

4-11-2011

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 11, 2011

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2011 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 11, 2011" (2011). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 64.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/64

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.

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
04/11/11 (3:15 p.m. - 4:32 p.m.)

SUMMARY

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy announcements included no press present. Provost **Gibson** encouraged faculty to attend the Wednesday forum for a candidate for the Associate Provost for International Programs. Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** reminded senators to encourage their Colleges to hold elections soon. Chair **Wurtz's** comments included a luncheon for senators, an overview of the agenda for the last meeting of this semester, April 25th, and cancellation of the Diversity program for Saturday, April 30th. Instead, senators will use that morning for a committee of the whole work day on senate reorganization work due to the combining of colleges.

2. Minutes approved for: 03/28/11 (**Smith/DeBerg**)

3. Docketed from the calendar:

1077 975 Emeritus Status Request for Virginia S. **Berg**, Biology (**Neuhaus/East**), regular order

1078 976 Emeritus Status Request for Fred **Behroozi**, Physics (**DeBerg/Neuhaus**), regular order

1079 977 Consultative Session with Athletics Director, Troy **Dannen** (**Soneson/Gallagher**), 4:00 p.m. on April 25th

1080 978 Emeritus Status Request for Rheta **DeVries**, Curriculum and Instruction (**Breitbach/DeBerg**), regular order

1081 979 E-Learning Migration to BBLearn9 alert (**Funderburk/Smith**), at the head of the docket on April 25th

4. Consideration of docketed items:

1074 972 Expedited Review of Program Changes for the Elementary Education, Middle Level Education, and Early Childhood Education Majors (**DeBerg/Breitbach**), passed.

5. Old Business

1067 965 Recommendations for Reorganization of Academic Units, revised from ad hoc committee, motion to forward document to President, Provost, Deans, and Department Head as recommendations and not policy (**DeBerg/Terlip**), passed

1068 966 Textbook Submission Process, report from ad hoc committee, motion to approve agreement with Registrar (**Funderburk/East**), passed

6. Adjournment at 4:32 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
04/11/11
Mtg. #1694**

PRESENT: Megan Balong, Karen Breitbach, Betty DeBerg, Forrest Dolgener, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Deborah Gallagher, Gloria Gibson, James Jurgenson, Julie Lowell, Chris Neuhaus, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Laura Terlip, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Absent: Gregory Bruess, Doug Hotek, Michael Licari, Michael Roth, Marilyn Shaw

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Wurtz** called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Press were not in attendance.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Provost **Gibson** encouraged senators to attend the first forum for the selection of the Associate Provost for International Programs on Wednesday at 3:30 p.m. in Schindler 344/345. She noted that this is a very, very important position on which she needs faculty feedback, so she would greatly appreciate everyone's attendance.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Faculty Chair James **Jurgenson** reminded those present that elections for offices in senates and colleges are coming up. Volunteers to run are sought, and he cautioned that not participating means losing faculty voice within the University.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR SUSAN WURTZ

Chair **Wurtz**'s comments focused on wrapping up the year in good shape. There will be a luncheon for senate officers, and she hopes that the various senates will have elected their new senators soon. Senate positions do run through August, but for those whose terms are expiring, she encourages that they be sure their Colleges elect subsequent representatives so that we know who the full Faculty Senate will be next year.

The agenda for April 25, the last regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting for this year, will include 3 Emeritus Status Requests to approve, so brief statements to be read into the minutes will be accepted. There will be a consultative session with the Athletic Director Troy Dannen who was asked to concentrate on the academic status of student athletes and what the athletic program is doing to ensure academic success. The status on the Vice Chair's work for assessing which committees the Senate actually needs and for updating/revising charges will be a hand-off rather than completed this semester. The plan for reorganization of Senate membership, which will require changes in the Senate Constitution and the By-laws, will likely not be completed this year but will be worked on over the Summer so that it can be finalized in the Fall very quickly. **Wurtz** stated

that she is close to posting a document regarding the reorganization following a meeting of their ad hoc committee.

