

2-13-2012

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 12, 2012

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2012 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

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



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 12, 2012" (2012). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 53.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/53

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

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
02/13/12 (3:00 p.m. – 4:50 p.m.)
Mtg. #1707

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

No press present.

Provost **Gibson** was absent today.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** offered no comments.

Vice-Chair **Breitbach** reported that the Bylaws Committee will be meeting soon and will have a report, hopefully by the next meeting (02/27/12).

Chair **Funderburk** had 3 comments. First, the review instrument for President Allen is on MyUNiverse, and he noted a couple of glitches in the program to be aware of. Second, the Active Scholar Committee has given recommendations to Provost **Gibson** who is taking them to the AAC and will report back to the Committee. When the Committee has something to share with the Faculty Senate, he said he would do so. And third, a special topic has arisen which resulted in the Faculty Senate today scheduling a special meeting for next Monday, February 20th, at 3:30 in the University Room of Maucker Union regarding University Budget Priorities with regards to Auxiliary/Athletic Funding and Budget Cuts.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for the Faculty Senate meeting on January 23, 2012, were approved by acclamation when no additions or corrections were offered.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1116 1014 Emeritus Status Request, Thomas Fogarty, Geography, effective June 30, 2012.

****Motion to docket out of order at the head of the docket at the next regular meeting (Neuhaus/Terlip). Passed.**

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1115 1013 Emeritus Status Request, John Fecik, Industrial Technology, effective June 20, 2011.

****Motion to approve (Neuhaus/Kirmani). Passed.**

1111 1009.3 Spanish Enrollment Management Policy proposal.

****Motion to take from the table (Smith/East). Passed.**

****Motion to reject the Spanish Enrollment Management Policy proposal (Smith/Gallagher). Failed.**

1111 1009 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Humanities and Fine Arts (DeBerg/Neuhaus).

****Motion to take from the table (DeBerg/Peters). Passed.**

****Motion to adopt the CHFA curriculum package (DeBerg/Swan). Passed.**

1112 1010 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, Interdisciplinary (East/Kirmani).

****Motion to approve Interdisciplinary curriculum package (Neuhaus/Kirmani). Passed.**

1113 1011 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Natural Sciences (**Kirmani/East**).

****Motion to amend the curriculum package, as requested by the Department Head, by removing the new course Tech 2015 and eliminating the dropping of existing course Tech 2072 (Peters/Neuhaus). Passed.**

****Motion to divide the question, pulling out the course Tech 1011 (East/Smith). Failed**

****Motion to accept College of Natural Sciences curriculum package . (Kirmani/Roth). Passed.**

1114 1012 EPC Recommendations Regarding Academic Ethics Policy, docketed in regular order (**Peters/Neuhaus**).

****Motion to table (DeBerg/Roth). Passed.**

5. Old Business

1109 1007.1 COE/HPELS name change (**Edginton/DeBerg**). No action. Remains on the table.

6. Adjournment

****Motion to adjourn at 4:50 p.m. (Bruess/Edginton). Passed.**

Next special meeting:

February 20, 2012

University Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Next regular meeting:

February 27, 2012

CBB 319

3:30 p.m.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 13, 2012
Mtg. 1707**

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

Absent: Gloria **Gibson**, Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk:** I call the meeting to order. (3:30 p.m.)

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

Funderburk: Before we start, a couple of reminders since there will probably be discussion from the sidelines again regarding some of the curriculum packages. Please remember to speak very loudly. Our air handling is loud in here, and Sherry (**Nuss**) has a difficult time hearing on the recording when she's doing the transcripts. Especially true of those of us with lower—medium to low voices because that's the frequency range the thing tends to knock out. So that's #1.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Funderburk: #2. Call for press identification. Any press today? I see none.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Funderburk: Provost Gibson is occupied elsewhere, so she will not be here with us today.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Funderburk: Are there any comments from Chair **Jurgenson**?

Jurgenson: No comments today.

Funderburk: Thank you.

REPORT ON COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION FROM VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH

Funderburk: Vice-Chair **Breitbach**?

Breitbach: The Bylaws Committee will have something to come before the Senate, hopefully in 2 weeks. Yes, that means we have to meet again, guys (light laughter). Ok.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Chair **Funderburk:** Ok. I've got 3 little items to talk about before we move to the Agenda. You should have received your e-mail notice that the review instrument for President Allen is currently available on MyUNiverse. As of Friday morning we had a 15% return rate—response rate thus far, which I think is very good. Still, please keep reminding people that it's there. It's active until a week from tomorrow, which I think is the 21st, I believe. The most common e-mail question I keep getting is "Where is it?" If you didn't get any info about where that happens, it's under the Current Announcements, and since you can actually customize your HomePage, it could be anyplace. But if you left it alone, it's front and center when you

open it—open MyUNlverse. Two notes that have come forward from our particularly fastidious people who notice things that I would never notice. There is an issue with semi-colons, so if you use a semi-colon in your text, it kicks you back out and gives you a screen telling you you are not allowed to use semi-colons. (light laughter) So please consider your punctuation carefully when making comments. And on a more interesting and important note is that there are--apparently are some navigation buttons that happen at the top of the page as well as the bottom that says "Next page," and for some reason if you click the top page buttons it advances you to the next page, but it erases everything you just did, and that's a MyUNlverse issue that we have now started conversations with but, you know, if you haven't done it and if you are doing it, we are going to try to figure out some way to craft a message to everybody reminding them to use the navigation buttons that are on the bottom of each page, 'cause there's nothing we can do with the survey once it goes online. I'm sure any questions about—I guess the other thing that we're involved in now is contacting members of the Cabinet for interviews, so the Committee will be interviewing the Cabinet members for their input as well on this. Any questions from anyone on this? Nothing? Excellent.

Second, the Active Scholar Committee, also known as the 4/4 Committee completed Senate recommendations, and we met with Provost Gibson. Very constructive meeting. She's taking those recommendations to the AAC, for discussion, and then plans to meet back with our Committee prior to anything happening and prior to something I can report back to you on that front.

Third item I have to talk about today is the e-mail that I forwarded to the senators only, and it was regarding some funding issues and some of the—some of the hot topics buttons currently before us and suggesting or asking if Senate action should be appropriate. I appreciate very much the number of you who have written comments. Several I have talked to on the phone. I thought maybe the best advice I got was that since we would have a few minutes to chat about this now to decide how or if the Senate might wish to proceed, or if it wishes to enter this at the moment. The options, and I'll just kind of throw out, that I see as possibilities are the Senate could take

no action until someone chooses to submit a formal petition either requesting that we adopt a resolution or make some statement regarding this; the Senate, because of our timing with curriculum and other things, we could potentially agree to schedule a special meeting of the Senate with this being the only topic on the table for an open discussion; and it's also within our power to instruct the Faculty Chair to call a meeting of the full faculty, if we felt it was important enough to have a discussion of the full faculty on this topic. So, I'm assuming that you've all seen the e-mail that I sent and probably some of the others, since I know some of you at least copied to everyone. The floor is open for any comments about this or any suggestions of what you might want to do on this.

Swan: Just so I can clarify, right, so this is just in the courtesy Chair of the—Chair of the Senate announcements?

Funderburk: Right.

Swan: So we're just chatting with you in your announcement period right now?

Funderburk: Advising me of how you would like to see this org—this received or not received.

Swan: Yeah. Very good. Very good.

Funderburk: We are taking no particular action. Senator **East**.

East: We have—we have visitors in the room who probably don't know what the hell we're talking about?

Funderburk: That is not—that is by design.

East: Ok.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Well, I—I—I replied and stated my preference already, so I don't know that it bears reiteration, but if necessary and it needs to go through a formal petition, I can do that.

