

4-23-2012

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 23, 2012

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2012 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, April 23, 2012" (2012). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 50.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/50

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
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
04/23/12 (3:31 p.m. – 5:51 p.m.)
Mtg. #1716

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Press identification: Emily **Christensen** from the *Courier* was present.

Provost **Gibson** had two comments. First, 3 candidates will be on campus next week and the following week to interview for the position of Dean of the Library. She encouraged faculty to be involved in the selection process. And second, she announced that Brenda **Bass** has been named Interim Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences as of August 1, 2012. A search will occur at some future time.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** had no comments today.

Vice-Chair **Breitbach** noted that the results of one of her Committee's work this year will be discussed in detail today, that of recommendations for the charge and membership of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee.

Chair **Funderburk's** comments, at this his final regular meeting as Chair, included a detailed summary of the impressive accomplishments of this year's Faculty Senate. He thanked various individuals who contributed to the many endeavors. He also summarized the University-wide challenges the Senate faced this year and encouraged members to continue efforts to open communication across campus and to seek for balance among all constituencies in decision-making.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for approval:

Meeting: April 9, 2012

No additions or corrections were offered, and the Minutes/Transcript were approved by acclamation.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1137 1033 Policy regarding Faculty notification of Grade Changes

Motion to refer to the Educational Policies Commission (Edginton/Bruess**). Passed.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1130 1026 Five-Year Review of President **Allen**

Motion to receive report with thanks to the Five-Year Review Committee (Smith/Neuhaus**). Passed.

1121 1019 Motion to change the charge and membership of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee

Motion to bring original motion forward from the table (Peters/Neuhaus**). Passed.

Motion to divide the question (Peters/Kirmani**). Passed.

Motion to amend the charge Sections 1, 2, and 4 by substituting with the new Section 1 (Peters/Neuhaus**). Passed.

Motion to extend the meeting until the Business on the Agenda is completed or until lacking a quorum (Breitbach/Swan**). Passed.

Motion to substitute #3 on the right [proposal] for #2 on the left [original] of the membership of the Senate Budget Committee (Peters/Smith**). Passed.

Motion to constitute members of the Senate Budget Committee as proposed (who?/who?**). Passed.

1132 1028 Motion to Discharge the Advisory and Liaison Committee to
The Department of Military Science

**Motion to discharge the Advisory and Liaison Committee to the
Department of Military Science (**DeBerg/Smith**, from docketing).
Passed.

1135 1031 LAC Review Procedures for 2012-13

Motion to approve recommendations (Neuhaus/East**). Passed.

1136 1032 Report of Findings from the University Writing Committee

Motion to accept report (Breitbach/Swan**). Passed.

5. New Business/Old Business

None.

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 5:51 p.m. (Breitbach/everyone**). Passed.

Next special meeting:

April 25, 2012

Oak Room, Maucker Union

11:00-1:00

Next special meeting/retreat:

April 30, 2012

University Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

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

April 23, 2012

Mtg. 1716

PRESENT: Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, James **Jurgenson**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Michael **Roth**, Jerry **Smith**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Katherine **Van Wormer**, Susan **Wurtz**

Absent: Betty **DeBerg**, Marilyn **Shaw**

Guest Presenters:

Maureen **Clayton**, Chair of the Graduate Council

Lauren **Nelson**, Chair of the Graduate Faculty

Gene **Lutz**, Director of the Center for Social and Behavioral Research

Deirdre (Deedee) **Heistad**, Liberal Arts Core Director

David **Grant**, Chair, University Writing Committee

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** [3:31 p.m.]: Can I have everyone's attention? We have a quorum, and we have a very full schedule today, so I'll call the meeting to order.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Funderburk: And I'll ask Emily (**Christensen**, of the *Courier*) to identify herself for press identification. [she indicated her presence by raising her hand] Anyone else? [none apparent] Very good.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Funderburk: Comments from Provost **Gibson**?

Gibson: Just 2 quick announcements. According to Associate Provost **Licari**, the candidates for Dean of the Library will be on campus next week and the following week. We realize that's late, but we ask that you try to make it to the open forum. The schedules will be posted on UNI Online, so....3 finalists. Second announcement, I have appointed Brenda **Bass** as the Interim Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences effective August 1. Dean **Mauceri** will be here up until that point in time, so she will serve as Interim Dean. We will have a search at some point, and I have no plans to merge SBS with CHAS [light laughter around].

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Funderburk: Comments from Chair **Jurgenson**?

Jurgenson: No.

REPORT ON COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION FROM VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH

Funderburk: Comments from Vice-Chair **Breitbach**?

Breitbach: We will be taking up another one of our initiatives today, if we have time today.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Funderburk: All right. Well, I have lengthier comments. While it is true that we have two more special sessions before the end of the semester, today is the final regular meeting of the UNI Faculty Senate for the 2011-12

academic year. At this point, I think it appropriate to reflect on the academic year we are completing.

This Senate has been one of the most active in recent times having been called upon to grapple with a wide variety of issues. Among these:

A significant reworking of the Senate bylaws which include:

a reworked leadership structure, with newly clarified duties, updated language to reflect current practices, and language which clarifies the Senate's relationship to and powers over committees of the faculty.

The Senate began committee restructuring including:

**a recommendation to restructure the Senate's Budget Committee,
**a recommendation to discharge the Senate's Strategic Planning Committee, and
**a recommendation to discharge the Advisory and Liaison Committee to the Department of Military Science.

For their many hours of work on both of these major initiatives, I want to say thank you to the members of the ad-hoc Bylaws Committee (Karen **Breitbach**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, and Jesse **Swan**). Thank you very much for all the work you put in.

Numerous significant university policy recommendations were passed by the Senate including policies related to:

electronic devices in the classroom,
academic ethics,
academic grievance procedures,
attendance and make-up work, and
spring mid-term designation.

A special thanks to the Educational Policy Commission, chaired by Gayle **Rheinberger-Dunn** for their work in reviewing each of these and bringing forward actionable policy recommendations to the Senate.

This year was a curriculum cycle for the Senate and, normally, that fact alone would have made for a busy year:

Once again, we learned that the overall curriculum process at UNI needs to be re-examined and perhaps altered in order to assure greater consistency and consultation and in order to affirm that curricular changes meet the appropriate tests to show that they are educationally valid **and** fiscally prudent.

This year, the Senate held 5 consultative sessions including presentations from the President, Provost, Associate Provosts, LAC Director, and those concerned about spending levels for auxiliary enterprises.

At the direction of the Senate, a committee was formed and President Allen's Five-Year Review was undertaken and a summary report prepared.

The most difficult work of the Senate involved consideration of recommendations for Program Closures and Restructuring brought forward by the administration, due to ongoing budget pressures.

Under difficult and, some would say, unreasonable restrictions, the Senate sought to mitigate the detrimental effects and severity of these changes. While opportunities for input were limited, our efforts were not without effect.

I want to thank the Senate's leadership team of Vice-Chair Karen **Breitbach**, Secretary Scott **Peters**, and Administrative Assistant Sherry **Nuss**. Without their consistent efforts, we would not have gotten through this year. They devoted many hours throughout the year to keeping things moving and to helping keep me in line. [light laughter around]

Clearly, the Faculty Senate had a heavy workload this year. Faced with this workload, the Senate altered its meeting schedule and more than doubled the number of work sessions, meeting weekly rather than twice monthly. Through all of this, I heard not one complaint from members of the Senate as to the workload, schedule, or the burden placed upon this group. From my perspective, in every instance this year, the Senate has approached the

tasks before it with professionalism and dedication, striving for what is best for the University of Northern Iowa. Thank you very much to all Senators and their alternates for taking on these many tasks.

For all of this, I am grateful and happy to have had the opportunity to work with each of you in this very difficult, but significant year.

Since the founding of this institution in 1876, the academic year we are currently completing will likely go down as one of the most challenging to date.

Sadly, those challenges are not fully behind us.

A continued lack of financial support for public universities threatens the quality, availability, and affordability of the educational system which has significantly contributed to the success of the State of Iowa as well as the nation as a whole.

If we have learned anything from the circumstances of this year, it is that we must learn to work together in a more open and collaborative fashion if we are to succeed going forward.

Closed door decision making and sniping through media outlets is not helpful in developing the cohesion that is necessary for this to be a truly great university. Students and faculty must be brought into the discussions so that we may work together with administration to discover the ***best*** paths going forward.

No one group has all of the information or answers. The significant breakdown of communications witnessed in the past few years cannot be allowed to continue.

We must learn from the missteps of the recent past.

It has been said that,
“Out of adversity comes opportunity.”

Let us seize this opportunity to foster better working relations on campus as well as with our varied constituencies across the state and nation. Working collaboratively, TOGETHER, I believe we can build an even better UNI for all.

With that, my final comments as Senate Chair, let's proceed to the next item of business, one that I have been eagerly awaiting, that would be the election of new Senate officers. [laughter around]

ELECTION OF OFFICERS [beginning]

Funderburk: So I want to thank Susan **Wurtz** who chaired that committee and all of you who took part. They brought forward two names, one each for Chair and Vice-Chair. And it is appropriate to have nominations or self-nominations from the floor, whatever. I guess actually we should do the Minutes first. We'll do the Minutes and then think about that.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Funderburk: Approval of Minutes for April 9th. From what I understand, there was one correction offered from Senators. Do we have any other corrections or comments from the floor on Minutes? None? Ok, so approved by acclamation.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1137 for docket #1033, Policy regarding Faculty notification of Grade Changes

Funderburk: We do have one item to docket. This is based on the discussions last time, a petition filed to develop a policy regarding faculty notification on grade changes. Is there a motion to docket on 1137?

Edginton: So move.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**. Second from Senator **Bruess** [who indicated]. Any discussion? This is regular order, I'm assuming. [motioner/seconder agreed with nods]

Swan: I have a question. So, who's bringing this to the Senate? That wasn't clear to me.

Funderburk: I wrote it up, and actually the intent was to forward it to the EPC, and that's actually what the thing says.

Swan: And that's what I think we should do. We should direct it to the EPC now, rather than docketing.

Funderburk: That's what the petition calls for, so the Senate can do either thing it wants.

Swan: Well, would Senator **Edginton** do that?

Edginton: Sure.

Swan: So that's what Senator **Edginton** meant when he made the motion? To send this request to the EPC?

Edginton: It's up to Senator **Swan**.

Funderburk: In a very practical sense, I think it won't matter whether we docket it as regular order and then send it to the EPC in the first meeting in the Fall, or if we send it today, because that Committee I think will not be constituted again until the Fall.

Swan: If we send it now, then it will be done.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I apologize for having been unable to do all my homework before this meeting, but would the Policies on Academic Freedom fit this better? Because that does very specifically talk about how many days people have to notify folks. Are we just asking for this to be amended or a completely separate policy?

Funderburk: Well, that's a request for a completely separate policy that was based on the discussion last week during those, because there is no policy on notifying a faculty member when a grade is changed here. So the motion I think on the floor now is to send it directly to the EPC requesting that they do this. And the second is ok with that. [**Bruess** nods.] Ok, further discussion? All those in favor, say "aye"? [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Very good. So it is off to the EPC so they have something to look forward to.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS [finalization]

Funderburk: Now, for election of officers. We have one nomination coming from the Committee for Chair, Secretary Scott **Peters**. Senator **Peters** is the nominee who has accepted for Chair of the Senate for next year. Are there any additional nominations from the floor, or perhaps a speech from Senator **Peters**? [laughter around]

Peters: No speech. [more laughter around]

Funderburk: [a cell phone goes off] How about a song? [even more laughter] So, hearing no additional, do we want to vote on this openly. [voices saying "yes"] We could do this as a secret ballot, if one wants the option; otherwise, we'll just do it as a voice vote. All those in favor of Senator **Peters** for Chair of the Faculty Senate, please say "aye"? [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Thank you very much. Congratulations.

There was one name forwarded for Vice-Chair who is also now Chair-Elect, and that is that Senator Jerry **Smith** agreed to have his name placed in nomination for the Vice-Chair position. We have the opportunity for any

nominations from the floor or a speech from Senator **Smith**, if he would like. [he declined non-verbally] No further nominations? Shall we do the same thing then? All those in favor of Senator **Smith** for Vice-Chair and Chair-Elect, say “aye”? [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [none heard] And abstentions? [none heard] Very good. Thank you very much, and congratulations. [applause and laughter all around] Senator **East**.

East: I would like to recommend that in the future we attempt to have at least 2 candidates for each office, because I think that we’re better served that way—if it’s possible.

Funderburk: I think I can speak for the Committee. I know there were more nominations, but people also have to accept the nomination for it to come out of the Committee. But I think that is an excellent point.

East: Thank you. Meaning no dissatisfaction today.

Funderburk: I understand. I will state that it is very difficult to get people to agree to do committees, especially one that can tend to get kind of busy sometimes. [heads nodding all around] Ok, moving forward.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1026, FIVE YEAR REVIEW OF PRESIDENT **ALLEN (BRUESS/DEBERG)**.

Funderburk: If we can have our guests [**Clayton/Lutz/Nelson**] come up to the center table, this is now for the Item 1130/1026 which is the Five-Year Review of President **Allen**. We have name tents and everything. [some laughter around] The summary has been posted online for about a week. The primary point of what this would be is the Senate just accept the Summary Report. I would like to thank everyone, and I asked Chair **Jurgenson** to do the presentation of this. I don’t know if you want to just take it from here? What needs to be said?

Jurgenson: I don’t know that anything needs to be said, but what I will say is that your Chairman, Jeff **Funderburk** was the primary mover in getting

this started, and he should be congratulated for that. I personally had little to do with it, not by design but mostly by coincidence. Meetings were held at times I couldn't meet. So this took place, as it says—well, it's not up there [on the projected screen]. In February? Yes?

Funderburk: It was posted on (?) or closed out on (?) February 21.

Jurgenson: 21? And Gene [Lutz, Director of the Center for Social and Behavioral Research] is the statistical guy here, so he knows all the figures. So how many—what percentage of the faculty voted?

Lutz: 35%

Jurgenson: 35%, but it was representative of the ranks. [to Senators] Do you all have a copy of this? [some heads nod] I don't know what further can be said about it. That's what it is.

Neuhaus: Chair **Jurgenson** would you be entertaining any questions or any comments at this point?

Jurgenson: Sure.

Neuhaus: I don't know whether you folks have a handle on it or have a sense of it. I know initially a number of my colleagues had a little trouble with that survey. I think it turned out if you backed up or did something in that survey, it sort of erased things and nullified that. Had you gotten much feedback on that particular survey instrument?

Jurgenson: I don't think so.

Funderburk: There were a couple of e-mails initially, and then a follow-up with some of the people explaining that apparently that's a problem with the MyUNiverse survey tool, not particular to this survey, that if you used your browser back-up buttons, versus the navigation buttons within the survey, it does do that. It saves when you go to the next screen, but if you go back a screen (using the browser back button), it would take it out. What we did was to compare the response rates from the previous surveys

to this one, trying to track that. And the response rate from this one was 35, and the previous was 34? Or vice versa. And **Gene** can say more as well.

Lutz: It's been that way since 1976.

Jurgenson: That's been the rate. It's been constant.

Neuhaus: So, likely that wouldn't have been a factor.

Lutz: No, I mean, in terms of the response rate. Now, in terms of "who" participates, I have no way to judge that exactly. But it was our first experience with the MyUNiverse tool in the Center, too, so we hadn't used it before. It's what it is.

Funderburk: I think it's worth noting since there were also issues raised of the concern about confidentiality that we have no way of knowing even what an individual—everyone had the right to skip any question, and we have no idea if that was a technical issue or a choice to skip. Nor did I think we ever saw data to know respondent A did this all the way through.

Lutz: No, we didn't.

Kirmani: Then I have a question.

Funderburk: Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: How was it announced that there would be it? Was it on UNI Online?

Nelson [Lauren, Chair of the Graduate Faculty] : Yes, and e-mail probably. [other voices agreeing] And also you would have gotten an announcement if you went on MyUNiverse. It would have shown up.

Kirmani: I see, because I did not get any announcement, and the reason is that somehow much of my e-mail goes to that junk box. I found it out later, so I had no opportunity to participate.

Funderburk: The e-mail was sent to a combined list that I worked on with Pat **Woelber**. It was the University list that went to all faculty, which unfortunately was larger than voting faculty which caused more confusion. And then it was in UNI Online twice, and then the announcement via MyUNiverse directly. I think worth noting is the confusion caused because this was the first time online, and that e-mail did get to an awful lot of people who should not have gotten it. And then the question was, “Why can’t I get my survey to work?” Then, going forward my recommendation would be to tweak the way you announce it to the campus. Make it clearer. Senator **Smith**, did I see you starting to.....?

Smith: Yes, I was kind of getting there. I’m just wondering if this is passed on to President **Allen**, and specifically it seems the bottom line concerns are about communication, vision, and working with the faculty during challenging budget situations. Is there enough specificity in what we would be looking for that he would be able to recognize what at least the faculty perceives as deficiencies? And I think in particular in the “vision,” what could you tell him, or what would you be looking for that you’re not seeing, that at least faculty aren’t seeing, that we can pass on to him that would be beneficial?

Clayton [Maureen, Chair of the Graduate Council]: I guess the primary sense from us—we were privy to the open-ended comments, which was the only piece of information that was available to interpret how people chose to score the question. With reading those, there were a couple of different wordings to those. Some were suggestions for improvement in each of the areas, and so we could look at those to provide feedback as to how fast it would suggest things be changed. I would say there were relatively few of those that were helpful. But those have been shared with the President. In terms specifically of vision, and feel free to jump in [directed to her co-presenters], the comments were suggesting that beyond the strategic priorities for the University, what faculty were interested in were a larger vision for the place of a comprehensive university in the current higher education realm, and how UNI fit in that particular aspect of the vision.

Smith: So, is it the idea that the comprehensive university like UNI is kind of between two schools—the Research University and a very teaching-oriented Liberal Arts College, and it could kind of fall between that? It's not clear that you're good enough in either one to be really great? Is that the thing? Or maybe I just put words

Clayton: I don't think we could pull that out of the comments. [several voices at once]

Nelson: Right. The comments simply meant to identify UNI's position going forward in a broader way than, "We're going to achieve these 3 strategic priorities." But no one would have gotten as specific as that in their comments.

Edginton: I think it's a very good question, because for the evaluation to be useful in any way, it really needs to be tied to some concrete recommendations on how we can carry forward. And this may be heavy, but, for example, I know that the President and the Provost go and visit Colleges [on campus]. Maybe the President and Provost should go and visit each Department and have a conversation with each Department, because there seems to be somewhat of a disconnect between the faculty and the President, and so if there's a call for—I don't want to say "more intimate" relationship but—a closer relationship with the faculty, and if that could be achieved.... I know it takes a lot of time to do that, but if that could be achieved, at least people would feel like they're being listened to and their concerns could be put on the table. I don't think you could do that in a broader forum where the entire College meets and that occurs. I don't think people really will fully express themselves, and there're just too many individuals, too many to get their questions answered. So I mean if we could tie this to some more specific recommendations, I think it might be useful. So, I think you're onto something, Senator **Smith**. That might be one of the

Smith: Yeah, if I can just follow-up. I mean, I know we did a lot of effort into the strategic planning thing and came up with the 3 priorities, but I felt with that that there was still—just having some exposure to strategic planning and things like that in courses I teach, I felt that there was—I

would feel that there's some things missing and that maybe this vision issue is kind of getting at that. That in the positioning of a comprehensive university, how do we—what is our excellence? How do we make it? How do we define our place in a landscape that's going to be changing an awful lot with online and other kinds of things? And I'm not sure that that was developed adequately by the strategic planning exercise. It may be something that the President with involvement of the faculty should look at again.

Lutz: I would just respond that our interpretation of the quantitative and the open-ended is that that's what people are saying they want. They feel a void there as well. It's not that there's some assertion that there's an answer that hasn't been revealed but that there's a void, and they're looking for leadership to fill that hole. That's an interpretation of ours.

Funderburk: Procedurally, it may be worth noting that the [Five-Year Review] Committee met with the President last Monday with the draft of this and some additional information to have a conversation and to allow questions also, some of which is similar to the questioning now.

Edginton: I want to add to your comment, too, about the tug-of-war that sometimes seems to occur between the professional schools and the Liberal Arts Program on campus. And I can remember when Provost **Gibson** first came that one of her first comments to Department Heads was, "Well, we're going to get in there and reevaluate the Liberal Arts Core." And my comment was, "Well, can we get in there and reevaluate the professional education programs here on campus at the same time, so that we can find out what the interplay should be between those two elements?" And I was thinking of Scott **Cawelti's** comments in his opinion piece in the newspaper where he said, "Monies are being funneled into the College of Business and the College of Education away from the Liberal Arts Core." That's not been my experience since I've been here. In fact, the reverse has occurred. The money has been taken out of the College of Education--I don't know about Business--

Smith: We never had any money. [laughter around]

Edginton: and funneled into the Liberal Arts Program. But I think that dynamic tension that has yet to be resolved is something that we need to give some stronger consideration to, how those two things blend together. And I think Eugene **Rice**'s presentation where he talked about "the third way" was very powerful conversation that he had with us. It's unfortunate the rest of the campus didn't hear that. But I think that needs to be addressed. I don't think there's any question about how we resolve that tension between professional education programs and the Liberal Arts.

Funderburk: Are there other questions or comments for the [Five-Year Review] Committee regarding this report? What will we do then? Vote to accept? But we didn't actually get a—or I don't even know that we need to accept or endorse. We could just leave it at reporting. We could say "thank you" to all.

Edginton: I think we need to accept the report. It doesn't mean we endorse it.

Smith: Shall we say we receive it? [voices agreeing]

Funderburk: I think "receive" may be the best way. So motion to receive from Senator **Smith**. Second from Senator **Neuhaus**.

Smith: With thanks to the Committee who all worked on it.

Funderburk: Additional discussion? All those in favor of receiving the Report, say "aye"? [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [none heard] And abstentions? [none heard] Very good. Thank you very much. Thank you very much to members of the Committee, both for coming and for all the many Friday afternoons we spent together.

DOCKET #1019, MOTION TO CHANGE THE CHARGE AND MEMBERSHIP OF THE FACULTY SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE (**TERLIP/BRUESS**).

Funderburk: Ok, so the next item that I have on the Agenda is 1121/1019 which is the motion to change the charge of the committee and the

membership. It's technically been tabled, so we need a motion to take it off the table if we are going to deal with it today. So is there a motion to take this item up from the table. Senator **Peters** [who indicated]. And a second from Senator **Neuhaus** [who indicated]. Discussion? All those in favor of taking it from the table, say "aye"? [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Very good. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Ok, so the motion that's on the table is the original motion that the [ad hoc Bylaws] Committee made that we discussed first on April 2nd. Discussion of this motion was that the Senate decided that there were two separate functions that needed to be carried out—informational on the one hand and consultation on the other. And we divorced (?) the consultation function and focused on the information function. Since that time we talked about the motion in committee of the whole; we've exchanged multiple e-mails among Senators and privately; and last Friday after all that discussion, Senator **Neuhaus** and I met with Senator **East**. We have also received a few e-mails from a couple of you privately. And we have put forward the proposal that I e-mailed last evening, so what you'll see on this screen [projected for the group] is on the left is the motion that's on the table. On the right is what I would like to propose as an amendment in a moment, but what I think would be beneficial is if we separate out the two main issues that we still have some disagreement on and set the charge separately from the question of how we constitute the [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee and the membership of that Committee. And therefore I'd like to move to divide the question to consider the charge of the Committee first and the membership second.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters'** motion to divide the question. Senator **Kirmani** is the second [who indicated]. Is there any discussion on the division of the question? All those in favor of dividing the question, say "aye"? [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [one heard] And abstentions? [none heard] Motion carries. Ok, so the question has been divided. Shall we take up the charge motion on the charge first, Senator **Peters**?

Peters: So to spark the discussion of this, I would like to propose that Section 1 of the existing proposal which is up on the screen on the

left....excuse me. Let me rephrase that. I would like to propose that we substitute Sections 1, 2, and 4 of the April 23rd draft that's up on the screen on the right for Section 1, which is the motion that's on the floor and is up on the screen on the left.

Funderburk: Ok, so there's a motion to amend. Is there a second to that amendment? Second from Senator **Neuhaus** [who indicated]. Discussion on the amendment? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: A very brief comment. I believe that there was pretty good consensus about the basic nature of the charge, that it should focus on providing information to the Senate, serving to answer questions of the Senate, to report regularly to the Senate. The issue of the parts of the original proposal that were pulled out of the current language, the amendment that's on the floor, had primarily to do with requirements that the report be circulated in a particular way and to particular people, requirement that the President be invited to respond. My own feeling is that we would probably do that anyway as a matter of course, that when a committee writes a report that might be of interest to other people on campus, we would probably vote to circulate it, and that it would certainly still be appropriate to invite the President to talk about budgetary issues soon after the time that we had received this information about budgetary issues.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I'm just curious about the October 1 date and how that fits in the current budgetary cycle, and would it be appropriate to have one at the beginning and the ending here. I just don't understand.

Peters: We actually talked about that. The March 15th date, our original thought was that it would kick off the budget planning process for the next year. The idea of the October 1st date might mean that it might be more important for the Senate to, relatively early in the year, basically start the year with a good amount of information about what ended up happening, what ended up being in the budget when the new Fiscal Year started, so that we can monitor the situation throughout the entire year. I guess my

feeling is that it might be two slightly different ways of getting at the same thing, and there will be nothing that would prevent the Senate from say, “You know what? We think it would be helpful to get a report from the Budget Committee in the middle of the Spring as well so that we can get a sense of planning for the next year as well.”

Terlip: October 1 just felt strange. It seemed like everything would be done by that point and just be looking at what actually happened.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Let’s get through the schedule here. October 1 they would get a report that would govern--say, October 1 of 2012, we’d get a report governing the budget of 12-13? Is that the deal then?

Peters: I think, yes, it would be “What did we start the year at? What is our budget for our fiscal year?”

Smith: So, it’s the budget for this year that we’re already in?

Peters: Yes.

Smith: And then idea that potentially if we wanted some front-end input into next year’s budget, that would be in the Spring semester? Ok.

Peters: Yes.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Why not twice a year?

Peters: We could do that.

Gallagher: I mean, unless I’m not understanding something, wouldn’t we want to have information at a point where some input could be offered? That just seems—if we’re going to have this [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee, isn’t that what it’s for?

Funderburk: Senator Provost **Gibson**.

Gibson: If we look at this year, I mean, we're hoping that we'll have the budget from the Legislature sometime in May. That's what we're hoping. Last year it was June. So, if there's to be input, that really needs to come during the Summer.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: Perhaps—I had some input into this—or at least I suggested that March 15 doesn't make sense because we don't have any information from the Legislature about what the budget's going to be at that point in time, and any planning, the Board of Regent's approves their budget earlier than that, I believe, or about that same time, so for the Senate to receive a report from the [Faculty Senate] Budget Committee on March 15th, seems to make no sense for providing input into what that Budget's going to be or reaction to what our Budget's going to be. I mean, it's just right in the middle of everything it seemed to me. And so having a report from them leaves essentially no action taken, I thought. And the idea of a relatively early in the Fall report would allow for a reaction to what did happen and a start of input into the next budget process, much more favorably and much more realistically, I think, than a March 15th kind of date.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip** and then Senator **Gallagher**.

Terlip: I guess my question was more from the standpoint, and again forgive me I was ill last week, but my understanding was that this [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee was just going to give information. It wasn't really the political arm so to speak so that to get it started, I think maybe October 1st is fine. But if they're supposed to be monitoring, it would seem that we would want something at the end of the year to see what happened. Is that inconsistent with what the [ad hoc Bylaws] Committee was thinking?

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher** then Senator **Neuhaus** and then somebody over here on the right.

Gallagher: [yielded—words unclear]

Neuhaus: Well, I was just going to respond or maybe Scott [**Peters**] would want. I think one of the things we built into this was the ability to ask for reports at nearly anytime if there's a need of that. So, there may come some point where we really need a report in December or we really need a report in January. I think some of our thinking was we wouldn't know that in a given year, because things don't always happen in a uniform fashion. I think the October date, the thought was on that that that was going to be fairly standard of what may unravel through the year or come together through the year could be dealt with at any time by saying, "Hey, we'd sure like these folks to report on what's happened right now." And maybe March would be too late at that point. Maybe we'd want it earlier in the year.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher** and then Senator **Terlip**.

Gallagher: Well, what I heard Provost **Gibson** say was that Summer would be an important time.

Gibson: Right. I mean, we'll know what our Budget is after the Legislature meets. We don't know right now what our budget situation is for next year.

Gallagher: Exactly. When you get the Budget in the Summer, late May early June, whenever, at that point that money is—you're starting to make plans at that point, because that would be a crucial juncture, right?

Gibson: That's correct.

Gallagher: We have talked about the Senate only meeting Fall and Spring semesters and maybe Summer there needs to be some work done. At least we need maybe to rethink that issue, too, but it would seem to me that a report would come to the Senate shortly after you find out what the budget is and get feedback from upper Administration about how that money is

intended to be spent, and that would be an important time to have a report. And I'd rather formalize that rather than say, "Well, we'll logically do X, Y, and X" because I'm not sure that will happen if it's not formalized.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip** and then Senator **Smith**.

Terlip: That's my concern about having it a second sort of follow-up, because it sort of assumes that everybody could remember that we need to do that or we want to do that, and I think what we're setting up is really important today. If we codify it, it will be better.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I happen to think that given that the charge of this Committee is mainly information that the October 1st does make sense because then you do have what the current Budget is. This Committee can do its job of saying, "Here's what's been budgeted." And that provides information to the [other] more proactive committee with more in terms of priorities in setting and giving advice to the Administration in terms of what should be done. So, quite frankly, I'm quite comfortable with the October 1st deadline. I think it does make a lot of sense because you have your numbers firm then and can work with the way things actually are but then use that to launch concerns about where we're going with our priorities.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Wouldn't it be after the money has already been allocated though? Isn't that kind of closing the barn door after the horse has left?

Smith: Yeah, but see, I guess I'm again making that distinction between finding—this [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee, in my understanding is, finds out what's the financial condition of the University? What are our priorities as reflected in the Budget? And then the other thing that needs to be done by the Senate or wherever else we decide to do that, is more of the, what do you call, lobbying but more proactive, "Hey, here's where we think the priorities are skewed. Here's what we think ought to be changed." So what this Committee is supposed to do, which is primarily

informative, providing information, providing understanding, I think it makes sense to have that done October 1st and the Committee can have an understanding of here's what the University now is budgeting in this year. Here's what it said. I think that makes sense.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters** and then Senator **Swan**.

Peters: Well, we certainly could require 2 reports a year and could have a motion to amend to add a second date in there to require 2 reports a year.

Smith: What would the 2nd report consist of? What would be the thrust of it?

Peters: I think if I'm hearing the concerns of some of the Senators, it would be to get some sense of what the outlook for the next year looks like, what the priorities the faculty perceives may look like, analyze how this year's Budget has played out in light of those priorities so that the Senate may, in whatever capacity ends up happening on the consultation side, being able to advise the Provost and the President about that. Did I sum out what the other Senators said? That's what I'm hearing, and I think if we wanted to amend that and have 2 reports a year, that'd be fine.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: I think Senator **Smith** articulated what we're doing most recently very clearly. Right now we've (technical difficulties occurred for some minutes so no audio available; summary follows from note-taking until audio restored for transcribing)

Senator **Swan** continued with his concern regarding the retracting of the delegated authority of this Faculty Senate Budget Committee. The discussion continued about the tension of where the authority would now lie but that this is not the current proposal.

Senator **Neuhaus** wondered about finding bright people willing to serve on this [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee who could find the time to analyze

all the figures after they arrive in late Spring. Working in the Summer on budget issues sounds ok in April or May but not so much in July.

Provost **Gibson** sought to understand the current discussion asking that if the Administration receives budget information from the Legislature, say, May 15th or 30th, what would be the next step of the Senate Budget Committee? Senator **East** reminded everyone that the current discussion is about the informational arm of this Committee and that consultation has been separated out. This current discussion is not about the mechanism whereby input is provided to the Administration but simply one of providing information to the Faculty Senate about the Budget and budgetary issues.

Senator **Gallagher** asked Provost **Gibson** if the Administration typically had potential plans in place prior to receiving the final budget numbers from the Legislature and when the final budget was determined. **Gibson** replied that they have models in place, and the final budget is due July 1. **Gallagher** continued by suggesting that for informational purposes perhaps the Budget Committee could report to the Senate on June 15 or so, so the Senate would know what the budget will look like. The Provost thought that after the Budget was out, the Senate would want to know whether the monies for the entire University, not just Academic Affairs, were flat or cut by 2% or perhaps UNI received the \$4 million it requested. [light laughter around] She would like everyone on the same page during the Summer, or the Senate might not know details until the Fall. **Gibson** thought perhaps an information meeting could be held rather than the full Senate for sharing details.

Discussion of amending the proposal under discussion occurred as to reporting dates, and **Smith** reminded everyone that many colleagues are not around in the Summer and also that enrollment affects everything. It is significant in terms of dollars available, he noted. That's why he feels October is a better date. Fall enrollment has stabilized by then.

Senator **Kirmani** asked if surely the budget process is ongoing and not just started after receiving information from the Legislature. Senator **Swan** reiterated that faculty influence is important but that it's unrealistic to

meet in the Summer. Communication can occur without actually meeting. And only if truly alarmed should a meeting be called. **Neuhaus** reiterated the difficulty the Senate may have finding members for this [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee if too much is asked. Many faculty need Summer for research, he noted.

Senator **East** brought the discussion back to the charge saying that nothing currently in the charge says that this Committee works with the Administration; rather it looks at the Budget, analyzes it, and reports back to the Senate. The Senate needs faculty who will have input and work with the Administration, but that will be a separate Committee.

Senator **Wurtz** suggested that an important time for faculty to provide insights that would be useful to the Administration in the process would be in the modeling period. Each group will have input into the models, and then in October the Senate can review from the report of the Budget Committee how things went and can plan for the next year.

Senator **Swan** spoke against this amendment under discussion because it offered nothing except information, gives no direct faculty feedback.

Chair **Funderburk** summarized that currently the consideration is of the amendment to the charge and the substitution of Sections 1, 2, and 4 for Section 1 as outlined on the projected screen. Senator **Edginton** asked a question about possibly tabling these motions to allow time for alternative recommendations such as **Swan** made, something parallel and determining whether the discussion is about influence or information. **Edginton** would like to be clearer in his mind about all of this.

Ad Hoc Committee member (Chair?) **Peters** reminded everyone that from the April 2 Senate discussion the original charge then was to consult with the Administration. Rereading of the Minutes would show multiple Senators expressed discomfort with one committee performing both functions, information gathering and consultation with the Administration. Vice-President **Hager** has implemented an advisory entity about the budget issues, but the Senate thought it still needed information and that the way forward was to change the charge of the Senate Budget Committee to

focus on the information-providing function. **Peters** stated that if the Senate still believes there is need of information in order to communicate faculty budget priorities, then he urged Senators to move forward with this proposal.

Senator **East** stated he felt input is critical and that faculty need to be discussing with the Administration the process used in order to have influence over it. Senators hope that at next Monday's Retreat a more formal process will be agreed upon by all to move forward, he said, or it may have to wait another 6 months or a year. **Gallagher** reiterated that her point was that the Senate needs information when it matters and not after the fact, that the Senate needs to be able to track things as they are unfolding and with models and not be looking at next year's Budget which she felt would not be useful. Senator **Edginton** agreed with **Gallagher** that the process needs to be in real time in order to exercise the influence needed. He wondered how it would work in real time.

Funderburk asked if this might be a friendly amendment from **Gallagher** to have an additional report in April? **Neuhaus** seconded. **Gallagher** then asked Provost **Gibson** whether she thought April was the best timing or perhaps after the Legislature releases their figures, and **Gibson** replied March or April. **Peters** summarized then October and April, and **Gibson** reminded the Senate that the April timeframe would be only modeling and not concrete figures. **Kirmani** noted that at least the priorities would be reflected, even if not final numbers. Yes, replied **Gibson**, the broad categories. Once again, **Gallagher** asked **Gibson** what were the ideal times, and **Gibson** replied that the Senate needs to know information when the budget numbers come from the Legislature but that perhaps e-mail would be appropriate rather than calling a meeting. The other primary time would be after the final enrollment count a couple of weeks into the Fall semester.

Swan stated that he felt the Administration is clearly asking for responsiveness, and he feels the Senate needs to work with them in the way they indicate would be helpful. Be prepared to meet all the time, if requested, he suggested. **Neuhaus** wondered about the workability of an emergency callback in the Summer. Could the informational group also be

the consulting group? He asked the Provost which the Administration would prefer, meeting with the Senate or with an informational group? **Gibson** reminded everyone that the issue for the Faculty Senate Budget Committee would be the University Budget and not just Academic Affairs. Clearly, the President, the Vice-President for Administration and Financial Services, maybe all Senators. It depends on how the Senate sees its role. She can talk for Academic Affairs, but the Faculty Senate Budget Committee will be looking at the Budget of the University as a whole.

Chair **Funderburk** reminded everyone that there are 11 minutes left in the scheduled meeting time. **Smith** suggested that the consultative role might be more defined after next Monday's Retreat. For the informational side, he suggested the Senate try these proposed dates, April and October. It can be adjusted later, if needed, and he called the question. **Dolgener** seconded. Calling the question passed. **Peters** asked if the proposed 2nd report date was this question up for vote, and **Funderburk** replied, no, the amendment of substituting Sections 1, 2, and 4 for Section 1 as projected stood. This vote on this original amendment passed with 3 no votes.

Now the question of approving the new charge for the Senate Budget Committee as amended in the proposal from the ad hoc Bylaws Committee was considered. **Breitbach** asked to table it until after April 30th with a second from Edginton. **Swan** was against this notion, asking why table it? Several, including **Edginton**, expressed an uncomfortable feeling with moving forward so quickly. [audio restored]

East: With all due respect to the Administration, I don't care what they think about our [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee. It's our Committee. We want them to provide information to us. They have no say in what we want our Committee to do. We've asked the Provost some things about timeframes and those kinds of things, and I think that's appropriate, but it's our Committee. It's for us to get information from. When we consult with them [the Administration], we very much care about what they say, and we don't want to force our Committee on them, but I think this Committee will be good for us. I think it will be good for the University. My guess is that they will do good work, and the Provost will be very interested in what they

say and as well as the President as well as everybody else. But it's our Committee, and I don't care what they think of it.

Gallagher: Can we call the question on the tabling issue?

Funderburk: The motion to call the question on the tabling from Senator **Gallagher**. Is there a second? Second from Senator **Dolgener**. [who indicated] All those in favor of calling the question, say "aye"? [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [one heard] [a voice called a division] We call a division. Hand vote. All those in favor of calling the question, raise your hands, please. [many raised] All those opposed? [very few raised] Ok, so question is called on the tabling. Motion to table, all those in favor of tabling, say "aye"? [one or two ayes heard] All those opposed? [many heard] And abstentions? [none heard] Ok. So we're back to the proposal which is from right side of the screen minus #3. Any discussion? Or are we ready to vote on substituting that. So this is to change the charge and restructure—change the charge portion of the [Faculty Senate] Budget Committee. All those in favor of the new wording, say "aye"? [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [several heard] Abstentions? [one heard] Ok, we're divided against. All those in favor, raise your hands, please? [quite a few hands up] All those opposed? [a few hands up] And abstentions? [unseen if any hands up] Ok, so the motion carries.

The next item now would be the membership on that [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee. Senator **Peters**, do you want to share ideas here?

Peters: So, again we refer back to the original [ad hoc Bylaws] Committee's Report originally discussed on April 2. You can see the membership provision. #2 at the bottom on the left of the screen B, now keep in mind that this was—again, the original proposal was for this consultative body. It would have been appointed by the [UNI] College Senates along with a representative from the Library, the standard representative from the Senate. We had at our original discussion of this and then again at our committee of the whole we had considerable discussion about a smaller appointed committee versus larger elected committees, and so what we did when Senator **Neuhaus** and I met to try to come up with language that we thought summarized the views that had been expressed in those

previous meetings, we came up with Section 3 on the right-hand proposal [on projected screen] in which the Senate would propose, accept, and solicit nominees campus-wide, would hold an election to staff that [Faculty Senate Budget]Committee and would appoint a Chair of the Committee from among the Senators. The text in red there [on the projected screen] is language that was missing from the draft I sent out yesterday evening, and that was just an oversight. So, I would move that we substitute Section 3 on the right for Section 2 of the original proposal.

Funderburk: Ok. Motion to substitute. Is there a second?

Smith: Second

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Smith**. A little bit of housecleaning for our—we have 2 minutes left. We have guests waiting to speak on topics. If we can get a sense of the Senate willing to extend, how long to extend, or how much of the Agenda we choose to do, so that perhaps some lucky souls can leave this room before others. Is there a sense that we're willing to go--I would say we're looking at a minimum of a half an hour if we're going to have even a fighting chance of getting at least some completed. Or are we going to draw the line at a certain point? Senator **Breitbach**.

Breitbach: I move to extend until business is finished.

Swan: I second that motion.

Gallagher: I didn't hear it. I'm sorry.

Breitbach: I would like to finish the business that is docketed for today.

Funderburk: Motion to extend the meeting until the business of the day is completed. Seconded [by **Swan**]. Discussion on that motion? Senator **Roth**.

Roth: I just want to be fair. I'm pleasantly motivated. I have a commitment at 5:00, but I'm not leaving because I'm unhappy. [laughter around and voices] I just wanted to be very clear about that.

Funderburk: I understand. That would mean we would continue business so long as we have a quorum. Ok? That's the motion.

Kirmani: I would have to leave at 5:30.

Funderburk: Many of us will be passing out before then. [laughter around] Ok. All those in favor of extending until the end of business today, that Business on our Agenda, please say "aye"? [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [none heard] And abstentions? [none heard] Ok. Very good. Thanks very much. Sorry, but you're still here [to guests]. So, the motion is made and seconded to substitute the #3 on the right hand for #2 on the left. I do have a clarification, though. I understood from what you [**Peters**] just said, that the Senate Chair would appoint the Senator who would become the Chair of that Committee?

Peters: Oh, you're right. I misspoke. I apologize. I misspoke. The Senate Chair will appoint a Senator, but that person would not necessarily be the Chair.

Funderburk: Ok, just for clarification. Discussion on the amended membership? Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: Just maybe a clarification matter for Senator **Peters**. Three-year terms except, I imagine, for the Senator who's appointed, unless you're always going to choose a first-year Senator for the Committee?

Kirmani: [too quiet to hear and other voices clarifying]

Funderburk: We're trying to simply say an annual Senate position, because I'm assuming the Senate Chair always has the possibility of changing it.

Peters: The idea of having someone appointed from the Senate was to try to make sure it's coordinated, effectively coordinated as best as possible. So I would accept that as a friendly amendment, "appointed annually by the Senate Chair from the Senate."

Funderburk: That's a friendly amendment offered and a second for that friendly amendment from Senator **Bruess** [who indicated] and accepted by the motioner. Other discussion? Motion to call the question [someone indicated]. Is there a second? Senator **Smith**. All those in favor of calling the question, say "aye"? [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] The question has been called. So, this is to substitute #3 on the right for the committee membership #2 on the left with the friendly amendment of annual appointment by the Senate Chair [of one Senator]. All those in favor, say "aye"? [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [none heard] And abstentions? [none heard] Ok. So the motion passes. Now the issue is voting on the membership for real with the amendment for the Budget Committee. Is there any discussion? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I would just point out that the alternative now is between this proposal and the status quo, which is that members are elected within their Colleges. If this proposal is voted down, then the current method of constituting the Budget Committee remains unchanged. [voices commenting]

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So just reiterating. So this is just informational to this Body, the Senate, this new [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee. A consultative committee that might actually be of service to others might be elected at large as it is and would be represented across campus? Just reiterating that that's what it is. That this [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee is just to develop information and give it to this Body only. [others agreeing]

Funderburk: Other discussion on this? Are we ready to vote? All those in favor of the new [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee constitution, say "aye"? [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? One abstention, ok. So motion passes. Thank you very much.

DOCKET #1028, MOTION TO DISCHARGE THE ADVISORY AND LIAISON COMMITTEE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY SCIENCE (DEBERG/SMITH).

Funderburk: Moving to your next item, this is 1132/1028 which is a Motion to Discharge the Advisory and Liaison Committee to the Department of Military Science. Just as a statement of explanation, you may recall that Military Science is now under CSBS with the logic being that the Senate does not normally have the habit of overseeing sections within a College.

Peters: Just one very brief note. I did confirm with the Dean of CSBS that although Military Science has no faculty members per se, the College Senate would have jurisdiction, I guess you could say, over its programs.

Terlip: So, in the past, we usually had a report [more but too quiet to hear]

Funderburk: That would be correct in my understanding. The same way we don't get a report from Theatre or other Department housed within a College.

Terlip: And just for clarification, _____ [too quiet to hear]

Peters: I did not ask that specific question.

Funderburk: I can say that this came forward as a recommendation from the Dean of SBS, so I would say that the College has agreed to take on the task of oversight on that. Yes, Senator **East**, then Senator **Bruess**, and then

East: I'm uncomfortable with this proposal in that while we do not ask for other special reports from subdivisions of other Colleges, those subdivisions of other Colleges are faculty, and they are part of UNI. The Military Science program and ROTC are not subject to any kind of control at UNI, and I presume that's why we had the special oversight committee, to provide that control, that oversight if we will, of the faculty. And most faculty senates, their experience is not in providing oversight to some external body but rather just providing kind of standard oversight to other departments' curriculum and often, too often in my view, just rubber

stamping. I think that in this time when we are trying to watch out for faculty oversight of curriculum, that this is a case where we would be giving up that oversight, and I think it's unwise.

Funderburk: Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: I was just going to say that in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences we are now holding elections for a committee that will provide that function within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and I believe that Senator **Van Wormer** is actually

Van Wormer: Nominated

Bruess: yeah, nominated to that committee. So it's not that it's being dropped. I'm not defending it. I'm just telling you that another committee will be handling this in SBS. (?)

Funderburk: Are there any other questions or discussion? Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Is it possible to ask that [fading away—likely along the lines of having the SBS committee report to the Senate at times.....]

Funderburk: My feeling is the Senate can request information from any committee on campus. Now, whether or not the Senate can compel it if they say, "No, we're not going to do that," I don't know. Any other discussion or are we ready to vote on this? Ok, so this is to discharge the Advisory and Liaison Committee to the Department of Military Science. All those in favor of discharging the Committee, say "aye"? [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [two heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Ok, let's just do a quick show of hands. All those in favor of discharging this Committee, raise hands. [many hands all around] Opposed? [a couple hands up] Abstentions? [none heard] Ok, so motion to discharge carries.

DOCKET #1031, LAC REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR 2012-13 (**SMITH/PETERS**).

Funderburk: 1135/1031 LAC Review Procedures for 2012-13. Dr. **Heistad**, I think you have a label down there someplace. [she moves to the center table and places the name tent in view]

Heistad: Thanks. So, I trust that you saw the memo that I sent to Dr. **Funderburk**. I did bring copies, if you didn't. Is it up there [projected on screen]? Yeah. I have some hard copies, too. I guess I'll just pass them around in case someone wants them. So, basically as I told you the last time I came to visit, which was about 2 weeks ago or 3 weeks ago, as part of the Assessment Academy initiative as well as on behalf of the Liberal Arts Core Committee, I'm here today to request that the Category Review Procedures for next year be uniform across the entire Liberal Arts Core Committee—meaning that what I'm requesting is that we use next year to create measureable, meaningful, manageable goals and outcomes for the entire Liberal Arts Core, meaning for every category and subsection. I'm also requesting that we also use next year to create assessment plans for each one of the categories or subcategories as needed. In the memo that I sent out to all of you, I went through just kind of a basic timeline as well as the context for the request, and so if you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: How does any proposed change in the LAC interact with this?

Heistad: We felt that one of the challenges at this point was to make sure that whatever type of category review process we have and whatever work that we do for the Higher Learning Commission and the Assessment Academy be such that it can be used no matter what the core looks like. When you look at some of the models that have been presented of what a new Liberal Arts Core could look like, all models have categories or components or sections. So what this would do is this would create some common vocabulary and common review procedures that should work with the current Liberal Arts Core as well as any new proposals.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher** and Senator **Swan**.

Gallagher: I'm always concerned when I hear the term "measurable" as in "quantifiable."

Heistad: Well, I think that we're going to have to look at full qualitative and quantifiable measures. I think that at this point we do—in some of the categories we do lots of direct measures in terms of in, for example in the Category 1C, Quantitative Reasoning. You know, they're going to say, "Well, our students could pass because they could pass the test." In other categories right now, for example with the pilot Cornerstone, we're doing a lot more indirect, qualitative measures because we don't have any measurable data per se. Now, indirect, qualitative measures, you know—is that meaningful? Absolutely.

Gallagher: Ok, well, I'm concerned about especially quantitative measures being very, very atomistic and reductionistic, and my overall concern is that this assessment ultimately winds up driving curriculum and limiting faculty in terms of what they teach and how they teach, and I'm adamantly opposed to that. I understand the need for assessment, and we certainly want to show we're assessing our own programs so that other people won't come in, for example, the Legislature, and demand

Heistad: Yeah, I guess that the only way that I can respond to that is that the faculty have to measure the student learning themselves. The faculty have to come up with these outcomes, and the faculty have to measure the outcomes. The faculty would then need to discuss whether or not curriculum would need to be changed based on these measurable outcomes. So, my answer to the question that you're asking is that—or my suggestion would be that faculty need to measure what they're interested in knowing about their courses, their categories, and it's not that I would go in or any other body would go in and say, "These are the outcomes for your students." No, the faculty have to decide what those outcomes are.

Gallagher: So, the faculty will be making their own....ok.

Heistad: Yeah, so there are going to be groups of faculty members who would create the outcomes, would create the assessment plan, and then

would eventually have to do what we're doing now which is implement the assessment plan.

Gallagher: I just don't want it to diminish and homogenize and do all kinds like that.

Heistad: No. And I can't agree with you more. I think that that part of it has to be that we just need the faculty to get them in the space and give them the time to meet. I used as an example in the memo the Category IV Coordinating Committee. I was here last Fall, and we basically had kind of reached a roadblock. And today I'm happy to report that we've been meeting every week this semester, and the Category now has some goals and outcomes that are meaningful to the faculty. They created them.

Gallagher: Ok. As long as this isn't coercive of sort of academic freedom and that sort of things, I'm ok. I just wanted to say that.

Funderburk: Ok, Senator **Swan** and Senator **Terlip**.

Swan: So, maybe you could discuss a little bit my no doubt wrong perception when I'm looking at this. So we went ahead and said ok to suspend doing program review in the categories, and now this looks like that's going to be taking its place. This looks like assessment to me, and that could be one important component of program review, but only one. And so all the other components of program review seem to be jettisoned. And so I wonder how am I misperceiving it? What are all the other components of a program review? How are those being addressed as you move forward with this that looks to me like mostly assessment.

Heistad: Well, I think that one of the things that we've realized over the years—and I guess Betty [**DeBerg**]'s not here, but Jerry [**Smith**] is here, and Jerry is on the LACC committee—is that the category reviews that we have been receiving haven't been particularly meaningful to anyone involved. One of the reasons, just for the context of why we requested the stay for program reviews this particular year, was because Category V was going to be doing its review. And the issue with Category V was that that was one of the categories in the original, and the preliminary LAC-RSC [Liberal Arts

Core-Review Steering Committee] recommendations was going to be changed somewhat dramatically. This year I just met with the Category V Coordinating Committee last Friday, and they—because of the space that we were given, they worked on a plan where—for those of you who are familiar with the Liberal Arts Core, you know that the students have to take a course out of VA, VB, and then a course out of A, B, or C. So the argument was made that with Category C, what are the outcomes for it? If they can just repeat A or B, what's the actual learning that takes place in Category C? And so they were working on those outcomes.

Now how does that get back to the actual review process? That goes back to the review process because what the faculty have asked for is that much of the review procedures in terms of enrollment data, in terms of if they want to look at GPA, if they want to compare their syllabi. They can do that type of stuff. But without some type of assessment plan, there hasn't been much to the category review. And what we heard when we went around and met with all the different categories is they want the category review to have the assessment part of it embedded within it. And it is ultimately assessment no matter how you define it, that basically pushes the category review process forward. If we weren't looking to assess it, we probably wouldn't have it.

You're right. The assessment that we're talking about in terms of the goals and outcomes is one part of it. There are lots of other factors. Whether or not it makes sense to ask people to create assessment plans and to review their goals and outcomes while continuing to do the other elements of a category review, that seems a bit much to be asking of the faculty at this point. I would rather allow the faculty the space to just really focus on what they want their students to learn, to articulate their outcomes, to articulate their goals, to articulate their assessment plan, take that assessment plan and embed it into what could eventually become, for example, a data dashboard, where we could show the faculty—I could collect the data; I could plug it in and say, look, you know, in these classes these are the average GPA's, or in these classes this is what we see in terms of tenure versus tenure-track faculty. This is what we see in terms of how this course matches the Strategic Plan when it comes to the benchmarks of the tenure and tenure-track faculty. And the fact that they can, in fact,

comment on that, that is one part of it. But assessment is essential to the category review process.

Swan: So, as you're talking, it sounds just like what I was thinking actually. So, for instance, I don't understand how the Liberal Arts Core Committee can use this. In the past I've seen how the Liberal Arts Core Committee has used the program review process to re-examine the entire Liberal Arts Core. This looks like it's going to solidify all the more each component making it then more difficult to imagine a very different Liberal Arts Core with different categories even, right? Because the categories are going to be solidified into thinking about themselves and their assessment outcomes. And the program review process doesn't restrict it to that. It can open up the necessity of moving categories around, transforming them. And so that's just another way of asking you about these other valuable functions for the curriculum, the Liberal Arts Core curriculum, that the program review process certainly meant to engage. I've seen it successfully do that. Perhaps recently it hasn't been.

Heistad: Well, I guess that that's what I would ask, if you could actually provide an example of its success? Because I don't know that in recent times that there's necessarily been—well, I have not seen a category review process being used for substantial curriculum change. What's being used to drive curriculum change are kind of national-level best practices, when you're looking at the entire Liberal Arts Core. When you're talking about a category, yeah, there has been curricular change. But I would challenge you to find an example, in fact, of a way in which a category review affected the entire Liberal Arts Core, because that's not the way the category reviews have been working as far as I can tell.

Swan: And is this going to help us work better toward that?

Heistad: Well, I think that what we're going to end up with is we're going to end up with a comprehensive list of outcomes for the entire Core at which point we can begin to measure the Core. If, in fact, we had university-level outcomes—for example, if we had university-level outcomes that allowed us to say, "This is what's going to be accomplished in the Liberal Arts Core; this is what we expect from majors," that's then

what creates an educated person. I do think that this review process can contribute to that. We don't have that university-level outcomes, and it's probably something that we need to think more about. The whole new Lumina Project and the Profile Project, that's what's being talked about on the national scene is connecting the Liberal Arts to the rest of the major.

Funderburk: I've got Senator **Terlip** and then Senator **Kirmani**. You said that 5:30 is when you need to leave?

Kirmani: Yeah.

Funderburk: [to **Terlip**], would you allow him to ask his first?

Terlip: Sure.

Funderburk: Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: So does this mean that the proposal to revise the LAC is shelved for the time being? The LAC will not be revised for the time being?

Heistad: No, well, that's not part of this particular proposal.

Kirmani: I know. But it suggests that that's not going to be done for the LAC-RSC Committee. I don't know what that part is.

Heistad: At this particular point there is no final proposal from the LAC-RSC to make changes. I do think that that will continue, but I don't think it's going to be yet this year.

Kirmani: But this says until 2014, so probably it will not go through then, which is fine. I was on that Committee, although I didn't like that work, so that doesn't bother me, but the LAC definitely needs much more work. It's one of the serious problems on this campus.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip** and Senator **Edginton**.

Terlip: My question I think I asked you last time, and you kind of addressed it. If everybody else is looking at university-level goals and objectives, it looks to me like we're still going to be tied to course-level goals and objectives, and how are we ever going to make progress beyond that? And I guess philosophically why are we choosing to go with continuing with what we have rather than a broader effort that involves all the faculty and figure out what we want our graduates to do?

Heistad: I agree with you in terms of I do think that we need to have those larger conversations. I think that there are a couple of different ways that I can use this information that we're collecting in the LAC that I can think of. One, with a comprehensive assessment plan of the LAC we can actually connect at least parts of the LAC to the Strategic Plan, which isn't something that we've done before. We can actually show what we're doing well and what we're not doing as well. Another

Terlip: Could you maybe give an example of where you're looking at connecting that in the Strategic Plan to?

Heistad: Well, I could even just in terms of tenured and tenure-track faculty. In the Strategic Plan we have some benchmarks, and I don't know if I remember exactly what the numbers are, but maybe that

Terlip: But Institutional Research collects all of that now. I was more interested in the learning outcomes.

Heistad: Well, for example, if we show that there's a category where we have some learning issues. Or, let's say that we have a category in which we have our outcomes. The faculty have established the outcomes. The faculty are doing an amazing job of achieving those outcomes. And we're demonstrating that. The next phase would be, "Well, we do have other information." For example, let's say that 85% of the people who are teaching in those sections are adjuncts. We have the most amazing learning taking place. We have 85% adjuncts. But our Strategic Plan says we should have 80%/85% tenured or tenure-track faculty in all of the courses. That's something that we should then talk about.

Terlip: But I still want to go back to the broader learning outcomes. I mean, right now it's still going to be encapsulated, and so I guess I'm wondering why philosophically we're choosing to do that now rather than work on the bigger outcomes, because it seems to me you had to pick a direction? So why did you choose this direction?

Heistad: Well, there is another issue that I think is really important in the Liberal Arts Core, and it doesn't address your question of "What does an educated student from UNI look like?" It can't answer that because the Liberal Arts Core is only part of that. We would have to have university-level discussions.

But there is something really important that we do need to talk about at UNI. One of the things that we need to talk about is, in fact, the number of students who transfer to UNI. And I think that what I hear the faculty saying about transfer students is different than the report that I'm sure came before you from the Foundations of Excellence Transfer—basically the self-study. And it seems as though the faculty have a tendency to wonder about the quality of some of our transfer students. Any faculty you talk to can give you first-person narratives of amazing students who have transferred to UNI from various community colleges. You do sometimes hear the opposite story. And quite often you hear about, you know, do the students who transfer here actually have the competencies and the proficiencies of a UNI student?

So I think that one of the things that's important for the Liberal Arts Core, and it still doesn't talk to the entire University and what it means to be a UNI graduate, but I think that it's really hard for UNI and for us a faculty to say, "You know what? The transfer students aren't as good as the UNI students," because we don't have anything to demonstrate that with. So, I for one would be happy to see, even if it is category-level assessment, ok? Even if it is at the basic level of "This is Category A. These are how equivalencies are coming." What I would like for us to do as a University, I would like to be able to demonstrate that we have a lot of students coming in, and they automatically get credit for "x." "Well, we know. We can demonstrate what our students know, what they can do, how they can

value this. We want to see you demonstrate that before we accept that transfer credit.”

So I do think that doing this type of assessment will have institutional impact. Will it have the type of institutional impact that you’re hoping for in terms of beginning at the top? Some people have talked about that. Some people have thought that we really need to have university-level outcomes before we can have LAC-level outcomes, but we’ve got to get this started. I mean, we really have to get this started, and we have to do something that’s meaningful to someone. And at this point, honestly, what’s meaningful to me is that whatever we do is meaningful to the faculty, because they don’t need to just be having more and more conversations about things that doesn’t actually affect what they’re doing in the classroom.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I was going to ask you to elaborate on the connection between the LAC outcomes and the broader dimension of the, you know, students as graduating from the University as a whole, especially as it connects with those majors that individuals have, because I think it’s very important for your conceptual framework to go there, to reflect that at some point, and as I presented to Associate Provost **Licari**, you know, we have a model that we have been using in a program to link to a broader set of outcomes, University outcomes, and I would like to see us go there immediately.

Heistad: Well, one of the things that I would like to see is that within the document that will become the Goals and Outcomes for the Liberal Arts Core, there’s terminology that’s being used, especially within the Lumina Project, that talks about—basically what it does is it sets up higher ed., and it says, “These are the competencies of an AA degree.” Ok. “These are the competencies of the Liberal Arts.” Ok. “These are the competencies that a student would have, proficiency that a student would have with a 4-year Bachelor’s Degree.” Then they’re starting to graft (? grab?) onto it the M.A., and then the Ph.D. And so one of the things that we’re looking at, and Susan (**Hill**) has been working on this a lot, is actually articulating, “This is what you, the faculty, can expect from the Liberal Arts Core, in terms of

the proficiency of a student. These are the ways that the majors enhance the Liberal Arts foundation.” And so, you know, at this point

Edginton: Or the reverse. [other voices saying “the other way,” “the reverse”]

Heistad: Or the inverse, although I would disagree with that, but that’s ok. But we are trying to articulate that, and if the Liberal Arts Core Committee passes it, it might be the beginning of that conversation. “Do we all agree that this is the relationship between the Liberal Arts Core and the majors?”

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I’ve been involved with the Liberal Arts Core for quite some time. And I’m the Senate’s rep on the LACC right now, and I was on the RSC [Review Steering Committee]. I just want to express I’m disappointed this year at the lack of progress, both with the curriculum proposals developed by the RSC over 2 years. This year, as far as I’m concerned, I see no significant progress. And I’m also concerned with the lack of improvement in the management of the program. I just don’t think we’ve done the kinds of things that are necessary to make this a really first-rate program. I don’t know if this is good or not. It may be beneficial. It may be necessary. It may be more just kind of cranking out goals and objectives which, quite frankly, has gone on for years around here. I think, though, that the Senate down the road should be more actively taking a look at this program and thinking more broadly about what we want, and we need to get some consensus here so that then we can give that to the LACC and the Director of “This is what we want,” because I don’t—I think right now there’s not enough momentum. There’s not enough push to make this program great. We keep talking about we’re going to be this great undergraduate institution. It centers on this program. But I don’t see where we’re making this program great, and so I feel we have to—the Senate’s going to have to at some point be more actively assertive than that.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Yeah, I just think that if you want a great Liberal Arts Core, you put the best minds in it, and people who know their area and who do some great scholarship in it. You put those people in there, and you let them teach. It's really pretty that simple, I think. I just have to say that.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: I think that developing outcomes—identifying outcomes and assessments of those outcomes is central to any kind of success here. Otherwise, we end up with statements like Senator **Gallagher** just said that, “In my opinion, if you put the best minds in there, and the best researchers make the best teachers,” and there's pretty much no evidence of that, I think. And this work needs to be done. It needs to be done quickly as Senator **Smith** suggests, and I don't share Senator **Terlip**'s concern about course outcomes, because it seems to me that if you have areas, you have multiple courses that are supposed to achieve a set of outcomes that aren't course-specific, that are more general than we expect, and I think that providing assessments for those early and often, or the more examples of reasonable assessments for those kinds of general outcomes such as being able to reason, being able to think, being able to solve quantitative problems, rather than knowing $2+2 = 4$, I think those kinds of outcomes and those kinds of assessments as they get developed end up providing fodder for new and better assessments. I think this is a critical part of what we need to do, and we need to do it quickly and move on and perhaps figure out better ways to organize those outcomes into courses.

Funderburk: Are there other comments or questions? Ok. The request is to approve or endorse this plan, I believe. Is there a motion to do so, or are we going to just receive this? Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Let's move to approve.

Funderburk: Second, Senator **East** [who indicated], move to approve. Is there any other discussion? Are we ready to vote? Ok. All those in favor of approving the LAC plan, the revision, etc., etc., say “aye”? [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [one heard] And abstentions? [one heard]

Ok, one abstention as well. Ok. So, it is approved. Thank you very much. Thank you for all the work. Thank you for the patience in waiting.

Heistad: Thank you.

DOCKET #1032, REPORT OF FINDINGS FROM THE UNIVERSITY WRITING COMMITTEE (**NEUHAUS/KIRMANI**).

Funderburk: Dr. **Grant**. Ok, this is 1136/1032, report of findings from the University Writing Committee. [voices as presenters exchange places] I think Senator **Neuhaus** also sent another revised version of the report which is posted there [projected on screen].

Neuhaus: Minus the pdf, though. [several voices explaining and sorting situation out]

Grant: There was a lot of procedural confusion in shuffling the document.

Neuhaus: I think Appendix B was maybe not looked at as closely as the rest of it.

Funderburk: So the current one is the one that says “second version.”

Neuhaus: Charts and Tables were there, yeah.

Grant: Well, Executive Summary, that’s the main thing. That’s what I was thinking. I apologize for the procedural stuff that’s come. All right, and we’ll make this quick. I think this does have a lot of connections with what Dr. **Heistad** just presented in terms of writing across the University. The University Writing Committee takes as its domain the entire University and how are students—by the time they finish their 4 years, have they changed any? How are we articulating the courses with the [LAC Category] 1A requirement, which is something separate? That’s managed largely by Languages and Literatures, although I know there are some professors in World Religions teach that requirement as well. So, what’s happening with that?

One of the things that we know—when we were formed, we knew that Donna **Vinton** in the Assessment Office had gathered data from NSSE and from MAPP and these other instruments. Very quantifiable. MAPP is more direct than NSSE. NSSE is a self-perception, indirect measure. And we got a picture from that. And so we looked at that, and we said, “Well, one of the things that we don’t know is any sort of corroborating evidence to what the students perceive.” So, we put together an instrument that looked at faculty and what faculty are doing. One of the questions for us was, “Can we ascertain any way in which that the faculty agree that, yes, the students are sort of correct in what they had, but also can we look at any data that might provide us with how well faculty exhibit certain composition pedagogies?”

That was the long and the short of it. So, I’m not going to go through all of the details of the wherewithal and whatnot because essentially what we came up with was that the students were fairly correct. They start out by and large in the earlier years with shorter papers. As they move on into their disciplines and whatnot, they get longer, more research-type papers. That seems to be kind of the standard. The research paper often tends to be 15-20 pages with sources and all those kinds of things. We also found that faculty, when doing this, they often present it. There might be lecture or conversation about it. By and large, there is not a long and extended period of doing a draft, revising, getting revising feedback, not a lot of the kind of hands-on bits, which would be expected for a longer paper.

So, as a Committee, we took this information, and we discussed it. We said that it’s not our purview to really do anything about it but to provide this information to you, and I think it goes quite well with what Dr. **Heistad** said about visioning a Liberal Arts Degree whereby students are able to craft an argument, whereby they’re able to look and critically think about information before they say something about it, and apply that, those kinds of skills, to their particular disciplines once they get beyond the LAC 1A requirement.

So we had really no more than just, “Here you go. You don’t have to approve it.” But I will entertain questions, or we can take this up in the Fall, if you want to go, too. [laughter all around as it is getting quite late]

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I just have one question. You said that most of the responses were the research paper kind of response. And I apologize because I didn’t go through all the data that you gave us, but was there any concern expressed about writing in new electronic forms, and if we are teaching that, or if we should be?

Grant: There was no concern expressed about that, but I think that would be something that the faculty and those who look at the Liberal Arts Core should certainly address. I mean, at this point we were just trying to get a sense on writing as it is more traditionally defined, although we do understand—I think we did have a question on there that did ask about PowerPoints and web-based media.

Cyphert (Dale, visitor): Very uncommon.

Grant: Yeah, it was not common at all.

Terlip: Not given we’re looking for learning outcomes, I mean, people blog, they write newsletters, they do e-mails much more often now, so I was just curious if that was reflected in there?

Grant: University-wide it doesn’t seem to be very common, all right?

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: I recently read that a study was just conducted about the efficacy of computer-based analyzers of writing, and while those have been available for 15 or 20 years and presumed and claimed to have worked, but this one actually tested broadly their capability and mostly they came out positive.

Grant: Yeah. Yeah. Uh huh, that’s been

East: Might that have, assuming that they were reasonable in cost, might that provide a mechanism whereby more faculty might be willing and able to deal with more writing in their courses if they don't feel like they have to tell students about spelling and grammar and the construction of the paper, but can actually focus on the content as you suggested? And still provide students with better writing instruction.

Grant: That's an interesting—I mean, as long as there's a human component. I'm interested in the way you put it, because in I don't know if it was *Inside Higher Ed.* or *Chronicle of Higher Ed.*, but these machines that do writing scoring, they're great at scoring writing that is deliberately constructed to be read by a machine. [light laughter around] So, if that's what you want students to write, if you want them to write like machines, then by all means have just machines. But I like that you have the human—you know, let the machines handle some of the more mechanics—for instance, make it mechanistic—and then have close interaction with a real human being and a real audience member in order to get at some of those other things. That would be worthy of discussion.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith.**

Smith: I was on the RSC that, among other things, did a survey of faculty asking them about various parts of the Liberal Arts Core, including the writing component, and one question that was asked in that survey—in fact, the one that got the highest positive response—was the question of whether the University should require students to basically pass a certification test to certify that they've achieved a certain minimal level of writing competence as a requirement for graduation. Very high support for that, which suggested to me and the other members of the RSC that a lot of faculty felt that a lot of our students don't write very well. So I'm wondering, do you have any information, data from MAPP, from any other kinds of widely-done assessment here that would substantiate or indicate what level of writing competence our students have? How many fall below an acceptable level of what we would expect college students to have? If you don't have that data, is that something that your Committee could develop? What about that?

Grant: If you're looking at MAPP data, MAPP indicates that we're really not doing too bad of a job. We actually assign more writing than many of our peer institutions of the cohort. So in the amount of writing our students do, we actually rank a little bit higher. Outcomes, you know, they're split over minimally and up to exceptionally proficient. And so I couldn't parse that column out for you, but it's available. One of the things that we did find that was very interesting was that when faculty were asked if the Liberal Arts Core did a—if they thought that it did a fair job at teaching students to write, they by and large felt, no, that it didn't and that something should be done. However, when asked if students are able to write by the time they finish—I'm going to have to ask [searching through papers]—I want to make sure I get the wording right here, so one of the things that came out was that if

Smith: In a manner consistent with the expectations of employers in your field.

Grant: There you go. You've got it. Yes. [light laughter around] So suddenly it shifts. Suddenly it changes where faculty are saying, "When they come out of the LAC, they're not able to write. But by the time we're done with them, they are." [more laughter around] That's an interesting little—how does that work? [voices commenting on this] So, that would be again—that's just the data we have. We could certainly drill into that more. We could find out more. But I think that it's up to you guys to discuss why might that be and what might you guys want to know more about?

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher** and then Senator **Swan**.

Gallagher: I'd like to see the Writing Center have more resources or something. I'm a former English teacher. That's not what I teach here, though, and so I'm always engaging my students writing, and I require a lot of writing. I end up doing a lot of individual instruction with my students. But when I send them to the Writing Center, a lot of times that experience is really inadequate, and it is particularly inadequate for graduate students, but even undergraduates. I think that that's not fully resourced enough to support the kind of writing efforts that we are trying to make.

Grant: And another finding that we had in the comments was that many faculty expressed they felt isolated, they felt alone, that they were doing the kinds of things it sounded like you were doing. You are trying to do this, but there's very little support.

Gallagher: Ok.

Grant: That's just beyond this study. (?)

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: Do you have information on comparing and contrasting us to universities that have in their cores 2 or more required courses in writing. We, of course, have our one. And if you do, could you discuss the differences?

Grant: Well, I can discuss what happens at our sister institutions. By and large they have 2 writing courses. And so at the community colleges I was talking to Ginny [**Arthur**], and then Dave **Marchesani** has kind of indicated to me that we're approaching the 40% mark of students who get their composition requirement done, almost 40% of our incoming students get it done through dual enrollment, and that passes here. At Iowa State and at University of Iowa—well, the University of Iowa has the 4-credit course, I believe, so they only get 3 credits in dual enrollment, but then they still have to do something else. And then at Iowa State they have to take [English] 2005, which is 2nd in their system. So, in both of our sister institutions there's a mechanism by which, "Oop, oop, hold the phone. You need to take some more writing," and make sure that we're all on the same page here. Beyond that, I don't really know, but I know that that's something that most institutions that I've either taught at or have visited and talked with, there's generally a sequence. You might get out of one, but you don't get out of the other.

Funderburk: Senator **Breitbach**.

Breitbach: If we wanted to do something like that, where would that recommendation arise? Who would make that recommendation?

Grant: To create another course?

Breitbach: Yeah. I mean, if we wanted a checkpoint here at the University so that we didn't have any of those situations with our transfer students?

Grant: I don't know. That's a good question. I don't know necessarily all the procedures. I don't have my tenure, so I don't really know.

Breitbach: Discussions like this have to come before the proposal.

Funderburk: Additional questions or comments?

Breitbach: I'd like to move that we say "thank you" and accept the report.

Swan: Second.

Funderburk: So a motion has been made and seconded to accept the report. Thanks to the [University Writing]Committee very much. All those in favor, "aye"? [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [none heard]

Breitbach: I'd like to make one more motion. [laughter around]

NEW BUSINESS/OLD BUSINESS

Funderburk: One would wonder, is there any new or old business? None?

ADJOURNMENT

Breitbach: I'd like to move that I get going so I can get home and get dinner on the table by 7:00 p.m.

Funderburk: I'll consider that a motion to adjourn. Is there a second? [many voices] Ok, everybody else in the room. Therefore, it passed. [5:51 p.m.]

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate

Next special meeting:
April 25, 2012
Oak Room, Maucker Union
11:00-1:00

Next special meeting/retreat:
April 30, 2012
University Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.