The Diversity program scheduled for April 30th will not occur, so **Wurtz** asked if a working session of senators might be held to further discuss the reorganization of the Senate. She asked who might attend, if so. **Balong** asked if the ad hoc committee working on the reorganization would have something ready for discussion. **Wurtz** replied that it is nearly ready and that she is waiting for input from one member prior to sharing it. She feels it is a good plan and that it can be shared with senators prior to that date and then everyone get together and work out any details so that it is ready for the Fall. A few indicated they will not be available, but a show of hands showed enough interest to convene a working session committee of the whole at 9:00 a.m. Location will be announced later.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

The Minutes for 03/28/11 were distributed late inadvertently, but some present felt they had sufficient time to review them for approval for posting. Motion was made to approve the minutes as distributed (**Smith/DeBerg**). No senators today had additions or corrections or discussion. Passed with 1 abstention.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1077 for Docket #975, Emeritus Status Request, Virginia S. Berg, Biology

Senator **Neuhaus** moved to docket in regular order. Second by Senator **East**. Passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1078 for Docket #976, Emeritus Status Request, Fred Behroozi, Physics

Senator **DeBerg** moved to docket in regular order. Second by **Neuhaus**. Passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1079 for Docket #977, Consultative Session with Athletics Director, Troy Dannen

Senator **Soneson** moved to docket in regular order. Second by Senator **Gallagher**. Discussion included scheduling a specific time for this session rather than regular order. The motion was amended for 4:00 p.m. on April 25th. Passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1080 for Docket #978, Emeritus Status Request, Rheta DeVries, Curriculum and Instruction

Senator **Breitbach** moved to docket in regular order. Second by **DeBerg**. Passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1081 for Docket #979, E-Learning Migration to BBLearn9 alert

Senator **Funderburk** moved to docket this item out of order at the head of the order, first thing on the 25th. Second by Senator **Smith**. Discussion included **Soneson** clarifying that the petition asks for the Senate to request funding from the Provost for 9-10 students to assist faculty to become familiar with and use a new version of Blackboard. He suggested that they simply ask Provost **Gibson** who is present. The Provost stated that she thought there is already a mechanism for this training. **Soneson** clarified that the petition states there is not sufficient mechanism. **Funderburk** wants to hear why there seems to be a problem with the migration, why the current system is insufficient, if it is. **DeBerg** voiced frustration with the continual changes in technology and would welcome some consultation with ITS. **Wurtz** asked if anyone has attended the workshops available. Senator **Lowell** has heard from one person that this new version is quite different from the earlier one and much harder. Senator **Balong** worried aloud about senators' lack of knowledge in this area when attempting a conversation with ITS. **East** suggested that ITS be informed that this would be on the agenda so they could send someone. Senator **Dolgener** clarified the issue as being a request for student help for faculty in their migration of current course content or in learning the new platform. He stated that this is a done deal; this new system will be the one everyone must use. Workshops have been scheduled to assist in learning about it. **Wurtz** read aloud the request as one of hiring and training 10-12 student workers to assist ITS and serve faculty in completing this transition. **Soneson**

recommend that if the Senate take up the issue that they also invite the petitioner, Diane **Depken**. **Dolgener** stated that a number of faculty in his area have attended the workshops and have reported that the workshops are adequate and that the system is fairly simple, and he feels that student workers are not necessary. **DeBerg** would like ITS to hear that changing at the end of the semester when everyone is quite busy is problematic, and there are other concerns that everyone could talk about. **Neuhaus** would like a group representing the faculty, perhaps the Faculty Senate, to hear about the all-encompassing system change. If it is truly complex, then there does not seem time for ITS to explain for the Senate's sufficient understanding prior to 4:00. It might be squeezing too much into too short a period of time. **Gallagher** asked for clarification as to other agenda items on the 25th. **Wurtz** enumerated the 3 Emeritus Status Requests, the Consultative Session, the Reorganization, the Budget issue report. So **Gallagher** noted that the Senate needs to prioritize the time for that last meeting. **Funderburk** also noted the time issue at this last meeting. If this issue is put off, then it is water under the bridge. Perhaps it would lead to additional workshops. **Wurtz** noted that the Senate may need to raise the issue in terms of their interest in either Curriculum or Academic policy as far as making changes in the academic processes with enough advanced notice and preparation. **VanWormer** stated that she received a notice from Continuing Ed. or Independent Studies that they are moving over to this new system, so she would welcome hearing more about it. **Wurtz** clarified that this would not be a "training" time but rather looking at the policy process by which this change gets made and the timing of it and the resources available to allow faculty to do what faculty need to do with it. Therefore, with the understanding that **Wurtz** would be asking ITS to come talk with the Senate on the 25th first thing on the agenda, addressing the issues from a policy viewpoint, she called for any further discussion. **East** stated that this discussion about policy is adding to the item to be docketed, which is to fund student assistance for training faculty in the new system. He feels that is the priority issue to be concerned with and to invite ITS to get their reaction to it and to hear any complaints they might have. The issue at hand is what was actually asked of the Senate, but it seems to be changing to something entirely different, he noted. Vote passed to docket out of order at the head of the docket on April 25th.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEM

DOCKET #972, EXPEDITED REVIEW OF PROGRAM CHANGES FOR THE ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION, AND EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION MAJORS

Four guests attended from the College of Education and moved to the guest tables. Those speaking included: Jill **Uhlenberg**, Interim Department Head & Assistant Professor, Curriculum and Instruction; Jean **Schneider**, Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction and Coordinator of the Middle Level Program; and Melissa **Heston**, Interim Director of Teacher Education & Associate Professor, Educational Psychology and Foundations.

Funderburk asked for details he was unable to find in his search following docketing and prior to today. Discussion followed as to the location of the posting of the documents (the curriculum package, a 20-page report, and a summary). The Summary was then projected for all to see. **Wurtz** asked for a motion for approval of the curriculum package under discussion today. **DeBerg** moved and **Breitbach** seconded.

Discussion began with an overview from **Uhlenberg** who explained that two events precipitated this curriculum change. The first, one year ago the State changed the requirements for Elementary Education licensing. Those requirements are reflecting in this document. Basically, it is additional content in 3 or 4 areas. The requirements will go into effect September 1, 2015, so they have asked for expedited review because those students entering Fall 2011 likely will not graduate by September 1. They often have an extra semester. So they will need to meet those new requirements, and the College of Education wanted these in place as quickly as they could make it available to the students.

The second cause of the change was that later this Fall there was a new interpretation of one of the curriculum exhibits for Middle Level Education. The previously approved course options were no longer approved, according to this new interpretation, and so the Middle Level students would then be required to take both Elementary and Middle Level versions of a couple of courses. Therefore, included in this expedited packet are

those changes, so that they will be in compliance as quickly as possible with the Middle Level coursework.

They have had multiple consultations with many Departments across campus. There are 105 pages in their curriculum packet, and the bulk of them are consultations. So they have been in discussion with many different groups to come to some conclusions and some compromises in some situations. The final packet is complete except for possibly one Department that has not signed off on a compromise.

DeBerg asked if some students will have to take two additional courses, an Early and a Middle instead of just a Middle or just an Early. **Uhlenberg** replied, yes, and went on to explain that the Middle Level Major is a dual major. That means that a student must be an Elementary Ed. Major or Secondary Major, and then they can add the Middle Level as a 2nd major. So those students, in their Department, will be required to take both Elementary Curriculum, for example, and Middle Level Curriculum; and Elementary Classroom Management and Middle Level Classroom Management. **DeBerg** asked if this was a lot of students. **Schneider** responded that previously their combination of Elementary/Middle Level Majors could take either Elementary Curriculum or Middle Level Curriculum, and it would count as a substitute. The Department of Education took that away. They said students needed both. So, in order to comply with both and not have a huge amount of redundancy, they changed the credit hours for Middle Level Curriculum from 3 to 2, and now they will have to take both courses, but the one course is reduced in credits and held to strictly what they need for Middle Level.

