have an ally if they made resource requests. So that's the Committee work tied to something that we hope would get—we already are in charge of creating a Program. This would help us get control over Program elimination, because that's not built in anywhere at this point in time, as was evidenced with what happened last year.

Secondly, a second thing that we talked a lot about was the 2-year curricular cycle, and we're making a recommendation that we think it's kind of out of date, because it was put in place originally because of the publication cycle, and now everything's online. So, we're hoping that maybe the Curriculum Review Process could sort of triage things and have sort of an expedited process for things that maybe only would have an impact on course descriptions changes in that College, so maybe the College Senates could take care of that, and then the UCC would deal with other kinds of areas. It's all in the document, so I guess we can answer

questions, as far as that goes. But, you know, hopefully we're thinking that would give—if everybody could propose new things continuously, that would make the existing University Curriculum Committee have work all the time. There wouldn't be that off-cycle, but it would be all substantive work, and they wouldn't be dealing with all these little detail things all the time, so that hopefully that would make things not so burdensome on that group. We also thought that any future expansion/division/mergers, structural changes that might happen, we're asking that the Administration definitely take those to the [Faculty] Senate, and to—as well as to the regular faculty, because at the very least, as we found with the last College merger, it had huge implications for faculty governance, and so at least a head's up and the input on that process for how Curriculum changes might arise as mergers or things occur would be a good idea. Did I leave anything out, Jerry [Smith]?

Smith: No.

Terlip: So basically, to sum it up, what we're proposing is a process that—where we can have regular review of Programs on an annual basis by this new Committee. They would kind of look at things that we already collect. We did not determine those criteria. We think that's a job for another group or for the Committee that's elected. But it won't be like a pro—a 7-year Program Review. We're talking about enrollments and things like that, but it's sort of a way for us as a faculty to keep an eye on what's going on, because in our own Programs, this makes perfect sense to us, but somebody from the outside looking in might not see it that way. So that would alert people to potential problems that way. It also would give us—I mean, I think if we're going to create Programs, we need to be willing to close them as well, so that we would take more ownership of the Curriculum Process. And the [Faculty] Senate throughout the document would be sort of the place where Program closures would be taken to initially.

Peters: Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: First, I'm a big supporter of this. I appreciate all the work you've done on this already. How do you deal with the thorny issue of "What is the definition of Program?" and how would you foresee the Committee dealing with it? Are you going to look at it by the Departmental level, so that they just present everything on a regular basis, or where does the division come when you get down to that? Or have you thought about that yet?

Smith: I think we're kind of tacitly assuming Programs are Majors, Minors, Certificates, things like that. So we weren't getting into the issue of "This isn't a Review of, say, the General Education Program, the Liberal Arts Core." It wouldn't be looking at that kind of thing, but it is much more Majors, Minors, Certificates. Now the issue of, you know, that we kind of got into a couple—a month or so here, do you call it "Emphasis" or a "Concentration"? That we didn't decide, and I think it's something that this Body or somebody, somewhere down the road, is going to have to be decided. You know, what constitutes a different, a distinct Program that should be evaluated on its own? Something we have to resolve.

Funderburk: Ok.

Terlip: I think the other thing that happened in those discussions is we were doing a large part of this work when the Contract was in negotiations, and we didn't know if they were going to come out with a Program definition in that process, so we didn't want to step on any toes.

Funderburk: Yeah, because the practical thing I'm wondering about is that, you know, picking on my own, so does it mean that the Department of Music comes up in 7 years and hears everything? Or is it like, "Here are these 4 Programs you're going to look at this year. And next year going to look at the next 4"? How do you envision that work happening is kind of what I'm

Terlip: It would be, if you're on your 7-year Program Review, those are all staggered already, and so this Committee would get the day-to-day data and then like 3 years into it, whenever you're—for your next one, that's

when this more rigorous Review would be done by the Committee, so you're staggered already now with your Department. It would be the same kind of thing.

Funderburk: So actually you're still looking at it by Department instead of Programs coming through. All of the Programs from this Department or area coming through in the same time?

Smith: Yeah, I think we'd be doing that, although if, within a given Department, if we saw particular Programs that were troublesome, we would, the Committee would not necessarily be shy about suggesting to the Department that "These Programs are a matter of concern, and you ought to be doing something about it." So, yeah, you're going to have a periodic—maybe 7 years, but even before that, a fairly thorough look at your Programs, and you'd get feedback on them from the Committee, positive or negative. But there would be a commitment to at some point, that 7 years max, that you're going to get a serious thing that would go with a PR [Program Review].

Terlip: The other thing is that all of these reports would be—come to the [Faculty] Senate every year, so campus-wide. It wouldn't just be this group. The Senate would look at the reports as well to see what those issues were, so that we have more open communication about them, before you came down to that ending period.

Peters: Senator **Hakes**.

Hakes: Well, I'm thinking about Iowa State's system, if I've got this correct, and it seemed to me that once the criteria is established, then Programs that are, well, noticed, based on this criteria, whether it be enrollment or whatever these things are. Not on the 3-year cycle. Nothing to do with their set—nothing to do with any cycle, simply that they're identified to this Committee, meaning the Committee then informs that Department that this criteria has tripped the trigger that "We're looking at you," and it warns them to be able to defend themselves if that be the case. But it suggests,

as opposed to any timing cycle, the timing is the criteria. That's what I thought, and that that gave that Committee the

Terlip: Well,

Hakes: Am I mistaken? Isn't that the way Iowa State's system operates?

Terlip: Well, we—but our—we were kind of trying to put more of a safety kind of thing in there, because you can't develop—Hi, Ira [**Simet**, guest who just entered], you're at a very good time.

Peters: Have a seat at the table, Ira.