Funderburk: I think we're finally doing that. The issue is particularly if—if we are wanting to call a special meeting, we are somewhat limited, and we would need to move on that most quickly to—to organize a room. Essentially the possibilities I saw were either next week, which would be February 20th or March the 5th, if one chose to do that. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: I didn't see Senator **Gallagher**, but I remember and sort of reference to what she circulated to the Senators, and she can correct me and add to this, my sense was, and I didn't think about the options you gave, so that's very good, but she wanted, and people who are thinking like Senator **Gallagher**, a special session where this Body discuss all of the matters with perhaps leading to some sense of what the faculty at large may be feeling about this issue, and so it sounds like the—the option of calling a special, consultative kind of meeting of the Faculty Senate to discuss this one issue is what the people who responded to “all” seemed to want, and so that sounds like a good idea.

Funderburk: And I will say that from those conversations and private connections I've had, it was a 100% feeling like we needed to have discussion. The issue seems to be primarily one of—of mechanics and technicality of how we wish to bring that forward in this Body. If you instruct me, I can call a special meeting and inform you of the time. I would just hope that it's particularly well attended.

Swan: And so that's the—since we are in your comments, we don't make motions or anything like this, but we just like I'll say “Yes, I'll attend a meeting that you called to this effect.”

Gallagher: Do you—do you need a vote, or do you want some kind of show of hands on all who would like to do that?

Funderburk: I thought I would just—I think maybe we'd just do this as a hand—show of hands of who would like to have this—well, is this a vote, or

Wurtz: This is a question.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**

Female voice: It's a straw poll.

Funderburk: Straw poll. Thank you. That's the word I was looking for.

Female voice: Yeah. That's the right word. (other voices agreeing)

Wurtz: If we are talking about a Senate only meeting, is that Executive Session?

Funderburk: No, I'm not thinking that it's Executive Session, but I think that it would be inapp—personally, I think it would be inappropriate to enter this kind of discussion without it being publically known and the type of topics we're talking about and that people can come.

Wurtz: Ok, and that's what Senator **Gallagher** was talking about, that we would follow our normal procedure of posting a petition and putting it into the current business.

Funderburk: And the only concern I have with that option is we do have quite a lot of business, depending on how fast we get through curriculum, and in my count we only have 5 meetings this year left.

Gallagher: Then, Susan (**Wurtz**), I was only asking if--if it's necessary to do that formality, I would, but—but I think a—a meeting where we only talk about and is open to everyone.

Wurtz: Well, that's docketing, and we'd simply docket it whatever order—I'm sorry

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I don't know. Jesse (**Swan**) is the better parliamentarian than I, but I think that we could certainly move to do that and set the meeting as long as people had—I don't know why we can't move it, honestly, or as Chair you can call a meeting, I think, whenever you want.

Funderburk: That's my understanding also, that's why if the sense of this Body is that you would like me to call a meeting on this one topic, that's what we will do, and it will not then affect the docketing of any other item of business. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: And, I—I would—I'm thinking that you're calling a meeting that's basically the Senate acting as a Committee of the Whole, in which case no action that the Senate would take wouldn't—the Senate in such a meeting wouldn't have any effect except to say, "We recommend to put on the docket at some future time this kind of recommendation." It's because of what's been talked about, it seems that a committee-like meeting is what's desired for the people on the Senate to speak as if they were on a committee without any known conclusions and to work through that, but that that, of course, be open to the whole community. So you, as the Chair, could say, "I'm calling a Senate meeting that's going to function as a Committee of the Whole to discuss this topic for this time and date." And if you have then the--the quorum, then on that date and time we would have that meeting as a quor—as a Committee of the Whole. So understanding that we wouldn't be making motions and passing them that would have the effect of a normal meeting. And those normal meetings are called "regular meetings." And this is a regular meeting.

Van Wormer: Couldn't we

Funderburk: Yes, in that I was—if I can respond to—in that I'm assuming we could not possibly get to the point of having something done.

Swan: I don't think we would be able to.

Funderburk: I wouldn't see this—my preference would be calling—if we are doing this through the Senate as opposed to the full faculty, of calling a full working meeting, and if somebody could organize a resolution or petition in advance, it might be that we would know.

Swan: I think that that would be the product of the Committee of the Whole.

Funderburk: I'm suspecting also. (?)

Swan: So then the next meeting would be the proposal.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**

Terlip: Can't—can't you just call it a Senate--“special Senate informational meeting”?

Swan: Yes.

Terlip: And that way everybody can come.

Funderburk: If that's the sense everyone has, we could definitely do that, it's my understanding. Then it looks like the straw poll part needs not be done. Yes?

Nuss: A question: will I be involved in that, because I'll be out of town March 5th, if that's one of the dates you're considering.

Funderburk: We will need at least the recording transcript, so—of this meeting. I did go to the trouble of checking the dates that are—or rooms that are available for these two weeks. If it's next—well, it's the same answer. On February 20th and March 4th (sic, 5th), this room is not available. University Room is available. If it is a public meeting, well, I would expect this topic might draw more people than a curriculum discussion, so it seems like it would be worthwhile to meet across the way in the University Room which would house. There's a cost involved, but I

think we'll be able to get it a minimum of \$35, so it seems to be money well spent. Do we have a sense of preferred? On the one hand, there's a degree of urgency felt about this from a lot of quadrants. On the other hand, a little more advanced notice might be worthwhile to the community also that it's going to happen. Shall we do a straw poll on these. Senator **Van Wormer**.

Van Wormer: I'd just go with the urgency side of this.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**

Wurtz: I will say that—semi-problematic, I know my Department has called a meeting for Monday the 20th, and that my Department Head is now being very careful to not conflict with Senate Meetings.

Funderburk: Yeah, I think either one of these dates will likely conflict with a lot of things that are trying to do that. My concern is as long as we stay with what Senator **Swan** was saying is that if this meeting happens a week from today, I think we would have to seriously curtail any official action because there would not be even 1 week's notice that we could be giving. If it was March 5th, I would feel more comfortable if we were going in there with some sort of action if we chose to do that.

Terlip: I would still support Katherine's (**Van Wormer**) notion that the earlier the better.

Swan: For the meeting that is basically a Committee of the Whole to discuss the matters freely and opening, yeah.

Funderburk: Well, let's do a straw poll this way. Those of you in favor of me calling a special meeting for February 20th, just show me a quick hands. We are going to do a quick count. Those who are opposed to that? Ok. It looks like the call then is that I will organize—we will have a special meeting called for Monday, February 20th, 3:30 in the University Room, and I will put out a note, and if Sherry (**Nuss**) will help me, that will be announced then tonight or tomorrow morning to the University community also that there

will be a special meeting the topic of which is the relationship of auxiliary funding and potential cuts within the University's budget. Ok, if we have any other light items to add in before we start the meeting.....(light laughter).

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Funderburk: As I understand from Sherry (**Nuss**), there were no amendments to the Minutes offered, unless someone has some to offer here--corrections to the Minutes? We'll assume that those are accepted by acclamation—a very lengthy and well-done, complicated transcript (laughter around). Thank you very much, Sherry. The meeting, as chaotic as it was to live through, it was even more so to try to read the Minutes and figure out how she managed to sort this out.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1116 for Docket #1014, an Emeritus Status Request from Thomas **Fogarty**, Geography, to be effective June 30, 2012.

Funderburk: Items for docketing. Calendar 1116, Emeritus Status Request from Thomas **Fogarty**. Do we have a motion? Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Yeah, move to docket out of regular order and placed at the head of the docket of the next meeting.

Funderburk: Ok. Motion to docket out of regular order at the head of the docket. Is there a second?

Terlip: Second.

Funderburk: Second Senator **Terlip**. Senator **East**.

East: Next “regular” meeting?

Neuhaus: Regular meeting. Yes, that’s a good point.

Funderburk: Ok. Any discussion on that? All those in favor of docketing it at the head of the order which will be on the 27th, all in favor say “aye.” (ayes heard all around) Opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1013 , EMERITUS STATUS REQUEST, JOHN FECIK, INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY, EFFECTIVE JUNE 20, 2011

Funderburk: Ok, so Docket item 1013, Emeritus Status Request from John Fecik. Do we have a motion? Senator **Neuhaus**

Neuhaus: Move to approve.

Funderburk: Motion to approve.

Kirmani: Second.

Funderburk: Senator **Kirmani** second. Discussion? Comments?

Neuhaus: I can say a little—kind of brief thing here.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Unless there is somebody from Technology that would prefer to stand up, but anyhow, just something here. I—I’ve worked with John ever since I’ve been here, and—and my impression has always been he’s one of the real champions of academic integrity. He’s—he’s both in terms of students and—and in terms of faculty. He’s also one of the folks that’s

been very instrumental in establishing the international outreach in the Industrial Technology program. I think his students have—have always appreciated him, although as he would probably admit, they appreciate him more at the end of a semester or at the end of a program because he—he was very demanding. He’s—he’s always been very good at making sure his graduate students got what they needed to get, got out there and found the kind of information they needed, and so for that matter the—the Librarians really loved him as well. But I—I’m—I’m saddened to see him go, but I’m also looking forward to—I’m happy for him to enjoy the retirement, I guess.

Funderburk: Very good. Other comments anyone? Ok, the motion of approve of Professor Fecik’s Emeritus Status, all those in favor say “aye.” (ayes heard all around) Opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion carries.

DOCKET 1009.3, SPANISH ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT POLICY PROPOSAL.

Funderburk: Do we have a motion to bring Docket item 1009.3 from the table, the Spanish Enrollment Management Policy proposal? Senator **Smith** (who gestures). Do we have a second?

East: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **East**. Discussion--or vote to bring that from the table at this time? All those in favor, say “aye.” (ayes heard all around). Opposed? (none heard) Carries. Ok, so on the table Spanish Enrollment Management Policy proposal. Do we have a motion regarding this? Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I motion that we reject this proposal.

Funderburk: The motion is to reject Enrollment Management Policy regarding Spanish. Is there a second?

Gallagher: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Gallagher**. Ok, now we are in position to do some discussion. Do we need to bring everybody back up to speed of what—what the topic is and why the reason is we’re discussing just before we get into it? So everybody knows what we doing? (voices agreeing)
Associate Provost **Licari** are you in a position to either bring it up [on the projected screen] or

Licari: I’m looking for it [electronically].

Funderburk: Senator **Smith** would you like to speak to why you have concerns perhaps while he’s playing with the computer.

Smith: Ok. As I understand the proposal, what it does is allows heritage Spanish speakers, i.e. native speakers of Spanish, to take a course here in Spanish, an upper—well, whatever course—and by passing that course with a grade of A or B, I believe, to get retrocredit—what’s called retrocredit for up to 21 hours for all other Spanish courses that would normally be taken before that course. I looked at other Universities that have retrocredit policies for languages. Some do it for math, but most do it, in so far as it’s done, it’s typically done for languages. And what I saw was that in most cases the Universities would only allow retrocredit for non-native speakers. It appears that this proposal specifically targets native speakers, rather than focusing on students, for instance, who took a language in high school and now would like to take—take a higher level University course in that language and get retrocredit for it. I was also concerned because when I saw other schools that do allow retrocredit, native or non-native, nobody goes to 21 hours that I saw. I saw limitations of 8 hours. I saw a 15. It struck me—and it—and--and the proposal justification kind of, to me, is bothersome. [reading from proposal] “This would be a powerful recruiting tool for heritage Spanish speakers.” It might well be. You are getting 21 hours free college credit to come here because you based—you are going to get the credit because you are a native speaker of Spanish. It seems to me you are giving an awf—away an awful lot of—of—of a higher education—of a degree—of a Bachelor’s Degree, just because somebody

grew up in a Spanish-speaking country. I did—I have troubles with that. I would like to hear somebody here from the Modern Languages Department who would, you know, explain the rationale. I talked to people on the Curriculum Committee. They couldn't recall any real discussion of the issue. It seemed to just kind of go through. We're told that these things are vetted very heavily at the Curriculum Committee. I don't think that's always the case.

Funderburk: Senator **Van Wormer**.

Van Wormer: Yeah. Well, I think this is a terrific idea. I think of these students coming here, and they have 2 languages to cope with. They have to do the English Writing, and here is something—now 21 hours might be excessive, but to give them some credit. I've always thought that, you know, here they are living in a world that's different from the world that the rest of us are living with with a whole knowledge. I—I just think it's very creative, and I really like it.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher**. I mean, sort of one bit of instruction. If there is someone here that wants to speak to this, please feel free to speak up with the added instruction I forgot to say at the beginning of--if you're speaking from the gallery, please state your name loudly for the transcript so that they can get all the information down as well. Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Well, I understand your point, but my concern is that we have speakers of many other languages that would not get that advantage. And—and—and moreover, I think the encouragement to learn yet another language is always a good one, too. That's the whole point of the foreign language requirement, I think.

Swan: There are two people who could speak to this from the program.

Olivares: There are 2 more of our..... (Two people move to the central tables.)

Swan: And there are two more—but, ok. And, of course, they are very nervous. We're not a very inviting, welcoming group. (many voices talking, laughing, welcoming; joking about the Valentine's chocolate being passed around and sharing)

Funderburk: Ok, so who shall go first? And just loudly say your name for the

Olivares: Yeah, I—I will introduce everybody that's here. Good afternoon. My name is Gabriela **Olivares**. And I am an Assistant Professor of Spanish, and this semester I am acting as the—I should give myself a title, "Interim Language Coordinator." (light laughter) I am—I am subbing for Jennifer (**Cooley**) who is in Spain; I am doing this. And I was asked to come here _____. I have my colleague Haley O'Neil, and also Kenneth Baughman and Julie Husband from the newly-formed Department of Languages and Literatures. And I am here representing the thought or the proposal to award retrocredits for Span—for Spanish heritage speakers. Now, I would like to point out the two comments I just heard. I am not here to debate with you. I just want to give you, I guess, our thoughts. I don't come here in a, let's say, a fighting mode, no (light laughter around). I would like you to understand why we came up with that, although I was not part of this process because I have only been at—I have so far now I've been an assistant professor, so—but I want you to take it at least from my point what I see. I want you to realize that these heritage speakers are not international students. These heritage speakers are U.S. born, U.S. citizens who happen to be of Hispanic ancestry. So, if we were going to give this credit to international students, I think that would be a different ballgame, because they will have to take the TOEFL or some other test, so this does not really apply to them. And we have not really yet implemented this. This is a proposal, so it is in the making. There are two ways where students can take—who can apply for retroactive credit, obtaining 15 credits through the CLEP exam and Credit by Exam option where they allow--they are allowed to get 6 more. So, whatever way they go, they are allowed to test out, paying \$50 for each test more or less, to obtain these credit. So basically our proposal is to provide a way or a course where it would be targeted to them, tailored to their needs where they would have

to prove their skills and obtain a B or higher. And then, of course, some financial fee or—or—or money to compensate for those credits. As I said, the rationale was also to—to make it similar to the CLEP and the Credit by Exam, also a motivation tool. What else? Do we have a handout? We do have a handout.

Baughman: (Kenneth, Assistant Professor in Languages and Literatures, passing out the handout) This is basically what's on the screen, but it may be a little bit easier to read.