Schneider continued by saying that the other area is Classroom Management, and with that, too, they were now required to take both, and the courses were essentially the same thing. So they have eliminated the Middle Level Classroom Management course and changed the Elementary Classroom Management course to K-8. **Uhlenberg** added that on the docket it states Elementary and Middle Level Majors. The packet, however, also includes Early Childhood Majors. The reason those 3 majors are included is because they do overlap in terms of the grades those teachers will eventually teach as well as courses that are offered that are required in

each of those majors. **Wurtz** said that we would make that change to the wording of the petition.

Soneson asked for current number of hours for each program and the number of hours in each program once these changes go into effect. **Heston** replied that exact hours depends on whether the student takes a 2-hour version of a course or a 3-hour version of a course. She can simplify it by saying that the current program is an Extended Program, meaning it takes at least 9 semesters and a summer. Under the changes put forth, it will no longer be an Extended Program. Students will be able to complete it in less than 128 hours for all Elementary Majors, and that is a sizable change from something that ranged between 129 and 135 to 137 or so. Because of the restructuring, they have eliminated a 24-hour concentration requirement, which was not part of the State's requirements. The State requires only a 12-hour concentration. They also added content in Science taught by science folks, content in Math taught by math folks, and they made some adjustments in relationship to methods in the Fine Arts and Performing Arts and in Physical Education and Health Education. So they have actually shortened the program. **Soneson** asked if all three programs have been shortened. **Uhlenberg** replied that Early Childhood never required that 24-hour area of concentration, so that program has really not shortened. To **Soneson's** question if that Early Childhood program has then been lengthened, **Heston** said that it might be lengthened, otherwise it would be impossible to add the content courses for students to receive endorsements. That endorsement is called Birth Through Grade Three. It is not the typical Pre-Kindergarten and down. So these students have to have what anyone teaching Kindergarten through 3rd Grade would need to meet the endorsement standards. Most of the students are actually double majors, so if they have the El. Ed. Major, when they take the course for El. Ed., then it will count for their Early Childhood Major. **Heston** continued that she does not think it significantly increases the Early Childhood Major. The bulk of the students are in the Elementary Education Major, some 1400, which will be moving out of an Extended Program and into a traditional 4-year program.

Soneson asked about the Middle Level Major and whether it will be increased in length or shortened. **Schneider** responded that there may be a slight increase but that it would be minimal, perhaps 1 or 2 hours. One

course was eliminated, but they still need both Middle Level Curriculum and Elementary Level Curriculum. There was no getting around that, so it caused a slight addition. They spoke directly to a Department of Education person in Des Moines, explaining that the courses were identical except for one portion, but that person said a direct "no." If the student has an Elementary and a Middle Level Major, then they have to take both courses. So they adjusted accordingly, and it ended up adding a slight amount. But they then eliminated the Middle Level Classroom Management course. It is only slightly increased because of compliance issues.

Soneson explained that several years ago the Faculty Senate passed a stipulation that no Extended Program can be lengthened. **Heston** then explained that the Middle Level Major is not a stand-alone program. Students can never take it by itself. If they opt to take it, they can only do so if they are already taking an Elementary Major or a Secondary content area major. So they are already committed to a significant additional timeframe, because they have two really fairly independent majors. There is more overlap with the Middle Level and Elementary, though. It may add 2 hours here, but because they are always dual majors in the Middle Level there is no way to adjust this. The State was really clear in that meeting about their requirements. If those are not met, then it does not meet licensure, and they will not license the Middle Level students. It is that simple.

Soneson asked if some rearrangement could be made of the courses and/or the content of the courses so that students will not be required to have to take more courses than they are already expected to take. **Heston** replied that it would be really difficult, especially given the timeframe they are working under. It is not as simple as taking one 3-hour Humanities course or another 3-hour Humanities course. The State has very clear expectations in their curriculum exhibit that says exactly what students must have. They do not define it by hours in most cases. And it becomes hard to cut and paste it all together in less than a year, which has been the challenge. They have to have things on the books and ready to go Fall 2011 for the incoming freshmen so they will not face having to switch programs half-way through for the new licensure requirements. It is truly a mess, she noted, for every teacher education institution in the State of Iowa. There have been many discussions, but the Board of Educational Examiners thinks

it "owns" content and curriculum where teacher education is concerned, and they are not very flexible once they make their decisions.