Terlip: We didn't want to wait until the criteria kicked you into that. We wanted this Committee to monitor trends, to say that this is going down before—so that maybe they could redress that or maybe the criteria for some reason aren't working for that Program, and they can make a case.

Hakes: Sure. But it still has to—there has to be some criteria that makes the Committee notice them.

Terlip: Yeah, absolutely.

Smith: I would anticipate that there are criteria, but I don't think it's going to be a hard and fast thing. There's certain to be judgment in applying those, and those judgments are going to be made—you know, it isn't like every year that every Program is going to be judged according to criteria. That would be too much of a workload for whoever is on here. But every Program is going to be judged according to whatever criteria every couple, three years, and at a minimum, you know—maximum every 7 years with the PR thing. So, I don't—if we're—unless we're going to use—if we went to "Every Program gets judged every year," you'd have to make it a hard and fast kind of thing, like was done and we objected to last year, because it gets simplistic. If we want to have a substantive evaluation, we have to kind of stagger it out a bit.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg** and then Senator **Cooley** are in the queue.

DeBerg: Well, I'm just going to say what I imagine as I write this. I imagine that every year, a fac—or Depar—Program or whatever, Department, would send in a kind of resume, a kind of set of brief responses to a set of key indicators, and so you have something that's kind of quick and easy for the Committee to look at. It's like a Faculty Activity Report, you know, it's a few pages. [voice: Every year.] And it address—every year so that you can see enrollment trends. You can see money brought in. You can see number of graduates, whatever—whatever the criteria ends up being. And then the Committee has to decide at which point does it look more deeply into a Program? I don't care, but—at that every year I kind of like because then the Committee gets used to seeing what this particular Department is thinking, what it's up to, what recent trends have been. But I don't see that as being a onerous—onerous, whatever—however you pronounce that, I don't see that as being a hard job to put together. That small resume or whatever that a Department turns in once a year.

Terlip: And as we talked about it, what we were thinking or hoping that things that we already do, which is simply start there. The Registrar can do some of it. We'll do annual Reports for each Department. Some of that could be accessed.

DeBerg: Although you want the format to be easy to use. I mean, if you start assembling junk from—I mean, imagine if you started assembling a Registrar's Report.

Terlip: No, what I'm saying is we are not recommending gathering new data. It would be data that's there somewhere already.

DeBerg: Ok. I get that.

Peters: Senator **Cooley**.

Cooley: I think what Laura just said pretty much represents what I had in mind. I like the idea—it's an intriguing idea to create a new Committee

devoted to this sort of work. It seems to me that a lot of this must already be happening at a Departmental level. Someone in many Departments must be looking at enrollments and comparing each Program against that Program. I think it's happening. It sounds like it's tweaking a format or the "to whom it goes," to whom this data is being delivered.

Terlip: Right. So that the whole faculty could look at the Curriculum.

Peters: Senator East.

East: I have a number of comments or questions or something. First of all, I think that the idea of the—those published criteria that everybody is going to be expected to meet or at least be examined by according to, is something useful. And I think that's one of the tools that—I view that as a tool that the Committee or the University can use to examine health of Programs, but I think there are other tools. And I think the University and we need to figure out what they are. The ones that come to my mind are every new course and Program should have acceptable Student Outcomes Assessment tools. They should have goal—perhaps not courses but Programs should certainly have goals that they're expected to meet with number of students, quality of students. Or they should have some of those outlined where—that they're going to use for self-assessment and that the Committee and the Provost can use for external assessment for how things are going. They don't necessarily have to be written in stone. You can say, "We were a little optimistic when we did this. We'd like to revise them." But something along those lines has to be included, or we're going to continue the process of faculty just patting each other on the back and saying, "That sounds good to me. I'll scratch your back, if you'll scratch mine."

And I think Programs—if Programs actually want, if they have a vested interest in the new Program, they should be willing to go through the trouble of identifying what their goals are and how they can be assessed. And if they're not willing to do that, then we shouldn't expend funds on them from the University. Let those who are willing to do that get our

hard-to-allocate money. So I think that we should have to jump through some of those kinds of hoops.

I think that there are some things that need to be done with the current Curriculum Process that seems not to have been discussed that to me have much to do with faculty control and approval of the Curriculum. In particular, all proposals should be easily viewed at all times by all faculty, which is not possible now in any reasonable way. And technology exists to make that happen really easily, if people decide that's what they want to happen.

All new courses and Programs should have campus-wide consultation rather than whoever is vested in this Program saying, "Oh, we'll consult with them and them, but we won't worry about these people over here, because they might say we've got—they might have a competing Program." When you allow the people to decide what their—who their Programs—who they need to consult, then you allow them to avoid consulting people that they should consult. If it was—it should have been really embarrassing to the [Faculty] Senate last year when we approved a computer—a course involving Computer Programming in Industrial Technology that the Computer Science Department had never been consulted on. That happens more often than we'd like to admit. It happened a number of years ago with the same program and Management. It happens more frequently than we want to admit, and we should do something that makes it not happen, such as having all such things consult campus-wide on new Programs, probably new courses as well.

And consultation should be approved by faculty members. When we were doing this by paper, there were two signatures required: Department Head and Curriculum Committee Chair. Now, we're doing it on a computer. It's not always clear that even the curric—the consultation process is used, but only the Department Head is expected to sign off. Not a Curriculum Committee Chair who is expected to be a faculty member, not a Department Head. And at least in our Department we pick people for the Curriculum Committee who cared about the Curriculum and looked at the Curriculum documents and didn't just say, "Oh, no impact," or "Has impact,

no objections.” If we really want to go about this, we have to put some teeth in it and make it a little more formal, rather than just, “Oh, let’s all kind of go along to get along.” Thank you.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I would just like to add to voice my disgust at the current state of the Information Systems on campus. How hard it was for members of the [Faculty] Senate to get Curriculum Packages was ridiculous. And I just think that this is unacceptable. It’s just not right.