Olivares: Point #2 is the one that is not there (on screen), and I would like you to, if you don't mind, read and see our rationale as the faculty of Spanish. We believe that this CLEP test and Credit by Exam are not really tests that assess the skills of native speakers, so if we could design a course that is more tailored to their abilities, language abilities and cognitive abilities, would be much better. There are institutions that are—kind of, sister institutions—where these systems exist, and on page 2 [sic, 3] where they are named, there are 4 where you would see that there are a number of retrocredit options. My colleague here comes from University of Santa—U.C. Santa Barbara. [Haley **O'Neil**, Assistant Professor, Languages and Literatures]

O'Neil: Yeah, I would just like to say that—that this is something that is becoming more standard, especially in states where there are more heritage speakers, and it's in part to benefit heritage speakers so they have classes tailored to their specific needs that are different than non-native speakers. It also benefits the native speakers in our Spanish classes, because if we have a combination of native and non-native speakers, in our classes, it becomes very challenging to teach to two completely different types of language learners. So it started at U.C. Berkeley and to a lot of the University of California. There are now classes for non-native speakers, which would be the more basic level Spanish classes, and then the heritage level language classes where they do improve their language to be able to move up to the upper division. So there—this is—and as you can see in the Midwest there are also these proposals. They benefit both the non-native speakers because they have classes tailored specifically for native English

speakers learning Spanish. They also are—are beneficial to heritage speakers because the language classes they'll—they will be learning to improve upon the Spanish that they already know.

Olivares: And the handout that you have has the message sent by Professor **Castillo** (Juan, Associate Professor, Languages and Literatures) who is in Spain. It is addressed to all of you, "Dear All," and more or less explains why we were proposing this. And I would like to say something, you know. I—I don't like to say that everything should be for Spanish heritage speakers, but I also believe that what is good for one particular group would also be beneficial for the University. If we could attract these students, maybe they're not going to major only in Spanish. They may major in science and religion. I mean, if we have something to offer them, to engage them in coming to UNI, it would be good for everybody. Now, the way you want to handle it, I'll leave that up to you, but if we could have a way to attract this population, I think it's worth giving it a thought.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So I know Dr. Castillo is the one who—who knows most about this, and he's doing research, as you say, in Spain, this semester, and that's why he can't be here, but I'm glad that you reproduced for everyone his communication. That's the last 2 pages of the document [handout]. So, if you—if we could turn to that and, **Gabriela**, if you could—and perhaps **Haley**—talk about #1, and so this just seems very compelling and directly addresses one of the concerns of one or more Senators here, about giving away 21 credits. And so #1 here seems—as it suggests it says—that they already get 21 credits through other means, giving money to—to other organizations outside of UNI to then, for us to give them credit through those means and then other exams, but this would replace that mechanism with UNI coursework and grading. Is that accurate?

Olivares: Yeah. That is accurate, but that course--to my knowledge, we have not offered that course yet.

Swan: Because we—right now they get the 21 credits in these other means off campus.

Olivares: Right. Exactly.

Swan: That's what I'm saying. Right now, we would be bringing it on campus. Ok.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Oh, I don't have a question. I just have a comment. This is for questions only, maybe? I'm sorry.

Funderburk: If you're on topic, go for it. (light laughter)

DeBerg: Well, I want to say that I really appreciate the creative thinking that this Department has done in terms of helping us recruit a population that's important to us and to the country. And I like the idea of not sending so much money to CLEP. That works for me. So, I wanted to congratulate your Department on this proposal. Thank you very much for sending it up.

Olivares: Thank you.

DeBerg: You're welcome.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: I—I don't understand why CLEP and Credit by Exam options are not adequate. I mean, if it tests the skills that—that they already have, that's the whole purpose of CLEP and Credit by Exam, I would think. And secondly, why not just do all Credit by Exams? If you want to save the money for UNI, then it goes in here. I mean, I don't know exactly how Credit by Exam works, but it doesn't go to CLEP, I assume. And any course on campus, presumably, can be—you can try to test out through Credit by Exam, is my understanding. (voice disagreeing)

Olivares: I can say something to that, why CLEP may not be enough. It may not be the--the best answer, but I wanted to be—to try to think who the students are. In my experience, I see that I think here on campus these U.S.-born, heritage speakers usually have learned their skill, their language skills at home without proper formal instruction. So when they come here, of course they are going to know, you know, multiple choice, how to test out, you know, if they CLEP—what I assume is multiple choice. I've never taken it. But, you know, it won't give much of a thought. But they have never had formal instruction in their L1 language. And those skills need to be polished. It's the same as, you know, they—the—the child of American parents born, I don't know, in the Middle East, and they're just learning the language from the parents, but they were never really being taught, even how to spell. So, in that sense, I think a course designed for them, addressing all this ability needs of the language is more beneficial for these population.

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

Smith: I guess the problem I have is that—and I guess it would apply to even CLEP for people who already speak a language, how are we improving somebody's education by giving them in essence 1/6th of the college degree for something that they learned just as part of growing up in their whether—wherever it was in the United States. You just learned it as part of growing up, and now we're saying, "Hey, you're 1/6th of the way through college because you happened to grow up in a Hispanic—in a Spanish-speaking part of the United States, and gee, isn't that great?" I—it seems to me that—I mean, these students now with this 21 credits, and I can take a minor. You know, they—they've already taken the credits. They'll take their major, Liberal Arts Core, and that's it. They won't take electives they don't have to. Is their education really being benefitted here by getting credits for something that they already knew just as part of growing up?

Olivares: Senator, I--I respect your—your position, and—and—and I think that you also have a valid point, but what can I say? I would see this—we have—if we want to bring this population, we have to make them attracted to them. If we say that we value their baggage—their baggage building (?)

with the skills, it's just a step in the right direction to bring them here. The other thing that I would like to say is that, if we really look at--into who these people are, these students probably are not—their parents are not going to be college prepared. These are first generation students who would have difficulty coming here just because nobody else ever told them about coming to the University, so if we can attract that population and meet them half-way, maybe we can accomplish something.

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

Gallagher: Well, I'm very much in favor of them coming here, and the—you know, I—I would approve of many, many, many efforts to do that. I—I would be more comfortable if those credit hours were freed up for them to take other subjects of interest and—and they could still have that course which would benefit them which you spoke of very eloquently. And it makes sense that they shouldn't have to do redundant things. That makes a great deal of sense to me. And, again, I'm very in favor of making this a very hospitable place for them to be, but I also see Senator **Smith's** issue. You know, if they have those credit hours free where they can enhance their education, you know, in other areas and expand it, I—I would be very much in favor of that.

Olivares: I—I—yes, I'm here to support whatever the Senate decision is going to

Gallagher: Then they could take

Olivares: act upon, and I'll agree, maybe, you know, we could—we could have—well, the point here is even this very low level course--basically Elementary Spanish would be, which is their language exit requirement. Right? Spanish I and II, and then it would be the Intermediate level, which are 2, Intermediate I and II, and then 1 more for conversation. So, these are very, very low course that would not really interfere with any other major. Now, we can maybe open up the Lab course, you know, or I don't know. That's something you may have to—curriculum may have to

decide—but given the option to pursue other venue. I’m not saying it’s perfectly fine, I mean.

Funderburk: I have Senator **DeBerg**, Senator **Wurtz**, and Senator **Swan**. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, since this is an experimental course, I would be interested in after the 3 times it’s offered, seeing some data about how successful it was, what kinds of outcomes you saw. And then I think the Curriculum Committee--the Department, the Curriculum Committee, and the Senate would be in a much better position to say, “This is something we want to do permanently” or not. But I—I think it’s worth a pilot. I don’t see any reason not to pilot it.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**. Senator **Swan**. Senator **Smith**.

Wurtz: Ok, I’m looking for parallels here, and Chair **Funderburk** maybe you can handle this one.

Funderburk: I doubt it.

Wurtz: If I grew up in a home where I had music lessons and I participated in piano recitals and lessons, when I come to campus, am I going to take whatever is keyboard 101 for credit? Or am I going to be told, “Oh, you already play that well, so you get this—these courses—you get this credit.”

Funderburk: I—since that’s a direct question, one has to take a proficiency placement exam, which I would--without seeing the data I would guess it’s maybe 10% of actually get out of. What normally happens is there’s a 3-level stage, and you’re placed in 1, 2, or 3, because it does cover skills other than what you normally

Wurtz: But there’s no retrocredit.

Funderburk: There's no retrocredit. Nor is there transfer credit in any applied area, if you come from another university. Credits are waived at the end of the program.

Wurtz: Credit.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan** then Senator **Smith**.

Swan: Oh, I thought Senator—oh, no, you—that's right, ok. So what's happening if—if the Senate today reverses the Curriculum Committee's recommendations here, we won't be fixing any problem with the CLEP and other exams giving away credit. That—I mean, and—and that's been thrown out as “Oh, we shouldn't give credit away,” blah blah, etc. That's fine. Maybe we shouldn't. Then maybe that needs to be the proposal to un—to forbid CLEP credit across campus. That's something that I might, in fact, be able to be very supportive of. That's not the proposal. The proposal is to take away the ability of a faculty to itself judge, assess, and teach a population and gi—thereby give them the credit if they succeed in that course. I think you have limits, B or greater in that course. And that that's how they get the 21 credits rather than going through tests off campus. So this Body can reject this, and these same people will still get the credit. They just won't get any education. They won't get any assistance—further learning. We won't be teaching them. They still will have the credit. That's the only thing that might happen today. So whether or not other things are good or bad ideas, that's not really appropriate at this stage with this body. That might be appropriate at the University Curriculum Committee where they take much more time, they look into everything, they don't just listen to some people here and there, and then say, “Yeah, that feels right. Oh, and I know my Department doesn't do it this way.” So we should keep on task and realize that this has been gone through, and that these same people will get the same credit just in inferior ways if we reject this today. If we accept it and promote it, they will have an enhanced experience at the University of Northern Iowa.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, I do want to talk to Professor **Swan**'s characterization of what happens in the University Curriculum Committee, and I—I mean, I fully respect what the Committee does, but looking at the Minutes of the Committee, there was no comments on this proposal at all, and talking to a member of the Committee, she couldn't recall that they had any kind of discussion of it. It apparently just went through. They deal with hundreds, maybe thousands of curriculum proposals, and they can't look at every one very carefully. I see no evidence that they looked at this one very carefully. Talking to Senator **DeBerg**'s comment, I've got no problem doing this on a trial basis. But that's not what you do in a curriculum proposal. You do it on—as an experimental course, which they can do anytime they want. So, if you want to do that, great, but then withdraw the proposal because it's not ready for that. Do it as a trial basis, and then we can decide based on the trial if it's worth it. We're still doing something that no other university that I can see does, and that bothers me. It's like, gee, we're—you know, and maybe we're out front and doing something really innovative here, but maybe we're also out front and cheapening our credits and our degree. That bothers me a lot.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: My understanding is that we're not addressing the course that's proposed at all. We're only addressing the retrocredit part of it, right?

Funderburk: That's my understanding.

East: And—and—and I would tend to agree with Senator **DeBerg** that it would be useful to go ahead and try to teach the course and to—to work on it, and I can—I can actually imagine, easily imagine that a student who—I mean, this—I don't know how heritage speakers are currently granted not having to do the exit—the foreign language requirement that everybody else is, but I assume that at least as a trial this would be a very good way to say, "Ah, you've come and you've shown us that you understand the grammar, syntax, or whatever the—the formal parts of the language are you pick up in this course, and as a result of that we're more than happy to waive those—that 10 hours of credit that we would normally require of

you,” as something that could easily be done without a curriculum change that could be a student request kind of thing that would be granted by the Department, and that seems like a perhaps less big step to—toward perhaps the ultimate goal of the 21 hours of retrocredit.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I would like to make a couple of comments about Senator **Smith**’s earlier characterization of—regarding giving credit for experiences learned in one’s life. I think there’s a term for that, an educational term called “phenomenological pedagogy.” It’s the—it’s the experience that you gain, learning they gain, that comes from living one’s life. It’s advanced by social activist and educator Freire, who we use his works, *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, *Pedagogy of Hope*, in our doctoral programs here at the University of Northern Iowa in the E.D.D. program. I think we have to be open to looking at alternative ways of educating individuals and not always look at the classical notion of the academy. This is one of those alternative mechanisms where we can apply a more contemporary approach to education, phenomenological pedagogy that’s advanced by some of the better minds of education that are available to us today, although Freire is dead. Freire spoke on this campus, drew thousands of people to his presentations when we was here several years ago. So I—I just—I would encourage you to think outside the box here a little bit, that the classical notion of the academy may not apply here and we ought to give them an opportunity to practice in a different way.

Funderburk: Senator **Breitbach**.

Breitbach: I would like to—seeing no other questions or comments, I would like to call the question.

Funderburk: The question has been called. Is there a second?

DeBerg: I’ll second.

Funderburk: Second Senator **DeBerg**. Discussion of calling the question? Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Point of information. What's the question being called? What specifically is the motion?

Funderburk: The motion is to reject the Spanish

DeBerg: Thank you.

Funderburk: Ok, all those in favor of calling the question, please say "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (couple heard) Let's do that again. All those in favor, say "aye" vigorously. (ayes heard)

Swan: This is not a debate.

Funderburk: This is just calling the question. (various voices indicating surprise and then laughter around) It's a noisy room. All those in favor in calling the question, "aye." (ayes heard around) All those opposed? (none heard) There you go. That's a lot easier to make a call on. All right. The question has been called. All those in favor of the motion which is to reject the Spanish proposal for credit, do we want to raise hands? That's reasonable. All those in favor, raising their hands. This is in favor of rejecting, right? One, two, three, four, five. All those opposed to the motion to reject? (counting under breath)... Six, seven, eight, nine, ten. Ok. So the motion fails. All those abstaining? I see no abstentions. So the motion fails, meaning, therefore, the Spanish remains.

Swan: This requires parliamentary (?)

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So this means this just goes back into the College's package that the UCC has approved, and it can't be taken out again—I mean, that would be—so it's just back into the package. When we finally approve the College's package, it would be part of that.

Funderburk: It reverts back into the package.

Swan: Very good.

Funderburk: Correct.

DOCKET #1009 CONSIDERATION OF CURRICULUM PACKAGES, COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND FINE ARTS

Funderburk: Speaking of which, Calendar item 1009 is the curriculum package from the former CHFA which has been tabled. Is there a motion to take this curriculum package from the table? Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: So move.

Funderburk: Moved from the table. Second?

Peters: Second

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Peters**. Discussion? All those in favor of moving this from the table—bringing it from the table, say “aye.” (ayes heard around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? Ok. Discussion on the full curriculum package remaining from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts, formerly. Do we have a motion?

DeBerg: I move adoption of the curriculum package from the once and great College of Humanities and Fine Arts. (laughter around)

Swan: Second.

Roth: I didn’t hear the

DeBerg: The once and better College of Humanities and Fine Arts? (more laughter)

Funderburk: That was a motion from Senator **DeBerg**. Second from Senator **Swan**. And contested by Senator **Roth**. (laughter around)

Roth: No, I didn't—I didn't hear what she said, what the motion was.

Funderburk: Is to approve the package.

DeBerg: The entire package

Roth: Ok, I didn't catch what you said the first time.

DeBerg: Sorry. Too busy laughing at my own joke. (more laughter)

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: Could you remind me of—of our action last time about us be—item 1009.1 and 2.

Funderburk: Those would be the Music Education courses, both of which were voted to be removed from this packet. So those have already been rejected by the Senate, and they are no longer a part of that package. Other questions or discussion? Are we ready for a vote then? All those in favor of approving the former CHFA curriculum package, say "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion carries. Package is approved.

DOCKET #1010 CONSIDERATION OF CURRICULUM PACKAGES,
INTERDISCIPLINARY

Funderburk: Moving on. Consideration of Curriculum Packages, Interdisciplinary. Do we have a motion?

Neuhaus: Move to approve.

Funderburk: Move to approve, Senator **Neuhaus**. Do we have a second? Second from Senator **Kirmani**. Ok. Discussion? Questions? Comments on the package from Interdisciplinary area, Women and Gender Studies curriculum changes. (a few voices talking in background) No one seeking—no one seeking recognition? Nothing? Anybody from their Department want to pose their own stuff? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I was going to move we approve it.

Funderburk: Ok. Are we there?

Peters: Call the question.

Funderburk: Calling the question here.

Edginton: I'll second.

Funderburk: The question has been called and seconded. All those in favor of calling the question, say "aye." (ayes heard all around) Aye. All those opposed to calling the question? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Ok. The question has been called. All those in favor of approving the Interdisciplinary Women and Gender Studies Curriculum Package, say "aye." (ayes heard all around). All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? One abstention. So motion carries.

DOCKET #1011 CONSIDERATION OF CURRICULUM PACKAGES, COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES

Funderburk: Now we are ready for the corin—consideration of curriculum package from the College of Natural Sciences, former College of Natural Sciences not former natural sciences. (light laughter) Do we have a motion?

Kirmani: So move.

Funderburk: Senator **Kirmani** motion to accept, I'm guessing.

Kirmani: Yep.

Funderburk: Do we have a second?

Roth: Yep.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Roth**. Discussion? CNS Curriculum Package. I see no one looking for recognition. All those in favor of approving the package from CNS then....

Licari: Oop, I'm sorry. Thanks, Jim. I received word very recently that the Department of Industrial Technology wished to remove two items from their component of the packet from the College. Jim?

Maxwell (James, Head of Industrial Technology): Do you want the numbers?

Licari: It's—they were proposing a new course and then dropping a course. They wished to not drop the class and not add the new class. [searching for it to project on screen] It's this new course they decided they do not want to add, and where is (voices asking which course numbers) They were going to drop Engineering Materials, and they do not want to. And the new course they were going to add was this Construction Materials class that they no longer wanted to add. Is that correct, Jim?

Maxwell: Yeah, that's correct. But that's not it right there [projected]. Yeah, that's it up there, Construction Materials. Yes.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: From my information, they've withdrawn a graphic design class and a construction materials class—course, I should say. Is that right?

Funderburk: Somebody

DeBerg: Those two topics?

Maxwell: No. We're withdrawing Engineering Materials. We're requesting this. And we are withdrawing then Construction Materials.

DeBerg: Ok, thank you. I'm sorry. I misread the screen.

Licari: I probably have it on wrong.

Maxwell: No, that's good.

Licari: Can you read that?

Funderburk: Questions? Does anyone—Senator--Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Do we need a motion to amend then because this is the full thing? What we are considering, right? (voices agreeing as to an amendment needed) I move to amend the package before us by—well, by doing whatever it is that (laughter around and voices)—by eliminating the parts of the proposal that deal with the proposed new course of Tech 2015 and the proposal to drop the existing course Tech 2072. (voices asking about clarifying this)

Funderburk: Can we—can we double check the numbers? And so the courses involved are 2015 and 2072? Is that confirmed from everybody? So there's a motion to amend from Senator **Peters**. Is there a second?

Neuhaus: Second.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus** second. Discussion on the amendment? Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So the only reason I'm voting "no" on this is because I have absolutely no idea what the changes are and how they affect this curriculum and this sort of thing, and so I can't possibly be able to know if

it's a good or bad thing, although I'm sure I trust the people are meaning well. But we do have a process, and I don't think this is a good way to make University Curriculum. And so that's the only reason I'm voting "no" on the amendment myself.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I would like to hear from the Department about why at this point they are withdrawing two courses. One course? It's two courses?

Swan: See, we don't even know what we're voting on.

Maxwell: The existing proposal (voices trying to clarify the changes)

DeBerg: Two changes. I'm sorry.

Funderburk: Please—please come join us, if you will. It's easier for the microphones.

Maxwell: Sure. For those of you that don't know me, I'm the new guy on the block. Jim **Maxwell** in Industrial Tech. The reason for the—the new course was proposed over the last year, Construction Materials, and after really discussing it with the Department and bringing everybody to the table, it was kind of silly to have a Engineering Materials and a Construction Materials, because materials are materials basically. If you are looking at plastics, PVC, you're looking at steel, it's the same thing, and it was just kind of like focusing on the construction side, not really discussing it with the Manufacturing and the Electrical Engineering Tech people. It really just made sense not to have two courses that are replicated basically. That was the intent. And I apologize, but I hide under being new, just getting here.

DeBerg: Nice to meet you, by the way.

Maxwell: So that's what—that's what transpired.

DeBerg: Thank you.

Funderburk: One was a withdrawal and one was an addition, correct?

Peters: Correct. (voices clarifying that it is essentially keeping the status quo)

Funderburk: Are there other questions or comments? Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Just clarification again. Could you restate the situation, please?

Funderburk: The issue is the amend—we are now discussing the amendment which is to accept the recommendation of the Department to withdraw their call for the addition of—is it 2015 that was going to be the additional course? And for the dropping of 2072. So the effect of which will be 2072 will remain as it is, and the new course 2015 will not be corre—instruc—started.

Gallagher: Will not be what?

Funderburk: Will not be begun. A new course will not be started.

DeBerg: It will be removed from the curriculum package.

Gallagher: They are removing it. Yeah, let's keep it consistent here. Yeah.

Funderburk: It will be removed from this curriculum package. Since the request was for a new course to replace an old course, that is no longer true. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So is this back to basically be removing their proposal to change? (voices agreeing) Oh! So we are just allowing them to remove—so voting “yes” on this amendment would be—and is this right?

Funderburk: To leave this—to leave part of the curriculum intact.

Swan: I wouldn't like to think about this on (?) the UCC, it would be in effect taking it out of the UCC package, but nothing else is changing. Is that right?

Funderburk: Associate Provost **Licari** would it?

Licari: Yeah, the—this request came up obviously after the UCC passed it to the Senate.

Swan: Passed their proposal, right? And they just want to take the proposal out. So voting "yes" on this is just letting them take the proposal out. The curriculum goes back to the way it was. I see. If that's true, and I'm going to be voting "yes" now, (light laughter around) depending upon that being true, if I learn in the future that that's false, I will feel very put upon. (more laughter)

Male voice: I think you're safe.

Funderburk: Ok, are there any other discussions, comments, questions on this? Ok, so the motion before us at the moment is to accept this—or the amendment is to change the proposal to remove 2015 and reinstate 2072 in the curriculum in place of it. All those in favor of the amendment say "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion carries. We're back to considering the now amended curriculum from CNS. Senator **East**.

East: I'd like to ask the representative from the Curriculum Committee if all the consultations, outstanding or object—outstanding consultations of any sort, were those all resolved?

Licari: Yes, they were.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: In looking at the package, I know there were some graphic design courses, and I'm in Communication Studies. We have some of those, and it

doesn't appear that there was any consultation. I don't know if they do conflict, but I think information needs to be shared, and if we have students who might be looking at those, I mean, we need to get some communication going about that.

Funderburk: Ok. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, in case someone from the Curriculum Committee reads the Minutes, that's the kind of oversight I would expect from the University Curriculum Committee. That if—if proper—if proper consult forms don't go to proper Departments, the UCC would tag that. So, that's a concern of mine, I guess. We have a lot of people in the graphic design pot here. We have at least 3 Departments that I know of. They need to be talking with each other. (someone offered "four") We have 4 that I know of. They need to be talking with each other.

Funderburk: If we wait long enough, we might find a 5th. Anybody else?

DeBerg: Religion might get into it. (light laughter)

Funderburk: Ok, seeing no other people.....Senator **East**.

East: Ditto. How can this happen? I mean, how can there be 4 or 5 Departments on campus that have graphic communication-related, graphic design, graphic communication building sites, websites, that kind of—how—how can the Curriculum Committee allow that to happen, Associate Provost **Licari**?

Funderburk: I believe that would be a direct question? (laughter around)

East: I mean, we—we have Senate rules apparently that say, "Oh, the Senate doesn't need to examine anything in details because the Curriculum Committee examines everything in detail." And then we find out from a Department that they weren't consulted about a course that seems relatively central to their Department?

Funderburk: And Senator **Swan**, also I take it?

Swan: Well, I don't want to step on Associate Provost **Licari**.

Funderburk: It looks like he's still warming up. (laughter around and voices)

Licari: Well, I don't know. I mean

Swan: My question is for Senator **Terlip**: is this an objection from Communications that we then should deal with?

Terlip: Well, I—I honestly don't know. And historically we worked well with Industrial Tech because we had sort of two separate paths, but the students were able to take each other's stuff. I don't know with this new course how that fits with what we're doing. I mean, it's really just more a "I didn't know you were even offering it." So I don't know how to react.

Swan: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. And then so part of that, too, is the checks. I mean, if—if a Department or Program isn't—isn't listed as to be consulted, they wouldn't know that they need to be consulted, right,

Terlip: Until it got

Swan: And so this is, you know, part of curricular problem process, but we also have senates, College Senates, and

Terlip: Well, I'd like to—I don't know this is unique

Swan: coming up

Terlip: to this situation. I think it happens periodically.

Swan: Yeah. Yeah. No. No. That's right. It was just that the representatives on the Curriculum Committee need to be vigilant at—at pushing consultation. That's one—one thing that does need to happen.

Terlip: Well, and I guess maybe my question is it wasn't brought up at Curriculum Committee at all? Or did they discuss it?

Licari: Yeah, well I think part of it

Funderburk: Dr. **Licari** and then Senator **DeBerg**.

Licari: might be that we've been perhaps overly reliant upon the curriculum development system that I think we can get lazy in using it. The—the system historically what it's done is prompted Departments for consultation if that class that you were proposing to change was being used in another program and might come up. (?) Ok. And that's a fairly limited set. You understand that? So I think if instead of simply saying, "Oh, this class that I'm interested in changing the description of and content of, it's not used in another minor or major, I can change this without a consultation." And literally that's been the system. If we wish to have a more thoughtful process, then what we need to do is I think have more on the ground kind of lower level communication between us. And lower level I mean almost grass roots communication between departments. If there's an interest in developing a project, you know, across Comm. Studies and Industrial Tech.

Terlip: Well, I

Licari: You know

Terlip: I'm sorry. No, I'm just thinking about the new integrated digital thing we just passed. This might be another course that would work, but—you know what I mean?

Licari: Right. It could be, although **Bettina** (?) really did a lot of legwork for a number of years, actually to—to get a lot of, you know, communication going.

Terlip: Well, absolutely, but it is a new course.

Licari: And so all—all I—well, my response is—is to Senator **East**'s question about how we can—how—how we have gotten in this corner.

Swan: How it happened.

Licari: And so I—I would suspect that's one of the answers to that—to that question.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I wanted to—I don't—in a—a non-hostile but very friendly way tweak Senator **East**'s point, I think. It—I understand, for instance, that departments can do the same thing about of a content area. For instance, a lot of departments, I hope, teach writing, and we don't crab about that. So it doesn't matter to me out of, you know, just on the surface of it that 4 or 5 departments deal with communication in a different medium or set of media, and that's electronic. But they really do need to be talking to each other, because we don't have a lot of resources for new courses, and I—I just wanted to be certain that courses don't overlap inordinately. So that's the point I want to make.

Licari: And I—I—if you will give me

Funderburk: Uh huh.

Licari: I—I—I agree with Senator **DeBerg**'s comment there. And so I guess I—I would be interested in searching for ways to foster that communication across departments so that resources could be shared, so that interesting ideas can be developed rather than a department over here development a—a set of kind of courses in an area and then a near duplicate developed somewhere else. That's inefficient, and I think keeps students and ourselves compartmentalized in silence. So, I—I fully agree with Senator **DeBerg**.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Well, I just—that—that model is there in places. You know, looking at your science proposal for the Environmental Science Program, if you look at the details on that, you see not only other portions in the Natural Science group playing in that, but you've got folks in Geography. You've got folks from the Business School. There—that--that's a really well integrated package there. So, I mean, it's—it's not like talking among ourselves is dead. It's just a little more abundant in corners of the University, you know..

Licari: Well, it's hard to do sometimes.

Funderburk: Do I see anyone else seeking recognition? I—Senator **East**.

East: I am very loathe to pass a program where consultation did not occur. I don't—I—I don't know which courses these are. One course or multiple courses? I—whatever it is, I would recommend that we remove it from the package and—and not pass it until there's been consultation. I move that we recommend it from—recommend all such parts, in this case apparently it's one course from Industrial Technology, that it be removed from the package until such time as consultation is—is—occurs appropriately with apparently the several other departments on campus, and

Funderburk: If I'm hearing this correctly, that's a motion to divide the question on this item of the graphic design course. Is that accurate?

East: Yes, thank you.

Funderburk: Is there a second for this motion to divide the question? And then I'll be more specific about it.

Smith: I'll second it.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Smith**. So the topic of du jour is the division of the question. If we can figure out what the exact course number is or something, we'll be able to get more specific.

Peters: Tech 1011.

Funderburk: Tech 1011? Ok. Discussion? Senator **Roth**.

Roth: I find myself in the position of agreeing with both **East**, about the importance of consultation. It's very important.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Just a question here. We—we kind of—and—and maybe all the consultations were there. We—we sort of sailed over the Art Department. They—they're putting all sorts of graphic design courses out there. I don't have a problem with that. I think it's a good idea, but maybe—maybe Mike (**Licari**) has answer to that, but I think there's probably a lot of consultation that could have happened all through there. Now—now we catch one here; we catch one there. Are we being as thorough as we can be as well? I know this is the problem. Should the Curriculum Committee have been thorough? Are we being thorough? I—I don't know. This—this to me has a little feeling of ad hoc-ness about it there, because there—there were a number of other points where I could have said, "Well, you know? What about the Art Department? They had a number of courses, and that's graphic design as well." So who's stepping on whose.....there's a lot of toes out there, you know. And I

Terlip: Yeah. I mean, I did look at

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

Funderburk: It's ok. I've got you.

Terlip: A number of departments were consulted. I mean

DeBerg: By whom? Art?

Terlip: By Art, but Industrial Tech was not.

Swan: Can--can we project this on the screen? Can we project the—the consultations on the screen?

Funderburk: Senator **Peters** while Dr. **Licari** works on that.

Peters: I—I certainly understand the importance of the consultation process, but that is also why the process that has been set up, at least as I understand it, exists. And that's that the Senate gives an opportunity for people who did not feel they were properly consulted to make specific objections to the inclusion of a new course, the change of a new program, what have you. This has now been up on the Senate's website for over a month. It has been on the docket for several Senate meetings in a row now, and I have not heard any objection from any affected department. In absence of such objection, I don't see why we should—to—to kind of pick up on Senator **Neuhaus**'s comments, pick this one course and decide that insufficient consultation was done here, when we haven't done so with other courses.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: I agree with that entirely and that is the process as I understand it as well, is that objections would be put on the Agenda for everyone to know, not in this ad hoc way that makes it very difficult to proceed except in an arbitrary and at least to others apparently capricious way, something I do not like to do. But we have the consultations now on screen, is that right? And so

Licari: This is for—this for the—this is the class that is under your discussion.

Swan: And so I'm curious—so if we can look at it and say so who was consulted and who's—who do we now, at this late hour, feel suddenly should have been consulted who wasn't consulted? That's what I do—I am

very curious about that. I think Communications is one who should have been

Terlip: Communication. I would like my colleagues who teach this to look at it. That's all I was thinking.

Swan: And so there's no record of Communications being consulted?

Terlip: None that I could find.

Coon: (Shoshanna, Associate Dean of Graduate College) Scroll to the very end of it, because some of the consultative—consultations actually happen, but they aren't summarized there.

Licari: There. There was a Library consultation.

Terlip: They consulted with English. They partly--consulted with a variety of other places. We were just not one of them.

Licari: It looks like Library and Art.

Swan: Oh, well, so there's Art.

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

Peters: So just to be clear, Senator **Terlip**, that you—you are now making a specific objection, because earlier I—I made this—I may have not understood your comments, but I thought you were just sort of objecting to their maybe not being thorough enough but you didn't necessarily have a specific objection to this course, but at the moment, you—you—you do think that—that it—it would be beneficial in light of the absence of consultation to pause this and—and consult?

Terlip: I was not attempting to derail the Industrial Tech program. That's not what I meant. (many voices showing understanding of that) This was just—I really just saw it this week when I was looking at it, and since we

weren't consulted, there was no way for anybody else to know. I mean, if you're not consulted, you're not knowing they're it until it gets somewhere.

Swan: You don't know they are doing it, especially in another College. Yeah.

Funderburk: Senator **Roth**.

Roth: So I—I'm not trying to put words in your mouth, but would I understand correctly that your comments are not at the level of a formal objection? And you're just saying, "Hey, we—it would have been nice to see it?"

Terlip: And actually follow-up that—that I would appreciate if this could get sent over to the Department, because honestly resources to do this are limited. If we can send some of our students over so they can take it over there, that'd be great, but if we don't know it's there, we can't use it.

Roth: Sure. Ok. All right. I see now. Ok. I understand better. Thank you.

Funderburk: Are there any specific discussions about the motion before, which is to divide the question with regard to this? Senator **Swan**.

Swan: I believe that there is a member from the Communications Department on the Curriculum Committee when this went through, and that person is—if it's the person I'm thinking of, if that's accurate—would have looked into it very, very thoroughly, and so if she didn't think that there was an issue with it, I can't believe that there is going to be one. Again, that's just depending upon my colleague in the Department now

Terlip: Well, and I know

Swan: of making the observation, reviewing it in detail the way she does.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: The Curriculum Committee has one representative from each of the old time Colleges, right? They don't have one from each Department. So somebody from Philosophy and Religion may have done all of SBS—not SBS, what used to be CHFA. And why would they have any more information about that course than anybody else across campus. I mean, that Committee is not as representative as it needs to be for everybody to speak to it. I mean, unless you are going to have somebody from every Department on there or some mechanism to do con—to ensure consultations, this Body can't assume that any of that happened.

Funderburk: Other speakers? Senator **Swan**.

Swan: I would—it was somebody on that Committee from the—from the Department. I mean, so whether or not she was doing other activities, she would be alert to possible problems there. Plus they have other mechanisms of operating where they do overtly, especially if they are not in the areas, try to look elsewhere. I am—the only—I'm speaking this way is because I'm very alarmed at changing packages this way and so late in the process, especially when there prob—especially when there's no apparent problem with it. I mean, that we can't anticipate an affected faculty in fact objecting that—that, well, we could wait and then that faculty will respond, "No objection. No impact. Had no objection." It might not be, but it is late in the process.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I call the question on the amendment to the Natural Sciences Curriculum Package to remove that cour—which was a mo

Funderburk: Just to divide the question. Ok.

DeBerg: I'm sorry?

Funderburk: It was a motion to divide the question, so

DeBerg: Oh. I'm—I'm calling the question on the motion to divide.

Funderburk: Motion to call the question. Do we have a second to call the question?

Dolgener: Second.

Funderburk: Second Senator **Dolgener**. Discussion about calling the question? None? All—all those in favor of calling the question

Roth: Could you restate the motion, I'm sorry.

Funderburk: The motion is

Swan: to stop debate.

Funderburk: to stop debate, right.

Roth: Oh, all right. All right.

Funderburk: Right. So, 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 now the motion is to divide the question and pull out for separate consideration the course related to graphic communications or graphic design. The question has been called, so we are voting. All those in favor, say "aye." (a few heard) All those opposed to dividing the question? (many heard) Abstentions? (none heard) So motion failed. So discussion is back on the curriculum package in the whole from CNS. Senator **Terlip** and then Senator **DeBerg**.

Terlip: I think this is getting taken somewhat out of context. I did not make my remarks in an adversarial role. I view consultations as not just an opportunity to object but as a way for us to know what other people are doing, and so that was really where I coming from in that I advise students who want to take more graphic design. If I don't know the course is there, I can't deal with it. And they will ask me, "Well, how's that different from our course?" And I'll go, "Well, I don't know," because I don't know right

now. So, it really was more a request that maybe we find a better way to make sure that that communication is thorough. And I actually have an idea that you might think about. You had that great little search feature where you could put the words in, it will pull up any place in the curriculum it appears. If people would do that on a regular basis, they would see who they had to consult with.

Funderburk: Ok, due to the time, I want to point out that our conversation has strayed from the actual topic. We're on the curriculum packages specific for the CNS package. The line-up I have is Senator **DeBerg**, Senator **Roth**, and we also have policy coming up, and we do have our Chair of our EPC here for that as well. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I call the question on the former—on the curriculum package of the College formerly known as Natural Sciences.

Swan: Second.

Funderburk: Motion to call the question. Seconded from Senator **Swan**. All those in favor of calling the question, please say "aye." (ayes hear all around) All those opposed? Hearing none, abstentions? Hearing none, the question has been called. The motion is to accept the curriculum package from CNS as written. There are no amendments, just so that's clear for everyone. All those in favor of the CNS curriculum package, please say "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (1 heard) And abstentions? We've got 1 abstention. Ok, so the package passes. And that was most entertaining. Okey dokey.

DOCKET #1012 EPC RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING ACADEMIC ETHICS POLICY

Funderburk: Docket item 1012 is now the EPC Recommendations Regarding Academic Ethics Policy. So we have a motion regarding this? Senator **DeBerg**, thank you.

DeBerg: I move that we table this motion until our next meeting.

Funderburk: Motion is to table.

DeBerg: We have 10 minutes.

Funderburk: Second is by Senator **Roth**. Motion is to table the EPC Recommendations. Any discussion about this? Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So, I mean, just explain the motion. Does—would this then be the first item on the docket next time?

Funderburk: No. It would be the second item.

Swan: Can that be the motion so the people don't have to keep coming?

Neuhaus: Well, the first item is an Emeritus Request.

Swan: That's right, but we can change that to make this the head of the docket.

DeBerg: I do not wish to change my motion, so

Swan: So where in the docket will this put this?

Funderburk: This would put it second behind the Emeritus.

Swan: Oh? Second behind the Emeritus? Oh, well, that's fine. That works. That's actually what I was getting at. I don't want it behind something long.

DeBerg: Did my motion get a second?

Funderburk: It did. By somebody that I said at the time. **[Roth]** Other discussion about tabling? All those in favor of tabling the EPC Recommendation docket item 1012, say "aye." (ayes heard all around) All

those opposed? (a few heard) I think it's pretty clearly—and abstentions? Hearing no—well, 1 abstention. Four, five, yeah, ok, motion passed.

OLD BUSINESS

DOCKET 1007.1 COE/HPELS NAME CHANGE

Funderburk: That brings us to Old Business, and we already know there is no interest to pull this from the table at this the moment. So. How 'bout that next section?

Edginton: We just want to leave it on the table? (receives a nod from Chair)

ADJOURNMENT

Funderburk: The Chair would entertain a motion to adjourn.

Bruess: So move.

Funderburk: Senator **Bruess** and Senator **Edginton** [seconds]. All those in favor? (ayes heard all around) Opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion carries. Thank you very much. (4:50 p.m.)

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate

Next Meetings:

Special meeting February 20, 2012
University Room
3:30 p.m.

Regular meeting February 27, 2012
CBA 319
3:30 p.m.