Funderburk asked which Department has not signed off on this yet and asked for a summary of the issues not yet worked out. **Uhlenberg** stated that to her knowledge the Department of Music has yet to sign off and that that has to do with the requirement for the Fine Arts. In the past, students were allowed to take either a Curriculum and Instruction course (Expressive Arts in the Elementary Classroom) or they could take one of the music courses or one of the art courses. The State is now requiring that students must have three areas--music, art, and drama. The Expressive Arts course has included those three for several decades, so the option they wrote in the program was that Fine Arts Departments could offer 2-credit courses in each of those three areas. So it would be a combination of 6 hours with the 3-hour LAC course and the Expressive Arts or the three 2-credit courses. So far, they have not developed those courses yet, but that option is in the program proposal. **Heston** explained that the goal is to allow students to choose. In Physical Education and Health, they can get the requirement in 2 courses or in one other course. It is similar now in Music, and they are waiting for Music to make proposals for the 2-hour options and for them to make contact with the Liberal Arts Core Committee for a waiver from 3 hours of Fine Arts in the L.A.C. if students take three 2-hour options. That must come from Music, however, not the College of Education. They have written it in as broadly as possible without actually adding yet more hours, and leaving it open for the Arts to propose what they propose. Art and Theater have signed off; Music has not yet. There seem to be some turf issues. Also, they are undergoing national accreditation, so their focus has been elsewhere.

VanWormer said she thinks these guests are doing a terrific job of working around the requirements and following the accreditation standards. Her concern is the L.A.C. and how the changes may affect other students.

Heston noted that she did not think the changes in the L.A.C. would actually affect any other major here on campus as much as it would theirs. In fact, their Chapter 79 requires that their majors take a body of Liberal Arts Core knowledge that prepares them to teach the Iowa Core Curriculum. It is written in the Administrative Code. They have not yet done the comparison to see if their students can opt for some L.A.C.

courses of the correct nature to do what Chapter 79 requires. However, because their students pass the Praxis II, a general knowledge test of elementary curriculum, the State has not seemed overly concerned that L.A.C. content is not preparing students to teach the Iowa Core Curriculum. If they do become concerned, it will affect not just UNI but also U. Iowa, Iowa State, and everyone else who produces teachers. It affects UNI more because UNI graduates about half the beginning teachers in Iowa. UNI has approximately 600 graduates each year, which is more than U. Iowa, Iowa State, and some of the small programs put together.

Gallagher asked if the State requires performance standards or credit hours. **Heston** replied that it does not spell out either of those. It requires credit hours for the endorsement, which varies with each endorsement. She gave an example in the sciences where the number of credits and the content types did not mesh and another example in the fine arts and health where the hours were dissimilar. What the State sees as important and as hours is not entirely predictable. They focus on methods, whereas UNI is wanting to strengthen content. **Gallagher** suggested that down the line perhaps the entire teacher education curriculum could be evaluated in line with new requirements instead of just making adjustments to satisfy the State. **Heston** agreed that significant revisions to the professional sequence could be made because that is governed by a different set of standards in Chapter 79, but in terms of the actual endorsements, which are independent from that, those are prescriptive in the type of content that must be covered. She gave one example, saying it would be really difficult to do major reshifting and that that was just one endorsement, whereas there are 70 or 80 endorsements offered, each structured differently by the State. **Gallagher** asked whether this content could fit within the framework and continue to be endorsed. **Heston** said she would not want to ask the science colleagues to develop new courses just for education majors so that it fit State requirements for endorsement. Content except for literacy comes outside the College of Ed. **Gallagher** just wanted to suggest bigger visions about the whole Teacher Education program. **Heston** agreed that bigger visions would be great but that they do not have something uniform to begin with. The many endorsements are very, very different. It is not competency-based like Early Childhood, and the Special Ed. Secondary endorsement is all content with no competencies listed at all.