East: Especially with all the money that the

DeBerg: Well, I know, given how much it costs us.

East: that the Information part of the University is spending or has spent.

Peters: If there’s nothing else, I have something that—I just forgot whatever it was....[light laughter around]....I was thinking of backing up a little bit—oh, ok, so the new Committee—however it happens, whether it’s Senator **DeBerg**’s resume idea or getting reports from the Registrar or some combination thereof, the Committee then does what with that information? Is annually make some kind of report to the [Faculty] Senate? It notifies individual Departments, “Hey, you’re in trouble with this threshold?” Does it then—does that information go to the relevant College Senates, UCC, GCCC, so that, say, a year from now or 2 years from now if that—if a Department is proposing a new Program, it gets into the Curriculum pipeline in some way?

Simet: Yeah. I’ll answer that, if you like. My view of it, and I think this is the Committee’s feeling, is that you need to pinpoint exactly who has the responsibility for judging Program elimination. Right now the faculty input is not centralized, as somebody commented just as I was walking in. It seems to be localized at the Department level. And so one of the things that we’d like to see is something that is more centralized. And that means that, you’re right, I would think that a Report would be generated by this

Committee, but then we would have to decide what happens to that Report. I mean, they can write a Report, but if it doesn't have a target audience, then it's not meaningful. The UCC might be a valuable place. To make a Report to the [Faculty] Senate might be a valuable place.

One of the things the Committee was most interested in was coming up with a way in which Programs whose indicators were in decline—let's use that diplomatic phrase—would be warned about that or would be alerted to the fact that their program could be viewed as "at risk" by any number of Bodies on campus or any number of individuals, and then they'd be encouraged to take some steps to start addressing some of the shortcomings.

One of the things that we liked that came out of our discussion was the notion that people—a Program that's encountering some difficulty would be put in touch with faculty who've been in other Programs that have encountered that difficulty themselves so that they could get some access to ideas about how to address the problem. I can't think of a specific example right offhand, but let's say you've got declining enrollment and you don't know what to do about that. I'm sure everybody has ideas, but let's say you have no idea what to do about that, you'd be in touch with a Pro—you'd be put in touch with a Program that suffered from that same difficulty to talk about their marketing strategies perhaps or, you know, how did they deal with that? That would probably go through the Faculty Senate, I would think, so if that's the case, then the Faculty Senate would get the Report. That was my impression of where it would go, so does that answer your question about...?

Peters: Mostly, I guess. I'm wondering if it's the case that one of the—that as I think Senator **East** said that the faculty have sometimes been too quick to approve new Programs, I would just want to make sure that if we're going to setup some Committee like this, the information it gathers somehow gets introduced into the Curriculum Process so that the College Senate—I mean, I would hope that it would happen as early as possible in the process. The College Senate would say, "Well, this sounds like a really

interesting Program, but we see you're already kind of having some problems with your existing Programs." Vice-Chair **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, what I would envision, and we talked about this a bit, but you could have in essence a table that had all the Programs, you know, organized by Departments, all the Programs in the University, and then a timeline saying when they've been reviewed or whatever, and then in the cells of the table you could go to and see the status of that Program or how it was reviewed and it's most—you know, it's relevant information at that time, and for my money, quite frankly, I think that if you did that, you could make it available to everybody—to all faculty on campus. And it'd be—I can't think of a reason not to do that. But if you did that, then people on the Curriculum Committee would be in a position to say, "What's happened? How do these—in this Department, how do their Programs in general look?"

As Ira said, we would certainly want to make a Report both to the [Faculty] Senate and to relevant Programs where we had cause for concern. Give them plenty of notice that we're getting—we're getting concerned about what's going on here in various respects, and as Ira said, that'd give them the opportunity to, you know, improve things and to meet with other people that could give them some advice. We might also want to have some influence on the Resource Allocation Process to submit through the [Faculty] Senate to the Provost, "These are the Programs that we think deserve more resources, that they've got the demand, and there's evidence that they don't have the faculty and the resources they need. So these would be at the top of our list for new lines" stuff like that. But, again, I think it would be nice to have something where every Program on campus was—you could kind of get a sense of its status, of how it looked. And I guess, for me, I don't know why—if there'd be any reason not to do that, because I suspect a lot of the information would end up being made available anyway. But if we could do that, I think that'd be a good thing to do.

Peters: Provost **Gibson**.

Gibson: Yeah, I—first of all, I want to commend the Ad hoc Committee for your work. I think it's a great start. My concern, and this is what I'd like for the Ad hoc Committee to think about, if—if, God forbid, we had another financial emergency, and there are cuts that are needed, you know, what would be the process then? I see this process as a long-term process in looking at Programs and evaluating Programs, recommending Programs for closure, and so that's one level, ok? There's another level if there is a financial—if there are financial issues tied with that. And it becomes even more complicated—unless you can explain why it wouldn't be—it becomes more complicated because of the UF Contract. And there are guidelines in the Contract as to if we have to close Programs and there are, or there may be, layoffs. So it become—and at that point, we have to follow—the University has to follow the Contract. So, I see sort of maybe 2 tracks here, unless the Committee has thought about this and you have some other thinking about it that I haven't thought about, but that's a concern for me. That's one of the concerns.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, ok, so, our reading of the Contract is that staff reductions unrelated to the Curriculum—staff reduction in the current Contract, the staff reduction, you wouldn't have to close Programs to eliminate staff. So I think it's fine that the Committee sees this as curricular only and not related to staff, because they're not tied together in the Contract.

My second comment, and then a slightly unrelated matter, I would like the membership of the Committee to be more proportionally representative. For instance, CHAS gets 4 and the College of Business gets 2. CHAS is way, way, way, way, way, way, way, way more than twice the College of Business in size, and I don't know what the other Colleges are. I'm just picking on Business because I know it's about the size of the School of Music, so I would like the membership on the Committee to be far more representational proportionally in the same way that the [Faculty] Senate has become. We've added new members and whatnot to make it more proportional. So I would like to see that done in this case.

Peters: Vice-Chair **Smith** did you want to follow-up on the Provost's...?

Smith: Yes.

DeBerg: It has nothing to do with the quality of individuals in the College of Business, you see. [light laughter around]

Smith: We'll talk to that. [more laughter]

DeBerg: There's not very many of you. [more laughter]

Smith: We'll—in talking about this, I know I felt and I think some other people felt as well that there should, as Senator **DeBerg** said, be kind of a separation of the issues of Program management from potential, you know, layoffs, etc. And I personally think that that's the way it should be done. I don't know about the old Contract, if it had to be done the way it was, but I personally got the impression that the Program cuts that were made a year ago were done so that you could cut faculty. But we would hope not to be in that situation. We think the Programs should be evaluated on their merits, and faculty, with the responsibility of managing the Curriculum, should do it through this Committee. Whatever is done in terms of managing, you know, in terms of faculty resources, that—you would be dealing with the Contract then.

Gibson: Ok.

Smith: So that at least is the feeling that I have, and I think we're very much on with that.

Gibson: Ok.

Peters: Professor **Simet**.

Simet: If I can add something to that. We felt that the data that was gathered by the Committee, they'd eventually have groupings of Programs. Some would look very healthy, perhaps deserving of enhancements. Some

would fall in the middle range. Some would be at risk. And so when it comes to a point where you're considering cutting some Programs, if you come up with a list—if the Provost comes up with a list and all of the Programs that you're looking at are in the healthy range, it might be a reason to think about it. It doesn't necessarily have to dictate, but you'd compare it, and these two lists would be juxtaposed, and at the very least, Programs that are at risk might recognize that they're going to be perhaps more, for want of a better phrase, more attractive targets, because they already have some shortcomings, and if cutting them can alleviate some of other problems, you could see why those things would blend. So that's—we thought it would be another voice or another source of information in those difficult decisions without necessarily guiding.

Peters: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: Oh. And so what I've heard actually makes me think Provost **Gibson** brought up a key important problem. Everything I've heard from—in discussion—in discussing this Report, I've been trying to listen for difficulties, and they all seem to be financial. Low enrollment or something like that. And then when you're asked about it, you say, "Oh, but we don't want to talk about those difficulties."

A curricular view isn't concerned with the cost of something. It's just the ideal curriculum the University, the particular university, thinks is best for itself. So high-prestige liberal arts colleges would have Greek and Latin. They don't worry that relatively few people want to major in it. It's just that's what a high-prestige liberal arts college has, right? And so a faculty Committee may be recommending that, and Administration has to decide how to fund it or if to fund it, and then there's that political negotiation back and forth. And so I don't see how this new Committee is actually going to be able to do that because you keep slipping back and forth. If you want to stay in the Curriculum, as I think you should, we do have a Union. United Faculty does work with the Administration, the Board of Regents, for the financing, the financial end of it.

To stay within the Curriculum, my question is “Why can’t the current Committee on Academic Program Review be charged to do what this new Committee is being charged to do?” It seems like that’s where it should be, and if it’s not currently charged that way, that it should be—an additional charge should be made to that Committee.

Peters: Professor **Simet**.

Simet: Can I respond to that? We actually discussed that, Jesse [Senator **Swan**]. That’s a very good point, and we have the committee called the Committee on Academic Program Review, but it doesn’t do academic program review, ok? [voices agreeing] I can say that, because I Chair that Committee. And right, David’s [Senator **Hakes** is also] on it, and you can agree or disagree, David.

Hakes: Oh, I agree.

Simet: What I think, at this point that Committee’s chief charges are to make sure that the self-studies that are being prepared provide an adequate footing for the External Review, but we don’t actually do the Review, and we also are the ones who look over SOA [Student Outcomes Assessment] Plans to make sure a Program does have an SOA Plan in place and that it is using it the way it’s meant to be used. I mean, those are the two charges of the Committee. At no time do we actually evaluate the quality or the finances and resources or any other aspect of the Program. It’s just, “Can you put together a decent self-study, and do you have an SOA Plan that works?”

Swan: Can I follow-up on that?

Peters: Yeah, go ahead Senator **Swan**.

Swan: Why? Why wouldn’t you say to recommend that that Committee get this additional charge to, in fact, think—to, in fact, evaluate—to, in fact, recommend?

Simet: We did talk about doing that. The chief barrier to that is that that Committee—the workload of the Committee is already quite high. In a typical year we get about a dozen self-studies and a month to read them in, ok? And that's a pretty substantial workload. It might be very difficult to persuade the faculty members who have generously agreed to be on it to take on this extra work, which is why at first we came up with a proposal to make a separate Committee. But it's not unreasonable to think that if we can tweak the way that Committee works, that it might be able to incorporate this function as well. That could happen.

Swan: Or enlarge it.

Simet: Or enlarge the Committee, right. Or have two sub-committees feeding into the same thing so the information flows back and forth. I mean, these are all models that we've talked about with our Committee, trying to figure out where this would be housed and how to persuade faculty to do it. And, as you can tell, we didn't come up with any definitive answers, but it's a good point, Jesse, that that Committee is well positioned to do it given what their current role is.

Terlip: We also talked about when do you get to SOA? And how they get it—the University? And does the assessment maybe work right then?

Simet: Which goes back to Phil's [Senator **East's**] point about, you know, if a Program wants to make a case for itself, they should at the very least have an SOA Plan that defines its goals. So, it goes back to that, too.

Peters: I have **Smith, East, and DeBerg** in the queue, in that order.

Smith: Yeah, on the issue of whether or not we should consider financial issues, I think we do have to. I think we have to be concerned with enrollments. I think it's irresponsible of faculty, given inevitably limited resources, to be proposing and defending Programs that don't attract students. Having said that, I think that we should not be involved in personnel issues because the Union does have that responsibility and because most faculty, even though they might have a teaching assignment

in a Program, they're flexible enough to have teaching assignments in multiple Programs, and so just because you're dropping a Program doesn't mean that that should be taken as justification for dropping a faculty. There are very few cases where that'd be an adequate justification. But, yes, we do have to consider enrollment issues. It would be very irresponsible for the [Faculty] Senate to say that we can do Curriculum without regard to resources and run all sorts of Programs that don't have student demand, when we know we've got lots of Programs on this campus that have lots of demand and not enough faculty.

Peters: I'll point out very briefly on behalf of the Committee that the Committee does say that the type of information it would get about these Programs would include things like what the Vice-Chair just mentioned but also things like centrality or quality of the Program, uniqueness of the Program within the State.

DeBerg: I think I'm after **East**.

Peters: Senator **Swan**, do you have a quick follow-up?

Swan: A follow-up, yes. When we do consider finances, we do it with such limited information. We never have all the information that Administrators have. Or that, for that matter, the Union gets. And so we need to acknowledge that and not be pretending that we're attending to finances when we look at something simple like graduation numbers or even enrollment numbers or something like that. There is lots that go into a Program to make a Program financially very cheap but valuable, and other Programs that are very expensive but they have more students. So the whole financial realm, while you might be tempted to think about it because it's so important, it really disrupts all legitimate consideration of the Curriculum. At some point we decide, well, what is the best Curriculum for us? And then we enter into the discussions with Administration about how to best achieve that or maybe limit it. But when we're doing it, the faculty are doing it, we don't have the information about the finances, and we don't have the wherewithal to get more money as the Administration, the Board, has the wherewithal to get more finances to supply us at times.

At other times, they don't. They, you know, face cuts, and they have to negotiate it that way. But that is not the faculty role to consider finances. When we do, we get terribly off track, and the Curriculum gets degraded so that it's terrible that no one who knows better would come to a university with such a degraded Curriculum.

Peters: Senator **East**.

East: I find it hard to consid—I think it's important that we separate financial support from Programs and evaluating the quality of the Programs, but on the other hand, you can't. So my—I was going to start by saying, "We should get rid of that item in the proposal that says, 'Is this going to cost—how much is this [course] going to cost?'" I mean, that seems a silly thing for faculty who are considering Curriculum to think about. On the other hand, if you're proposing a new Program so you can get a new faculty member, well, then you need to get the faculty member approved before you get the Program approved. So there—they have to work sort of in conjunction with each other but perhaps not tied together.

But there is a question of resources when we talk about Programs. Some Programs want to have Practicums where faculty supervise students at 5 or 10 or 15 students at a time period, whereas some of the rest of us are expected to supervise and grade students that—in the 50's or 100's of students rather than in the 10's of students. And that is a matter of resources and how critical is that to your Program? Is your Program—do your Pro—does your Program really need 15 section sizes of 15? And if it does, then what is that costing me, when I have section sizes of 30 or 40 or 50? I mean, I think that there has to be some recognition of that in the process somewhere, and if it actually—I mean, the thought occurs to me, for instance, that English, they limited the size of their classes to 25, because it's very damned hard to teach Eng—people to write, and you can only teach a certain number of people at a time. Now, I may be wrong in that, but that's sort of the impression I have. On the other hand, Math, which we all know is really easy [laughter around], they can teach hundreds of people at the same—at once, so they have sections of hundreds of students because it's easy to teach Math and people learn Math so readily

that you can teach it to all of those people at one time, but you can't teach hundreds of people at one time how to write.

I'm not real sure that we've got our ducks in a row when it comes to what we know about teaching and Curriculum, and we still have plenty of work to do, but the idea of resources is—it's a financial question, but it's also a quality of the Curriculum question, and I think that when faculty members have a vested interest in their—in the Curriculum as a whole being useful, and maybe watching out for themselves a little bit when somebody says, "Oh? I need to teach classes of 15 people." And "We're only going to graduate 15 people a year, but I need X number of faculty to do that." And so I—it's—I don't have a solution, but I'm starting to recognize that the problem's really complex.

Peters: We are quickly running out of time. We need to select our Regents Awards for Excellence people as well before we conclude today. I've got Senators **DeBerg**, **Terlip**, and **Gallagher** in the queue. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I just wanted to clarify some things about what's the Union turf and what isn't. These kind of generalizations are tossed around. Collective bargaining does deal with financial issues, but they're pretty limited when you talk about the Academic Programs. We deal with salaries. We deal with leaves. We deal with insurance. We deal with staff reduction, if layoffs are necessary, and we deal with staff reduction only to the extent of how it is that seniority lists get put together, because layoffs have to happen according to seniority. So that's the financial part of the collective bargaining agreement. Things like what Programs should have faculty lines? What Programs need equipment, labs, library resources? What Departments get empty lines when they come open? None of that is dealt with. All these are all financial resource issues, none of which is dealt with in bargaining. Zippo.

And I like the—I think that faculty members can make financial decisions if we have a budgeting committee who becomes educated and who's given enough information to make these decisions. So I think between better Budget information and better Program quality information, I think that a

group of faculty members, whether it be this Body or another group, could very easily make very good resources recommendations. I have complete trust in that. But the Faculty Senate in my life here has never been given adequate fina—budget or financial information. So, who knows what might happen if faculty were?

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I was just going to say that I think a number of the comments or the kind of discussion I think this kind of Report would stir so that we can have that common Curriculum. If we don't have information, we can't see what we all see is necessary, and we don't have that information right now. So I think it would promote transparency and accountability if we created something that would allow this to happen.

Peters: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Related to Senator **Swan**'s comment about the centrality issue, I think sometimes we forget about Programs that may have a lower enrollment for very understandable reasons. For example, last Spring our Visual Impairments Program in our Department was in danger. Now, that serves the State, but visual impairment and blindness is a low incidence disability in this—you know, not many kids are blind. But it was a—it's a very important Program, very invested in the State, and so that's another dimension of what Senator **Swan** was saying, that that sort of thing didn't seem to register on the radar even though it was kind of brought up as a criteria issue. I think it's important.

Terlip: That was one of the things that was suggested in the criteria.

Gallagher: I'm sorry. Ok.

Terlip: We had outreach and uniqueness of the Program within the State as other things that we might look at.

Gallagher: Ok. Ok. Well, I think maybe the word “uniqueness” didn’t really register anyway.

Terlip: That’s what we had and meant.

Peters: Senator **MacLin** swears she’ll be short.

MacLin: I’ll be very brief. And I agree with much of what Senator **Swan** says about the importance of evaluating Curriculum because it’s what we believe a university education is about. On the same token, though, I think it’s critical that the data that are used by Committees later to potentially recommend Program cuts be the data that the initial Committee uses to evaluate if there are problems. And so you can evaluate more if you felt like it, but that at the very least. We get to have Jerry [**Smith**] and I and others were on those—that APA task force 2 or 4000 of whatever, and we had very specific data that we used, and so we want this more kind of friendly early Committee to be using those same data so that it is—the Departments and the Programs are getting meaningful information early on, so it’s not coming down like an ax later.

Peters: Well, thank you all very—

Hakes: Can I have a share of time if I make it 30 seconds?

Peters: Sure. Sure. Senator **Hakes**.

Hakes: With regard to the essentials about a Program Review Committee, at our current formulation, what we’re really capable of doing is determining which Programs are in disarray, not necessarily centrality, importance. You know, we get data on things that could go forward, but we can immediately check off and tell you right now where Programs are in disarray by any definitions and which ones are clicking, whether they are small enrollment, large enrollment, or any of them. We can tell—we could—and our lists would look the same. Everybody’s lists would look the same. I don’t know if that information is valuable, but we can do that.

Now that's not exactly what is being asked for here, but it certainly relates to other problems.

Peters: Well, the Committee is continuing to work on this. As I mentioned, Ira [**Simet**, guest] you weren't here yet, but I filled everybody in on your—where you were and your ongoing consultation with the other Bodies on campus, and so if you have other thoughts, feel free to email Ira. There were a few things our discussion didn't quite get to, like the change in the Curriculum Cycle. So, if you have thoughts on that issue or other issues, send an email, and we'll look forward to hearing back from the Committee before the end of the year. Thank you very much.

Simet: Thanks for the discussion.

Peters: We need a motion to rise from Committee of the Whole.

East: So move.

Peters: Senator **East**. Is there a second? Senator **Hakes** [who indicated]. Thank you. All in favor, please say, "Aye." [ayes all around] Opposed, "No"? [none heard] And we will just refer it back to you for further work.

Simet: Sounds good.

1184 1080 Recommendations of Senate Budget Committee on Allocation of Resources within Academic Affairs, regular order
(**Heston/Neuhaus**)

Peters: We have just a couple minutes here. We need to—I'm going to ask unanimous consent, please, to skip the next item on the Agenda. We'll talk about that at our meeting next week.

1185 1081 Regents Teaching Awards Committee Recommendations, for
March 25th meeting (**East/Kidd**)

Peters: And so we need a motion to go into Closed Session to reveal the recommendations for the recipients for the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence. And during Closed Session, only members of the [Faculty] Senate can be present, and our guests, we'll just see them next week. And our support staff can just step out in the hall for a few minutes. So, can we get a motion to move into Closed Session to consider Calendar Item 1185, Docket #1081?

Terlip: So move.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**. Seconded by Senator **East** [who indicated].

[tape off; then back on]

Peters: Ok, are we ready? Ok, we're back in Open Session then. And we need a motion to approve the names that were revealed to us in Closed Session and pass those along to the Provost.

Breitbach: I move.

Peters: Senator **Breitbach**. Seconded by Secretary **Edginton**[who indicated]. Is there any further discussi—discussion, keeping in mind, of course, that the names are confidential? [none heard] Seeing none, all in favor of approving the list of nominees for the Regents Award for Excellence, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] The motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

Peters: And, without objection, we will adjourn. Thank you all.
[none heard] [5:05 p.m.]

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting: 04/01/13 CBB 319 4:00 p.m.

Follows are 2 addenda to these Minutes.

Addendum 1 of 2

Proposed After Hours Building Access Policy Report to the UNI Faculty Senate Kim MacLin

I heard from graduate students, undergraduate students, department heads, individual faculty members, faculty members reporting for a group (a lab, a department, or several like-minded people). I encouraged all who spoke with me about this issue to submit their comments to the online link for policy feedback—so as not to undermine the public comment process of policy implementation. I present here a summary of the feedback I received.

The overwhelming consensus is that the proposed after hours building policy is restrictive, unnecessary, and has significant unintended consequences.

Initial Key Access

“My key is my permission”—Given the rules, paperwork, and controls in place about who gets keys in the first place, having a key to a particular building or room *is in and of itself permission to be there*.

Rules at all three regents’ institutions include strict stipulations about who gets keys and how key request get filed and approved. Other rules common across all three institutions are:

- Don’t share your key
- If lost, report immediately
- Don’t let unauthorized persons in to buildings after hours
- Do not prop doors after hours.

Building Use at ISU and UI

“Faculty, staff, and students shall be permitted access as required for their work or studies”—specifically stated in University of Iowa’s building policy. I could find no mention of after-hours access policies at ISU or UI, *for people who have keys*. I only found helpful information for:

- How to get into a building after hours if you were locked out
- Changing the building hours of a building
- If someone is not assigned a key, but has reason to be there, how do they use or get into a building after hours.

After Hours Use at UNI: Faculty

“I need unfettered access to my office to do my job”—After-hours use of buildings is a necessity for faculty. Reasons include:

- Many hours of outside of normal work time is a requirement and necessity for many trying to achieve tenure.
- Can’t work at home (and shouldn’t be expected to have to); need access to software, equipment, resources and supplies.

- Lab research often requires checking experiments or equipment.
- Faculty don't work 9-5 jobs; recent workload survey should bear this out.
- Data are often required to be kept on campus.
- "I can't work alone???"—Much faculty work is solitary work: reading, writing, research, practicing (Music/Performance faculty report that their practice spaces are single, solitary rooms for private practice).

After Hours Use at UNI: Students

"I have to be able to work on campus, I don't have anything I need at home"—Graduate students in particular note many of the same issues as faculty:

- They must put in after hours time for successful completion of MA theses and doctoral dissertations
- They do not have the materials at home that they need including access to specialized software and data from their research that must be kept on campus
- Music/Performance students (undergraduate and graduate) report the necessity of working late in their appropriate academic environments (practice rooms, studios, performance spaces).
- Restrictive library hours that require them to use their office and laboratory space
- They too often work alone, and they often are working without a faculty member or advisor present.

Keep in mind: we are talking about students who have already gone through the key approval process—these people are approved to have keys for the buildings and spaces they are using.

Identification

Most people are quite comfortable with the notion that they should make sure they have campus identification if using a building after hours and that they may be asked to show it. However, there is some concern about having to be 'cleared' for being in the building, despite have a key and ID, and the time it might take to do so.

United Faculty

UF has raised concerns that this could be a bargaining issue as access to facilities and equipment, progress toward tenure, etc, are bargaining issues; specifically, that the university may be inadvertently restricting ability to do their job. Additionally, it has been raised that the policy may make Public Safety Officers de facto supervisors of employees and buildings.

Academic Environment

"We are adults engaging in scholarly activity"—Many remarked on what such a policy does for the 'feel' of a university, such that it is less a collection of faculty and student scholars, and more a physical plant run by non-academics. Other remarks included:

- If it is cumbersome to come to campus after hours, it makes me less likely to do so which has a huge impact on the job and the experience of university life.

- There is a discriminatory element in that those working after hours have to engage in activities that those who work during regular hours do not have to do.
- Why are rule abiding people's rights being infringed upon in the name of stopping rule breakers? (Presumably people who are using or might use buildings inappropriately after hours?)
- Students and faculty do not engage in strictly 9-5 activity; academic life has great flexibility in hours.
- It does not make an environment 'safer' to restrict access to it.
- Offices house the private property of faculty, and thus they should have a right to access it at any time.
- If a university values education and academic work, it allows unfettered access to the facilities and spaces to do that work.

Unintended Consequences

Those proposing this policy may simply not realize the sheer volume of after-hours activity that regularly occurs on campus, and how much time would be taken to have to approve or even document use, check IDs, etc.

- 48 hours advance notification is "restrictive, ridiculous, and impossible to know."
- Even if there was not a 48 hour restriction, any call-ahead rule is going to be incredibly time consuming and cumbersome—many faculty and students reported that they would be calling upwards of 4-6 times per week.
- If ID checking time takes any longer than literally showing the ID, then that's an added problem (one faculty member reported a recent occurrence of being held up for 10 minutes after showing ID before being allowed to continue their work in their own building, for which they had a key).
- The policy is couched in the notion that it is designed to assure safety; in fact, safety can never be assured, and one wouldn't want people to assume 100% safety simply because such a policy was in place.
- Some terms are not defined: who is the "building coordinator"? What definition or criteria would constitute 'abuse' of the 'privilege' of access? Who constitutes a 'university official' (beyond Public Safety staff) who could request ID?
- This proposed policy has raised a long-standing sore spot among many faculty—issues with parking when they stay late or arrive early (and being ticketed for doing their job).
- Other indirectly related issues were raised regarding existing rules not being following in terms of locking buildings (buildings being unlocked at midnight, but locked at 3pm); keys or fobs not working.

Recommendations (in no particular order)

1. People who have approved access to buildings (defined by having been approved for a key and having it in their possession), *may* (but are not required), to call Public Safety to alert their presence after hours.
2. People who have approved access to buildings (defined by having been approved for a key and having it in their possession), should carry University Identification and show it upon request. There should be no requirement for clearance of said ID.
3. All those using buildings after hours should follow existing rules and common sense:
 - Don't share/loan your key
 - If lost, report immediately
 - Don't let unauthorized persons in to buildings after hours
 - Do not prop doors after hours.
4. There are generally no restrictions for working alone (see below for exception).
5. Students (graduate and undergraduate who have approved for a key to a particular building or space) similarly are allowed to work alone and do not need a faculty member or advisor on premises—while following building/department policy (see below).
6. Departments should be encouraged to review and/or develop their own policies for:
 - Who gets access to keys (including undergraduate and graduate students).
 - Understanding and communication of who the “building coordinator” is.
 - Working alone (there likely would be no restriction in many disciplines; but some restrictions in some disciplines where activities are best conducted such that if someone got hurt, there would be a second person available to secure help--operating a lathe may have different safety issues compared to operating a computer or musical instrument).
 - Building hours (there are procedures in place to request a change in building hours).
 - Policy regarding faculty and student use of buildings after hours and the safety of those doing so should be generated at the department level by the people who are familiar with the space, discipline and work demands, and safety concerns.

Addendum 2 of 2

DRAFT PROPOSAL – Faculty-based Curriculum Management and Process

At the UNI Faculty Senate meeting of 27 August 2012, the formation of “an ad hoc committee to recommend changes in curricular policies and the handbook to insure faculty control” was announced. Establishment of this committee had been identified at an earlier Faculty Senate retreat as one of four major initiatives for 2012-2013. The resulting Curriculum Management Committee was charged with review of processes for curricular change and evaluation, with an eye to development of an improved and effective process featuring extensive faculty involvement in decision-making. Following its initial review of curricular process here at UNI, the Curriculum Management Committee has identified several areas in which improvements could be made.

- As we reviewed the curricular process, the contrast between program creation – driven principally by faculty – and program elimination – often falling to administration – was particularly evident. The hazards of such a problematic separation were highlighted by the recent array of program cuts announced in spring 2012. The reasons for this division of responsibility are unclear. While sources (Faculty Constitution, Policies and Procedures manual, or similar governance documents) confirm the faculty role in initiation of new programs, the charge for review and possible elimination of programs is less clear. Consistency in these two processes is important. We firmly believe that no academic program should be eliminated without the consent of the Faculty Senate.

Currently, the role of the Committee on Academic Program Review does not include recommendations for changing a program’s status; the Committee now serves to check self-study documents and to confirm the presence and use of Student Outcomes Assessment plans for each program, and that review occurs only once every seven years. The University Student Outcomes Assessment Committee is similarly limited in scope, although it does evaluate SOA plans each year. Neither the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee nor the Graduate College Curriculum Committee is charged with program review, and the Faculty Senate does not often take up questions of program elimination (although it is not barred from such actions). Our Committee observed that these latter three groups, working with short review times, are often limited to cursory reviews and therefore find it difficult to provide a genuine assessment. The common result is a tendency toward approval of proposals for new programs, probably owing to deferral to the proposers, and possibly to avoid delaying action for an additional two years as the curricular cycle proceeds.

This deficiency in regular review of program status leaves the Faculty with little information and little voice in judging programs. Positive and negative trends are difficult to identify, particularly in their early stages, and there is no vehicle through which to take action on any trends that are notable. The data to conduct these reviews are available, and in fact are already collected for yearly reports, but no centralized group bears responsibility for campuswide collation and review.

As a means to increase faculty participation in all phases of curricular decision making, we propose the establishment of a faculty committee to manage the status of all programs. The committee would consist of faculty members elected to represent each college, the Graduate Council, and the Council on Teacher Education. We recommend four faculty representatives from CHAS, two faculty representatives from each of the other three colleges, and one from each of the Councils; the Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate would serve as a nonvoting Chair. This committee would:

- * maintain a master list of programs
- * collect available data and review programs yearly based on a small set of criteria, as yet unestablished but likely to include numerical indicators (such as sizes of classes, both program-related and otherwise, taught by program faculty, and number of program graduates) and other measures (such as centrality of the program to UNI's mission, quality of program, outreach potential, and uniqueness of the program within the state). The review would not be linked with faculty lines; specifically, a recommendation to consider elimination of a program or course would not be construed to be a recommendation to eliminate or change one or more faculty lines.
- * identify both signs of growth and areas of concern
- * conduct detailed reviews for all programs every three to four years, serving as midpoint checks between detailed Regents-mandated program reviews
- * provide advice and suggestions for improvement to programs showing downward trends
- * make recommendations regarding resource allocations

The committee would report to the Faculty Senate, which could then recommend or take actions based on the Committee's findings. The Senate also would serve as the first level of appeal for program faculty who disagreed with the Committee's conclusions.

- Our Committee believes that the current two-year curricular cycle, which was strongly linked to the two-year catalog publication cycle, is now outdated and acts as a barrier to comprehensive and efficient curricular review. We would argue, as noted above, that curricular review bodies are reluctant to delay endorsement of newly proposed programs because of the risk that a request for revision could force the proposers to wait until the subsequent cycle for final approval. Replacement of the fixed two-year timeline with a rolling two-year timeline (in which proposals could be initiated in any year) would remove this complication.

We recognize that this would increase committee workloads in the currently-defined "off-cycle" years, with some functions needed every year instead of every other year; however, that should be offset in part by the decreased workload in the currently-defined "on-cycle" years.

- Our Committee also recommends simplification of the curricular process by dividing curricular flow into different pathways for substantive versus nonsubstantive changes. Asking curriculum committees to evaluate small changes in course description language

diverts their attention from larger proposals (such as creation or elimination of programs) with far broader impact. We believe that an initial triage would be useful in identifying items that would require only College-level review and approval prior to grouping as a consent agenda for the University Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate.

- We believe that expansions, divisions, and mergers of colleges, departments, schools, and programs should be reviewed by the Faculty Senate for curricular implications. At the very least, these actions could affect the composition of committees that participate in the curricular process.

In summary, the Committee's recommendations mandate greater faculty participation in the curricular process. Several responsibilities, currently not assigned specifically, would be affirmed as functions of the faculty:

- * regular review of programs
- * identification of, and working with, programs exhibiting early signs of difficulty
- * Faculty Senate approval of proposed program closures
- * timely consultation during mergers and divisions of academic units.

We believe these functions would be expedited by a rolling timeline for curricular flow and by separate curricular paths for substantive versus nonsubstantive changes.

Barbara Cutter (Women's and Gender Studies)
Todd Evans (Health, Physical Education, and Leisure Services)
Gayle Pohl (Communication Studies)
Ira Simet (Chemistry and Biochemistry)
Jerry Smith (Management)
Laura Terlip (Communication Studies)