East wanted to be clear about the double major issue. Students with Middle Level Majors have chosen to add it to their first major--a content area in Secondary Education or perhaps an Elementary Education Major. They are in no way tied together nor required, he asked. It is the student's choice to make their program longer. **Heston** agreed. **East** also wanted to be clear that the Secondary Education and Elementary Education programs have gone from Extended Programs to traditional-length programs. **Heston** agreed. The Elementary Education program has gone from being an extended program to between 120 and 128 hours depending on labs chosen and other choices students may make. The Middle Level Major, called an Endorsement by the State, is strictly an add-on. It cannot be chosen by and of itself. With the Elementary Major fewer credits, now it frees up more time for those who choose the Middle Level in addition. She added a bit of fact in that 67% of the 2500 Teacher Education students are currently in Extended Programs. The most popular major on campus, Elementary Education, is now less than an Extended Program. It also adds content in math and content in science, so it is hard for her to see that as a bad thing. They may also ultimately have more content or more experience in the Fine Arts when that is finalized.

Lowell asked if these changes are going to actually improve the teacher training of UNI students? **Heston** replied that it will improve their content knowledge in math and science, but whether it will translate into more effective teaching is debatable. If more content meant more effective teaching, then every PhD would be an effective teacher, and everyone knows that that is not true. The Math Department was concerned that they would lose their K-8 Math Minors and that those students would have fewer math hours. But this way all students will have more math hours rather than a small, select portion. So there have been trade-offs. They are striving to meet the State's requirements without weakening what is already there. Some may argue that they have done that anyway by eliminating the 24-hour specialization, but she does not think that that necessarily is the case.

Soneson noted that he is all for shortening programs and with Elementary Ed. increasing content. He is very supportive of that. He does worry, though, that there is an increase in numbers of hours in Early Childhood

Education as well as the Middle Level Education and feels that that will add a burden on the students who are focusing in these areas. **Uhlenberg** noted that in the Early Childhood Education Major there are currently some elective hours, so the program itself will not be lengthened. It just means that students will have fewer elective hours because of the added math and science content areas. **Soneson** said that was a helpful clarification. **Heston** added that about 95% of the Early Childhood Majors are Elementary Education Majors anyway, so it is a very, very small number of students that would be affected by this change who would not have already been affected by these changes in some way. Middle Level, again, is that independent sort of thing that students either add on or not. It is always an Extended Program in essence because it is added to another major.

Dolgener asked how all this would affect students already in the program. **Heston** said that current student can complete the program they registered for when they entered. They must watch carefully, however, about when they graduate because if they do not graduate timely--perhaps take a year off or delay for some reason--then they may have to switch programs and meet the new requirements because they will not have what they need for licensure.

Soneson asked one last thing--would any of the changes require hiring new faculty? **Heston** said they have checked, and she believes the answer is "no." Earth Science may need a portion of one person to do some of the Earth/Space science, but that is all. These are L.A.C. courses rather than specialized courses that are truly unique to the Teacher Ed. students. **Uhlenberg** added that for the Earth/Space science requirement, there are 4 or 5 courses they can take to satisfy it, so that will spread out the demand. **Heston** noted that if the Fine Arts gets up and running, there may be issues, because the Education students must have access to the Theater course and the Art course where resources are more scarce than in the Music area. This will require some strategic planning.

Wurtz asked if there were any additional requests for clarification from the guests or points of interest the guests wish to put on the table as senators make up their minds to vote yes or no or any other points to be made that have not yet come up. **Heston** stated that she appreciates that they were allowed to expedite the curriculum process. She does not favor the

expedited process under most circumstances, but they did find themselves under the gun with the Board of Education Examiners. When multiple institutions said that these changes were occurring too fast and that all needed at least another year to do this correctly, they were denied. This current BOEE is not receptive to their needs and scheduling issues, so she appreciates that various groups throughout the whole process were willing to move this forward more quickly than is typical. **Balong** responded that she has seen how hard they have had to work in order to create the package and has seen issues resolved with some Departments which at first seemed unlikely.

No further discussion. Motion passed with 1 abstention. Chair **Wurtz** complimented the guests on their good work in a tight situation.

OLD BUSINESS

DOCKET #965 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REORGANIZATION OF ACADEMIC UNITS, revised document from ad hoc committee

DeBerg moved to bring #965 off the table. Senator **Terlip** seconded. **DeBerg** reported that the ad hoc committee, which consisted of **Bruess** from CSBS, **Roth** from CNS, and herself from CHAFA, met following the productive and helpful Senate discussion about the initial draft of recommended procedures for academic reorganization. She went on to highlight major changes in the draft. They took a lot of the specific information out of the introductory remarks about the CNS/CHAFA merger because a couple of faculty members from other Colleges communicated with them some concerns they had along the same lines in their own Colleges. Thus, they made the introduction much more general.

They also included a definition in Section A of academic reorganization as recommended by **East**, **DeBerg** continued. In the other sections, they made specific which type of reorganization as defined in A each of the following sections applied to. For instance, "proper consultation for all types of reorganization" is B; "budgetary rationale for all types of reorganization" is C; D and E apply to "mergers or moves from one unit to another and not to other forms of reorganization"; F applies in cases of

"splits." They added splits as a logical possibility to the definition. So there is no question as to where this particular set of recommendations needs to be placed. In general, they made all the language consistent in the document, and they tried to make it very explicit that these are recommendations, so senators will see recommendation language added throughout and in a consistent way. They kept the appendices as they are. They kept the support from their own policies and procedures. They kept support from the AAUP documents on policy, shared governance, and from the constitution of UNI's faculty in support of these recommendations. So the founding documents remain the same.

East noted that in Part B it does not seem to say that faculty need to be consulted. **DeBerg** replied that it listed "elected faculty representatives." **East** agreed, saying that this does not mean faculty of the units being reorganized. **DeBerg** felt that the elected faculty reps. could consult the faculty of the units in question. The College senates could choose to consult College faculty. The Faculty Senate could choose reps. The Chair of the Faculty could choose to do that.

East wanted to make clear what is happening here. This is a recommendation listing recommended policy and procedures which would go to the Provost and then where? **DeBerg** stated that in the last paragraph of the introductory material it says that "The ad hoc committee, designated by the Senate to draft recommendations for future academic reorganization, moves that the University Faculty Senate adopt the following recommendations and forward them to the President, Provost, Deans, and Department Heads." That's the steps that will happen should the Faculty Senate approve this new draft. **East** asked whether for it to become procedures or policy of the University, somebody else has to approve it? **DeBerg** replied that this is being forwarded as recommendations not as University policy.

The motion to forward the revised document to the President, Provost, Deans, and Department Heads, understanding that this is a recommendation from the Faculty Senate for procedures and that it is not a proposal for specific policy was voted upon. Passed. **Wurtz** offered thanks to the committee for the follow-up work on this document.

DOCKET #966 TEXTBOOK SUBMISSION PROCESS, report from ad hoc committee after meeting with Registrar

Funderburk moved to bring #966 off the table. **East** seconded.

Funderburk reported that the ad hoc committee, consisting of **East, Roth,** and himself, met with Registrar Phil **Patton** at the end of February to explore the issue of the call for listing of textbooks for the following year in early February. A new Federal guideline has asked schools to make their best faith effort to provide textbook listings at the same time the Class Schedule goes to students. **Patton** was willing to work with the committee. He said that the majority of faculty had complied and that he was willing to e-mail those who had not yet. He would work with them on wording that would seem less authoritarian, perhaps not the best word **Funderburk** admitted. The idea was to help everyone see that it was important but not to feel overly pressured because sometimes new textbooks require additional time to consider. **Patton** will send an e-mail reminder to any faculty who have yet to turn in a textbook listing approximately 2 weeks prior to when the Class Schedule will be available to students. The final deadline is 2 weeks prior to when the class actually meets. **East** agreed that that is a good summary of the issue and added that there might be monthly reminders during the Summer, hopefully just to those who have yet to comply. **Patton** was receptive to the idea that the wording of the original notification was a bit terse and authoritarian.

The Senate voted to accept the work of the ad hoc committee as described by **Funderburk** as having satisfactorily addressed the issue, with thanks to the ad hoc committee for their work.

ADJOURNMENT

The business for the day being accomplished, the chair declared the meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss,
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate