

11-16-2009

# University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 16, 2009

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2009 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents](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, November 16, 2009" (2009). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 82.

[http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents/82](http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/82)

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](mailto:scholarworks@uni.edu).

**SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**11/16/09**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of the 11/09/09 meeting as corrected by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Schumacher-Douglas. Motion passed.

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

No press present.

**COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON**

Provost Gibson had no comments.

**COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN**

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

**COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ**

Chair Wurtz stated that UNI Student Government (NISG) has asked if the Faculty Senate would like to send a Senate member or representative to the City Student Affairs Commission, a new committee that is being put together by the City of Cedar Falls to enhance UNI Student relationship with the City. There were no volunteers.

Chair Wurtz read a prepared statement to be read into today's minutes, noting that she has comments two issues.

The first issue concerns the minutes of our October 26, 2009 session, which include a statement concerning allegations of a specifically-named individual violation of the United Faculty (UF) Constitution and the individual named has pointed out that the record of the allegation stands in our minutes without means

of similarly putting on record any answer to the allegations and has requested that a motion be brought before the Senate to strike that content from the minutes.

However, the process of expunging something from the minutes is cumbersome, and to engage in the process would only result in further highlighting the record.

The individual has agreed that pursuing a motion to expunge from the record will not be necessary if the Chair of the Senate emphasizes again that it is not the role of the Senate to engage in discussion about the operations of United Faculty, just as it would be inappropriate for United Faculty to interfere in any way with the operations of the Senate; and if the Chair reminds the Senate body that negative statements about any individual actions should only be brought into Senate discussion when two conditions are met: 1) that actions of that individual have a direct bearing on legitimate Senate business and 2) the Senate processes allow for presentation and recording of opposing views evidence.

I have now so emphasized. I have now so reminded. I trust this matter is at an end and no similar matters will arise.

Item two: A question was raised concerning the role of the Senate in receiving reports from its committees, and specifically about receiving the reports from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC).

For the record, the role of the Senate is described in the Bylaws of the Senate, which were last amended in 1986.

Chair Wurtz went on to review the role of the Senate in receiving reports.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING**

1008 Guidelines for Study Abroad Courses

Motion to docket in regular order as item #906 by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Basom. Motion passed.

1009 Resolution that documents docketed by UNI Faculty Senate be posted on the UNI Faculty Senate Website

Motion to docket in regular order as item #907 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Schumacher-Douglas.

1010 Emeritus Status Request, Timothy M. Cooney, Department of Earth Science, effective 7/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #908 by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

1011 Emeritus Status Request, Ralph Scott, Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations, effective 12/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #909 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East. Motion passed.

1012 Emeritus Status Request, Paul E. Rider, Sr., Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, effective 7/10

Motion to docket in regular order as item #910 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

Chair Wurtz stated that the Faculty Senate has been asked to provide a Senate representative to the Strategic Planning Committee.

Motion to nominate Vice Chair Mvuyekure to the Strategic Planning Committee; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

Chair Wurtz noted, with the Senate's permission, she would like to move ahead to the Emeritus Status Requests under "Consideration of Docketed Items". The Senate gave their permission for Chair Wurtz to take these out of order.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

897 Emeritus Status Request, Thomas R. Berg, Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations, effective 6/09

Motion to approve by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Schumacher-Douglas. Motion passed.

898 Emeritus Status Request, Carol Cooper, School of HPELS, effective 7/09

Motion to approve by Senator Van Wormer; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

899 Emeritus Status Request, Cheryl Timion, department of Teaching, effective 7/09

Motion to approve by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Devlin. Motion passed.

900 Emeritus Status Request, Sandra Alper, Department of Special Education, effective 8/09

Motion to approve by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Devlin. Motion passed.

901 Emeritus Status Request, Lowell Hoeft, Department of Teaching, effective 8/09

Motion to approve by Senator Balong; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

902 Emeritus Status Request, Antonio Planells, Department of Modern Languages, effective 01/10

Motion to approve by Senator Basom; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

#### **ONGOING BUSINESS**

Motion by Senator Soneson to pull Item #905, Curriculum Package - Social and Behavioral Sciences, Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology - Certificates and Interdisciplinary off the table; second by Senator Devlin. Motion passed.

Kent Sandstrom, Head, Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology, was present to speak to the Social and Behavioral Sciences, Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology - Certificates issue.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Senator Breitbach moved to call the question; second by Senator Devlin.

Motion to approve Item #905, Curriculum Package - Social and Behavioral Sciences, Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology - Certificates and Interdisciplinary passed with 2 nays and 3 abstentions.

Item #905 Interdisciplinary

A lengthy discussion followed on the proposed Global Studies Major.

Motion by Senator Schumacher-Douglas to call the question; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Global Studies Major passed with one nay and 3 abstentions.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS, continued**

903 Category 3B Review - Literature, Philosophy and Religion, Liberal Arts Core Committee

904 Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct

Chair Wurtz noted that the Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct is somewhat pressing due to federal regulations.

Discussion followed as to how to proceed.

It was noted that there was no longer a quorum present and as a result it was decided to move to item #904 Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct is somewhat pressing due to federal regulations.

Discussion followed as to how to proceed.

Chair Wurtz noted that this was brought to the Senate by Anita M Gordon, Director of Research Services, Sponsored Programs because UNI receives grant money, and as such we must abide by federal mandates and have certain processes in place to respond to any allegations of research misconduct. This isn't a question of approving it or not but do we approve of the way it's put together. The panel on Faculty Conduct is no longer operating and it is unclear as to when and why it was disbanded, and she's not sure how the Senate would do a panel at this point, but she can say they we will.

Christine Twait, Assistant Provost for Sponsored Programs, was present to discuss this with the Senate.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion to table by Senator Breitbach; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

---

**DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW**

### **MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING 11/16/09 1670**

**PRESENT:** Megan Balong, Maria Basom, Karen Breitbach, Gregory Bruess, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Gloria Gibson, Bev Kopper, Julie Lowell, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Michael Roth, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz, Michele Yehieli

**Absent:** Doug Hotek, Phil Patton, Chuck Quirk

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of the 11/09/09 meeting as corrected by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Schumacher-Douglas. Motion passed.

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

No press present.

**COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON**

Provost Gibson had no comments.

**COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN**

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

**COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ**

Chair Wurtz stated that UNI Student Government (NISG) has asked if the Faculty Senate would like to send a Senate member or representative to the City Student Affairs Commission, a new committee that is being put together by the City of Cedar Falls to enhance UNI Student relationship with the City. The first meeting is Friday, November 27.

Chair Wurtz noted that it might not be feasible for the Faculty Senate to send a representative as the Senate is asked to send representatives to many committees. There were no volunteers.

Chair Wurtz read a prepared statement to be read into today's minutes.

"I have comments today on two issues.

Issue One: The minutes of our October 26, 2009 session include a statement concerning allegations of a specifically-named individual violation of the United Faculty (UF) Constitution.



I noted at the time, and on the record, that it is inappropriate for the Senate to engage in discussion about UF operations.

I had hoped that statement would provide sufficient balance.

It has not.

The individual named has pointed out that the record of the allegation stands in our minutes without means of similarly putting on record any answer to the allegations. He requested that a motion be brought before the Senate to strike that content from the minutes.

However, the process of expunging something from the minutes is cumbersome, and to engage in the process would only result in further highlighting the record.

The individual has agreed that pursuing a motion to expunge from the record will not be necessary from his perspective if the Chair of the Senate emphasizes again that it is not the role of the Senate to engage in discussion about the operations of United Faculty, just as it would be inappropriate for United Faculty to interfere in any way with the operations of the Senate; and if the Chair reminds the Senate body that negative statements about any individual actions should only be brought into Senate discussion when two conditions are met: 1) that actions of that individual have a direct bearing on legitimate Senate business and 2) the Senate processes allow for presentation and recording of opposing views evidence.

I have now so emphasized. I have now so reminded. I trust this matter is at an end and no similar matters will arise.

Item two: A question was raised concerning the role of the Senate in receiving reports from its committees, and specifically about receiving the reports from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC).

For the record, the role of the Senate is described in the Bylaws of the Senate, which were last amended in 1986.

Pertaining to reports from its committees, of which the UCC is one, the Bylaws of the Senate provide that the Senate "...may approve reports in part or as a whole; it may amend them; it may return them to the committee for revision or for additional information and recommendations." The Bylaws also state, "Since

the Senate is not principally a fact-finding body, the Senate requests committees to present with their reports and/or recommendations whatever information and documentation may be necessary to allow the Senate economically to deliberate upon the committee's recommendation."

This is the process the Senate followed last week and it is the process the Senate will continue to follow over the next several sessions.

Also for the record, we have received the opinion that, "recent practice on this matter has deviated significantly from [the Bylaws], thus creating new custom and expectations as to process which supplant written codes in legitimacy. By effectively serving as ratifier of UCC decision-making for so many years, the Senate's new scrutiny of curriculum packages, although perfectly reasonable according to code, are no longer legitimate because the code process itself, through lengthy lack of adherence in this area, are no longer relevant or legitimate."

As I recall my five years of Senate experience, there has been consistent and on-going discussion reminding ourselves of the need to strike the correct balance between not re-doing the work of our committees and exercising our responsibility as the final forum for decision making. Though there is no doubt the Senate achieved that balance more successfully sometimes than other times, I believe the Senate is on solid ground in its current actions. Just as a point of interest, a quick and rough count indicates that the Senate as it is constituted today generates a total of at least 60 years of Senate terms, and that is only over the past decade.

However, I do appreciate the question and the opinion. They provide welcome foundation for my current endeavors, as described in my recent memo to the Senate, in collecting the information necessary for a reassessment of our committee structure and of our processes.

Again, I did not intend to take your time on this now, when you already have so much that demands your attention. But the need has arisen to discuss this with others outside of the Senate and I will not do that without bringing it to your attention first. You have received a memo from me about this. I have spoken briefly with Provost Gibson about it. I invite Provost Gibson and any Senators who so choose, to be as involved in this early stage of data collection as she and you choose.

And now, by the act of reading this into the minutes of the Senate, I am responding to the opinion (thank you for that foundation) and providing campus-wide awareness of the work being done."

#### **CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING**

1008 Guidelines for Study Abroad Courses

Motion to docket in regular order as item #906 by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Basom. Motion passed.

1009 Resolution that documents docketed by UNI Faculty Senate be posted on the UNI Faculty Senate Website

Motion to docket in regular order as item #907 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Schumacher-Douglas.

Senator East asked if this couldn't be handled administratively. It doesn't appear to be a resolution to change bylaws. It seems that the Chair and the Secretary could agree among themselves that all documents supplied to the Senate to be acted upon could be posted on the Senate's website.

Chair Wurtz noted in the memo she sent to senators, describing that she is now talking with the people who manage our web page, and she is getting lovely, timely responses. It is happening. However, this resolution may give her a little extra weight.

Motion passed with one abstention.

1010 Emeritus Status Request, Timothy M. Cooney, Department of Earth Science, effective 7/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #908 by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

1011 Emeritus Status Request, Ralph Scott, Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations, effective 12/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #909 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East. Motion passed.

1012 Emeritus Status Request, Paul E. Rider, Sr., Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, effective 7/10

Motion to docket in regular order as item #910 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Chair Wurtz stated that the Faculty Senate has been asked to provide a Senate representative to the Strategic Planning Committee. She noted that she represented the Senate at their first meeting and that Vice Chair Mvuyekure represented the Senate at the last meeting. Vice Chair Mvuyekure has noted that he would be willing to continue to represent the Senate on that committee.

Motion to nominate Vice Chair Mvuyekure to the Strategic Planning Committee; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

Chair Wurtz noted, with the Senate's permission, she would like to move ahead to the Emeritus Status Requests under "Consideration of Docketed Items". The Senate gave their permission for Chair Wurtz to take these out of order.

### **CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

897 Emeritus Status Request, Thomas R. Berg, Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations, effective 6/09

Motion to approve by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Schumacher-Douglas.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas stated that Tom Berg retired as an Associate Professor from the College of Education and the Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations. He taught in Ohio in the public schools and then joined UNI in 1972, teaching until 2008. Students will remember Dr. Berg for his "Schools in American Society" course in which he generated healthy and robust discussions and debates. She concurred with the nomination for Emeritus Status.

Senator Soneson added that the Senate would also like to thank Dr. Berg for his many years of service.

Motion passed.

898 Emeritus Status Request, Carol Cooper, School of HPELS,  
effective 7/09

Motion to approve by Senator Van Wormer; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Senator Van Wormer noted that Carol Cooper will be missed and her absence noted. As her personal Republican friend, Senator Van Wormer stated that Carol Cooper is well known to faculty for her university leadership. She has been the Chair of Faculty Senate, President of United Faculty and worker behind the scenes such as helping to organize the Committee on Committees. Carol could be called the UNI historian as she is an expert on bylaws and rules of university governance and how they came to be. As a staunch Republican, Carol has been very active politically, and she can tell who to vote for by voting against whoever Carol supports. Carol had been a leader of the League of Women Voters and offered a popular Capstone course on local politics that presented both sides of every issue. What is not known about Carol Cooper is that when an obituary needs to be written, she does the background research and writing, when a faculty member is in the hospital, she is there to visit, and she has made frequent visits over the years to very elderly, retired faculty in nursing homes. Although she is retiring from teaching, she remains active in community affairs and is always happy to give advice on how to get things done and a number of issues.

Senator Soneson commented that Carol has been a member of the Faculty Senate for a number of years and has served honorably and graciously. We should thank her for that service and for her overall service as a faculty member.

Motion passed.

899 Emeritus Status Request, Cheryl Timion, department of  
Teaching, effective 7/09

Motion to approve by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Devlin.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas stated that Cheryl Timion retired as an instructor from the College of Education and the Department

of Teaching. She worked at the University of Connecticut from 1988 until 1992 when she joined UNI at Price Lab School. She taught first and second grades, then middle school, grades sixth, seventh and eighth. As a middle level educator herself, Senator Schumacher-Douglas remarked that she can appreciate all the challenges and joys that encompasses. In 1999 Ms. Timion moved into the Office of Student Field Experiences and taught 280:170 "Human Relations" and served as a supervisor for out of state and international student teaching field placements. She served the university as Executive Secretary of the Student Publications Advisory Board and was also published in numerous books, publishing chapters and received numerous grants. We would like to thank Cheryl Timion for her service to UNI.

Senator Neuhaus added that Cheryl was one of those people who got her money's worth out of her librarians. She regularly held classes in the library, which the library encourages. She was also a believer in avoiding the textbook, believing all her students should have a book that they chose themselves and the library certainly had enough of those, working with the library to develop reading lists. She was very interested in diversity before the rest of the educators got on the diversity bandwagon. She was a great colleague, and he was able to teach some classes with her and the library will miss her.

Motion passed.

900 Emeritus Status Request, Sandra Alper, Department of Special Education, effective 8/09

Motion to approve by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Devlin.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas noted that Dr. Alper retired as a Professor and Associate Dean of Graduate Studies of the College of Education. She taught from 1976 to 1994 at the University of Missouri-Columbia before coming to UNI in 1994 as a Professor and Head of the Department of Special Education. Dr. Alper is a nationally and internationally recognized expert in the area of Severe Disabilities and Inclusion, and has received numerous grants in the area of leadership in Special Education. We appreciate her expertise that she brought with her to UNI and the expertise she shared with the faculty.

Motion passed.

901 Emeritus Status Request, Lowell Hoeft, Department of Teaching, effective 8/09

Motion by Senator Balong; second by Senator Soneson.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas stated that Mr. Hoeft retired from UNI as an instructor from the College of Education, the Office of Student Field Experiences. Prior to coming to UNI Mr. Hoeft was a teacher in Wisconsin. He joined UNI in 1987 as an instructor at Price Lab School, and in 1996 he became an instructor in the Department of Modern Languages and held the position until 2005. One of the outstanding characteristics of Mr. Hoeft is the great things that he did with students. As an example, from 2000 to 2004 he had 76 students win or place at the state level French contest and 24 winning at the National French Contest. He had a long history of supporting students as they explore modern languages and a remarkable record. He received the Iowa Foreign Language Associations Outstanding Educator Award in 1999, he received the College of Education Outstanding Award for Teaching in 1995, and he was a Fullbright Teacher Exchange recipient in 1993. Mr. Hoeft received the Distinguished French Educator Award from American Association of Teachers of French and he also received the Foreign Language Program Award by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language. He has an outstanding record of not only supporting students but also of grant writing, presentations, publications, and teaching. He will be missed.

Senator Balong commented that Mr. Hoeft was a much-loved instructor at Price Lab School for many years. He had a huge impact on the many students going on to major in French at the college level, a tremendous proportionally number of students from his classroom. He also established an exchange program in France and that has created long lasting relationships for Price Lab students that are still in touch with those former students in France. He will be greatly missed.

Senator Basom added that Lowell Hoeft was a phenomenal classroom teacher, among the best she has ever seen. He was universally loved by his students, and his students knew French so well, consistently placing among the best French students in the nation. He is going to be really missed.

Motion passed.

902 Emeritus Status Request, Antonio Planells, Department of Modern Languages, effective 01/10

Motion to approve by Senator Basom; second by Senator Bruess.

Senator Basom noted that Dr. Planells is retiring as a full Professor at the end of Fall semester. Prior to coming to UNI in 1992 he taught at Howard University in Washington D.C., as well as at Loyola College and Concordia University in Montreal. Dr. Planells has been a wonderful colleague, and exceptionally warm and kind person, as those who know him will know that about him. He has published extensively in the area of literature and he's taught in every area of our curriculum, Spanish language, literature and culture courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, as well as courses in translation and courses in the Liberal Arts Core, in addition to serving many years as Department Head of Modern Languages. His most significant contribution to our curriculum was his development of a series of courses in languages for the professions, particularly Spanish for Social Work and Medical Spanish, which he has taught at Allen Hospital for many years. Dr. Planells worked very hard to develop these courses as well as a certificate in Spanish for the Professions. In addition, he developed materials in the area of literature therapy, along the lines of art and music therapy, which he also piloted at the hospital. We want to thank Dr. Planells for all his work with the community over the years, and he wishes us well as we face the challenges of the coming semester.

Motion passed.

#### **ONGOING BUSINESS**

Motion by Senator Soneson to pull Item #905, Curriculum Package - Social and Behavioral Sciences, Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology - Certificates and Interdisciplinary off the table; second by Senator Devlin. Motion passed.

Senator Soneson recommended that Kent Sandstrom, Head, Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology speak to the Social and Behavioral Sciences, Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology - Certificates issue.

Dr. Sandstrom provided background on the certificates, noting that the Certificate in Social Identities, Inequalities and



Intersectionalities was approved in the previous Curriculum cycle. Their request is largely a re-statement of certificate, and their understanding was that it was primarily a formality. They originally had decided to go with one overall certificate, guided by the notion that they track the emphasis areas chosen by students. They discovered that this arrangement was confusing to the students, and based on feedback from students during their Student Outcomes Assessment (SOA) process they are proposing the change so students will have a clearer understanding of the emphasis area associated with their certificate and students also noted that it would enhance their marketability, particularly in the eyes of potential employers.

The renaming and splitting of the certificate will not involve any additional resources; they will simply continue to teach the courses that they're already teaching. They developed this certificate, and subsequent certificates, out of a lengthy process of deliberation both within the unit and former Dean Julia Wallace, who strongly encouraged and endorsed the plan to develop it more innovative and make courses more appealing to students.

Dr. Sandstrom stated that they believe their certificates do distinguish their program from other sociology programs at Regent universities in the state. They have many students interested in earning these certificates as part of their major or in conjunction with their minor, approximately 36 with 27 officially declaring their intention to pursue a certificate. This number is likely to grow. These certificates are designed to serve both majors or minors in Sociology but also students in other programs. They have talked with people in other programs, including Women's and Gender Studies, Anthropology, Criminology, Social Work, Global Health, Communication Studies and even Management.

Dr. Sandstrom continued, noting that given the recent bias related incidents taking place on campus, this seems particularly timely to be offering students courses and certificates that focus on issues pertaining to race, ethnicity, diversity and culture. The certificates that they're offering would be a tangible demonstration of the commitment of both the department and the university have to diversity.

Senator Smith stated that it is his understanding that as it is currently set up in the program, Sociology majors can only get one certificate. With the new change they could get two, three, four certificates.

Dr. Sandstrom replied that yes, potentially but it's unlikely that anyone would take the number of courses necessary to get four but they could get two.

Senator Smith continued, noting that there is so much overlapping in some of these certificates that students could get two certificates with the same three courses.

Dr. Sandstrom replied that he didn't think so.

Senator Smith continued, noting that his concern at the last meeting from serving on the Program Assessment was that we had certificates with very low enrollments and why are we offering programs that students don't want. He does understand that this is a new certificate but he's still bothered that they're going from one certificate to four. Why are we expanding these offerings with a program that hasn't demonstrated its marketability? He does understand the desire to change the title and believes it's an incredible clunky title. When he looked at this more closely, what really bothered him was the fact that there's so much overlap between the certificates and the major that what in essence they're doing is giving students a major plus some certificates. There's hardly any distinctive substantial set of knowledge that a student has to do over and beyond the major to get the certificates. This really bothers him and trivializes certificates. He gave the example that all students earning the certificates have to take two courses that are required for Sociology majors, 980:001 Introduction to Sociology and 980:108 Research Methods, basic requirements of the program. In addition the program has core electives, with students taking two out of three, one course in three of the four core areas, with a certificate for each area. Two of the three electives for each certificate, say a student took 980:100 Social Psychology and 980:138 Sociology of Culture, would work in two of the three certificates. Students take one more course, 980:167 Gender in Cross-Culture Perspective, which is another of the electives and those students will graduate not only with a B.A. in Sociology but with a Certificate in Sociology of Gender and Culture and a Certificate in Sociology of Race/Ethnicity and Immigration. Students are getting three degrees for nothing more than one. In essence, if we took this policy and applied it across campus we'd see thousands of certificates that students will be getting for doing nothing more than what they would normally do in their major. He believes there is a role for certificates, appropriate for when there are professional requirements and it's something that sets

students up for some kind of professional body. It's appropriate when there's a substantial body of knowledge that's kind of in the major and you offer elective courses but if you do more of this you kind of specialize. But the role that's being used here is using certificates for what most programs would do as emphases or concentrations, and that he objects to. Students are getting an extra credential, an extra piece of paper and by doing so are demeaning those credentials, making it so everybody can get one for doing nothing. That, for him, is why he cannot support this.

Senator Soneson noted that he wonders if the Sociology's concept of a certificate is almost like a minor.

Dr. Sandstrom replied that a minor is 21 credit hours.

Senator Soneson continued, saying the same way a student could get a minor and a major in the same field. Students who major in Sociology aren't going to get a minor in it as well. His guess is that they are trying to lure students from other programs into courses in Sociology.

Dr. Sandstrom responded that they certainly invite them.

Senator Soneson stated that their intent is not so much to give a Sociologists a certificate in Sociology.

Dr. Sandstrom added that it could be part of that. For students it would involve more than simply doing your major because it would involve taking additional courses, taking one course in each core area and taking two additional courses in a core area to develop a sufficient base of knowledge to really indicate that you have a specialization and earn a certificate of knowledge. They also have an advising process where students have to work with and meet with their advisor to do those certificates. One of the parts of that advising process is also to try to stop the very redundancy that Senator Smith is talking about. They could do that more formally but informally they would steer students away from that process and suggest that they not take the same three courses that it would take to get the Race/Ethnicity and Immigration certificate and the Gender and Culture certificate.

Senator Devlin commented on behalf of a number of different students in HPELS who actually would very much be interested in these kinds of certificates. She noted that they do certificates in HPELS and they don't add any additional

personnel costs; it's simply a way of grouping certain kinds of classes together so that the students get a degree and it also says "Certificate in..." on their transcript. It's really just a marketing tool to let students that are already here anyway without any extra costs to be able to add an extra line if they happen to take those classes above and beyond. She supports the concept of certificates.

Dr. Sandstrom added that it makes potential employers aware of the fact that they specialized knowledge in those areas.

Senator Devlin remarked that at this time, especially with the bad economy many students want to be able to demonstrate that they have certificates. Students are overwhelming in support of certificates.

Senator East stated that he tends to agree with Senator Smith's comments about getting an extra certificate or an extra credential with no extra effort. That does trivialize all of our degree programs. It could be fixed really easily by just saying you can't double count the courses in your major or minor and a certificate. And it does formalize the advising and alleviates some of the concern that Senator Smith has.

Senator Smith stated that since the courses that are required for each of these certificates are also required for the major you've forcibly got double counting. He would be sympathetic if they were to say that the certificate could not be awarded to Sociology majors and he would be accepting of it. That answers Senator Devlin's point and Senator Soneson's point is right, we don't give majors and minors for the same area and the same should apply for certificates, which is what we have here. It would be very difficult for a sociology major not to be awarded one of these certificates.

Dr. Sandstrom responded that students could take many other course besides those referred to by Senator Smith.

Senator Devlin noted that students are all the time coming out with their major degree and have a supplemental certificate that's related to the degree. An example is the Health Promotion, with a Global Health Certificate or an Environmental Health Certificate for an extra set of classes, usually 12-15 additional hours.

Senator Smith remarked that if this was for 15 credit hours above the major he wouldn't object because then it would be

specialized, but that's not what we have here. Almost all these courses are basic in the major and there's hardly any specialization beyond that.

Dr. Sandstrom added that it was his understanding that the certificate was approved in the previous curriculum cycle. All they are asking for now is a re-naming or re-statement of the certificate. This discussion seems to be on the approval of the certificate which seems mote to him because wasn't it approved?

Senator Lowell stated that what she is impressed with is that the renaming of these certificates came out of SOAs from the students. We all emphasize the importance of SOAs, taking what we learn from them and doing new things that will appeal to students and that they want, and that is something to think about as we discuss this.

Senator Smith replied that students always like to have more credentials and will always be happy if you offer them more credentials.

Senator Lowell interjected that it will help them get jobs.

Senator Smith continued, that students will always go for more credentials. As for the fact that this certificate was approved in the previous curriculum cycle, that just talks to the fact that maybe things weren't done as carefully then as they should have been. If it was justified then it should be justified now, and he's making the argument that it's not justified now. In the previous curriculum cycle he was on the Senate and they went through everything with hardly looking at things.

Dr. Sandstrom asked if the previous approval can be revoked?

Senator Smith responded that, yes, the Senate can stop proliferating stuff that shouldn't have been done in the first place.

Senator Devlin noted that the way she understood it from the last time it was presented is that this is essentially one certificate that had been approved but because of marketing issues was renamed to reduce confusion and has come back to the Senate. It just seems that this type of issue would have been looked at already by the department itself, by committees within the department, by groups within the college, and by the UCC, and she would caution the Senate to not get into the issues of micromanaging three, four, five different committees.

Senator East stated that any time the Senate decides it wants to actually exercise some oversight, it's a good thing. The last time the Senate did this we exercised very little, if any, oversight, which was a very frustrating experience for him. He likes the Senate to exercise oversight and maybe we have another opportunity or two to do that yet this semester. While we can't go back and revoke approvals of the past, or at least he doesn't think we can as it might require a different kind of action, it's perfectly reasonable to say no, we don't think that we have to approve something new even though we approved of what existed before. We don't have to rubber-stamp any other committee or series of committee's work if we disagree with them. He's aware that there are people here that agree and there will be a couple that disagree but we don't have to say because someone else said it was a good idea we have to automatically say it's a good idea.

Senator Soneson added that the major objection so far is that the majors will take the certificate without anything new added to their program. He asked Dr. Sandstrom what percentages of students he thinks would be likely to take these certificates, majors versus non-majors? If there are majors who take it, to what extent will their certificates include courses that are not directly within the major itself?

Dr. Sandstrom responded it would probably be about one out of three.

Senator Soneson continued, and of those that do take it, what would these certificates add to their majors?

Dr. Sandstrom replied that it would enhance their area of specialization, making it clear to both themselves and prospective employers what special knowledge and skills they've gained.

Senator Neuhaus added that what we're trying to do is encourage students to broaden their education. We champion the Liberal Arts Core and that may be a shrinking endeavor as the budget infringes on it. This might be another way to encourage students to go into these areas. This fear of cheapening of certificates may be because of some association senators have with certificates as a certifiable piece of currency, it's pretty nearly a degree and that more certifications would possibly lessen that, asking if anyone had examples?

Senator Smith noted again that if this was just for majors he believes it should be set up as emphases so that they're giving one degree with this emphasis, which is what you'd find in many degree programs on this campus. If it was for non-majors it should be restricted to non-majors. As it is, what it simply allows people to do is to get three credentials for the price of one. That does cheapen the credential. The notion that while we don't want to micromanage and it's up to the departments, what departments do has an effect on all of us. These degrees come from UNI and if we're giving them out like gold stars, that affects all of us, every program on this campus. We need to maintain the integrity of our programs.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas commented that one of the issues that comes up is, are we setting a new policy now and the people that will be caught in the timing of this are those people in Sociology. She's really torn because she does agree with the proliferation of certificates. Certification in teaching is a big thing. Whether or not it should be fair warning in the future that we will look at certificates very carefully following from this meeting, should that be the message we send out, or do we want to set that standard now and not allow our colleagues to proceed as they have thoughtfully considered this process?

Faculty Chair Swan asked the UCC what if anything they said about this?

Associate Provost Kopper responded that she was not at that meeting as she was attending a Board of Regents meeting.

Diane Wallace, Assistant Registrar, noted that it was discussed by the UCC and some of these issues were brought up. That is where the asterisk, "take three courses" was put in saying that students could not count any course toward more than two certificates. The UCC felt that with that addition that did not proliferate the certificates. Also, in the mandates in the booklet it does not say anything about limiting courses and certificates. The UCC felt that this better designates for these students on their transcripts what courses they actually took. Everyone felt the old title was lengthy and didn't mean anything.

Dr. Sandstrom added that the other major statement was that they change the titles of the certificates, adding "Sociology" in front of each one.

Senator Roth asked for clarification about certificates in the Sociology field, what does a certificate mean outside of UNI, what doors does it unlock, what significance does it have if a student has it on their transcript?

Dr. Sandstrom replied that they've gone through a very timely and lengthy process including consultation with their dean and have done this with their advice and encouragement. That said, he can't fully answer that as employers would be in a better position to answer but the feedback that they're receiving from students and some employers is that it will be more meaningful for those that will be, for example working with Spanish speaking populations, to see a student have a Sociology major with a Certificate in Sociology of Race/Ethnicity and Immigration and would put them in a better position in terms of their marketability.

Senator Devlin responded to the question of what difference a certificate makes. She noted that in some areas, such as teaching or medicine, it is actually licensure and certifications, which is different than in areas such as the social sciences where it is "a certificate in", meaning students get their base degree with the certificate going beyond, 10 to 15 additional hours, not quite a whole other degree. In the social science fields certificates of specialization are very much valued. If students have a generic degree such as Health Promotion of Sociology, what does it actually mean, what's the area of focus? That is why in a lot of fields they use certificates to further clarify; it's not a licensure, it's an area of focus.

Senator Smith responded to Senate Devlin, noting that if that were true in this case these certificates would have been established, would have been used by all sociology departments, but we've just been told that this is new. It is not a standard part of sociological practice, it's not in the profession, this is something that the department is doing and he applauds them for trying to make their major more identifiable to give them a competitive advantage to give their students some identity but the way to do that was with an emphasis in the major, not a certificate that has no current standing in any profession.

Senator Devlin responded that actually in their field in the social sciences it is a new trend. In health promotions, sociology it is the trend to have further specialization. She does this for a living and she works in the community very heavily in daily contact with employers. They have many



students that get these kind of joint things between sociology and health. She's aware of what they want and they very much want this kind of thing.

Senator East noted, in response to Senate Schumacher-Douglas and as an alternative, he believes now is the time to say "no more", not "next time." Additionally, saying no to this now doesn't mean that it wipes it out, these would be new programs and new programs can be brought anytime in the process so it's a matter of recognizing any problems with these programs.

Senator Soneson commented that if these certificates can help our students get jobs he believes the Senate ought to support them.

Senator Breitbach moved to call the question; second by Senator Devlin.

Motion to approve Item #905, Curriculum Package - Social and Behavioral Sciences, Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology - Certificates and Interdisciplinary passed with 2 nays and 3 abstentions.

#### Item #905 Interdisciplinary

Senator Schumacher-Douglas noted that the College of Education (CoE) has voted on the Global Studies Major and has approved it as being appropriate.

Senator Basom asked to hear additional information from proposers on this.

Senator Devlin commented that the CoE was very much in support of this as it is a way, without any additional cost, to link different specialty areas within the university and put forth together a Global Studies interdisciplinary program, which she believes is very timely. She also supported Senator Basom's request to hear additional information from the proposers.

Dr. Konrad Sadkowski, History, stated that he's the "point man" for this proposal. He understands that there is some opposition to the proposal and that a letter from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts (CHFA) Senate was also sent to senators. He would like to address that concern, and noted that it's taken over three years to put this program together.

Dr. Sadkowski stated that this effort began in early 2006 with the effort beginning as an independent faculty initiative, with various administrators supporting it along the way. Generally the proposal derives from a perceived need to increase international education among UNI students and the new major will be the most comprehensive internationally-focused program on campus. Three areas studies majors have been eliminated to create this proposal and to make way for this major. As the head of the committee to establish the major he sought from the outset to include on the committee faculty with particular disciplinary and area backgrounds equally from the various departments that would be offering courses or that would be affected by the major, though in several cases this was not possible. In the end they had approximately 20 people from 10 different departments. The thematic and geographic areas in the proposal were shaped by different sub-committees. The program over all is very similar in structure to the program at the University of Iowa (UI) and Iowa State University (ISU).

Philosophically they aimed to be systematic and focused through required core courses in the program overall and in the 11 areas of the program, and to also incorporate as much breadth into the program as possible by giving students as many elective options as possible. After all the world is a very big place and the more course choices students have the greater the chance for content breadth and the greater the chance for making interdisciplinary connections. What may seem like a haphazard selection of courses or even a laundry list of courses or course offerings is that to someone who has only superficially considered the program. It is his belief that one of the strengths of the program is that breadth in elective choices.

On the language issue, the committee spent more time than any other issue. The language component was reduced from 3 years to 2 years by committee members. The majority of programs in the country have an intermediate, that is, a 2-year language requirement, with some having less. And in Iowa there are several colleges that have no language requirement for international studies programs, with several colleges having a one-year requirement. On the other hand, UI has a 3-year requirement but they have a 2-year exit requirement while ISU has a 2-year requirement.

One important way to consider the language issue, Dr. Sadkowski noted, is that global competency is not a fixed thing. Global competency is very broad, ranging from very basic knowledge of foreign cultures, languages and issues to very advanced

knowledge of the same. Advanced knowledge comes with Master's and Ph.D. level work and beyond. Each of us continues to increase our own global competency. We should not seek to impart advanced knowledge of languages and cultures through an interdisciplinary major with a number of distinct goals such as Global Studies has.

The consultation phase for this proposal began late summer 2008 and lasted through the 2008-2009 academic year. Approximately 20 consultations were conducted. Department heads and program chairs were given three documents: the Global Studies curriculum proposal, listing of the courses by title, as well as the student outcomes goals statement. Most of the consultations came back "no objections, has impact" with several letters coming back with objections but these were confined to specific courses being part of the major and these objections were all resolved.

Only one department raised objections that could not be resolved, the Department of Modern Languages (DML), which had extensive representation on the committee, with three permanent people, a fourth informal member and input into the language issue by Cheryl Roberts, Department Head. Again, DML had plenty of input in this process as language faculty and area studies faculty. In the end, the Global Studies Committee decided as a whole to reduce language to two years. On September 17 he attended a DML meeting at the request of Dr. Roberts, presenting the program, and he talked about past DML involvement in the process and tried to deal with the concerns raised and questions. The essential position of Dr. Roberts and several DML faculty voiced toward the end of the meeting was "what do we get out of this program?" It was his opinion that they were asking if DML could use the Global Studies Major to produce language minors and majors, which would be the case with a higher amount of language in this proposal. Of course, they did have concerns about increasing language and culture study but they had to compromise because they have a number of areas to deal with, area study, language study, topical study as well.

On November 5, 2008 Dr. Roberts passed along a written list of objections to the proposal, which he responded to with input from the Global Studies Committee on December 2. On November 19, 2009 he offered a way to bridge this difference on language by proposing placement exams to the Global Studies Committee, with the email also being forwarded on to DML, noting:

"As all of you know we debated the foreign language requirement long and hard as we developed the program over the last few years. I informed the DML of our deliberations. We began with a three-year language requirement but voted to reduce it to two years for a number of important reasons: 1) past UNI area studies programs have been unpopular and some have failed, we believe, because of high foreign language requirements; 2) many international Global Studies programs around the country carry a two-year foreign language requirement; 3) the student attracted to the Global Studies Major in all likelihood will want to do additional foreign language study on campus and abroad; 4) UNI administration is keen to trim program hours if at all possible. As it now stands, the Global Studies Major requires a minimum of 33 hours to complete, with the range being 33 to over 50 hours. Students needing to complete the two years of foreign language study on campus, such as Russian and Portuguese, would have to complete up to an additional 20 hours past the 33 minimum. However, the reality is that very few students arrive on campus with no high school foreign language study, 2% of this fall's (2008) incoming freshman class. At the same time only 42% percent arrived on campus this fall (2008) with four years of high school foreign language. An additional 27% arrived with 3 to 3 2/3 years of high school foreign language. These statistics are from UNI Office of Institutional Research. This means that theoretically and based on this years freshman class (2008) more than half of Global Studies Majors, about 58%, would have to finish off their two year foreign language requirement on campus since approximately that many students arrived on campus with less than four years of high school foreign language study. At this point in the formulation of this major I'm highly reluctant to call additional meetings to go over plowed territory. As was noted in past meetings, the Global Studies Major is not a DML program. The DML has it's own majors and minors. What we seek from the DML is approval that students may use DML courses if necessary to complete the Global Studies Major. The DML has a right to offer opinions and concerns about the character of the program from its particular disciplinary perspective, and as a committee we need to listen to these opinions and concerns, but equally as a committee we must be guided by what we feel is best for the Global Studies program in its totality and based on the breadth of our collective experience. By starting out with a three-year language requirement indeed, we were cognizant of DML wishes to maintain a high language requirement but reduced it in the name of the four factors, as well as in the interest of balancing foreign language with the other program components, core, thematic and geographic areas. As the Global Studies proposal currently

stands, an incoming freshman with four years of high school foreign language would not have to complete any additional language study on campus because the four years at the high school level formally translates into two years of college study. Such students, however, frequently are far from the college two-year competency level. Furthermore, a UNI sophomore/junior declaring Global Studies as his or her major could be two or three years removed from foreign language study itself compromising further his or her foreign language abilities. I suggest that all students seeking to use four years of high school foreign language study to fulfill the Global Studies two-year requirement be required to take a placement exam administered by DML faculty to show their two-year competency. We can go further and require all Global Studies majors to take a foreign language placement exam (which is what we've done). I suspect the great majority of such students will not meet the two-year requirement and thus be required to take additional foreign language study on campus or abroad. Ultimately, since only approximately 42% of incoming freshman (based on last fall's incoming class) complete four years of high school foreign language study, nearly all or indeed all Global Studies majors would have to complete additional language study through the DML or study abroad. The DML would then have the opportunity to recruit practically all Global Studies majors into their own majors and minors, which I believe the DML is keen to try to do."

In the end, Dr. Sadkowski stated, that proposal was rejected by the DML. Dr. Roberts wrote, saying that they "are not entertaining having placement exams". That impasse has stood since that time.

In Spring 2009 Dr. Sadkowski noted that he presented the Global Studies proposal to four of five undergraduate colleges as he had earlier given to all involved department heads and program chairs. He passed along to all college senators the Global Studies proposal, a listing of Global Studies courses by title as well as the Student Outcomes Goal statement. The College of Business Administration endorsed the major but requested that they be removed from any sponsorship of the major because of accreditation issues. The CoE endorsed the major as did the College of Social and Behavior Sciences and agreed to be a sponsor of the major. The College of Natural Sciences did not respond to several attempts to schedule a meeting, but this would only have been a courtesy meeting due to the low level of their involvement in the program. Finally, CHFA Senate rejected sponsorship of the major. Dr. Terlip, CHFA Senate Chair, wrote

on March 31, 2009 of the Senate's vote and added "The Senate ask that I convey that they're very supportive of Global Studies at UNI but do not support the specifics of the program proposal provided at our meeting. Senators are now working to draft a response that outlines their concerns in detail. That document should be ready by the end of the semester and we will forward it to you as soon as we can." That document never arrived.

Dr. Sadkowski also added that the new Global Studies major will draw on already existing courses and faculty at UNI, and there is no request for new faculty, new courses, or additional funding attached to this proposal. The directors of International Studies at UI and ISU have both endorsed this proposal. Last winter and spring, the Office of Institutional Research conducted a survey on what students thought about international education at UNI and the need for a Global Studies program. The results are in the handout that was passed out.

Senator Smith asked what the basis for the demand estimates and did they talk with other universities that have comparable programs, what kind of demands did they experience, where did their students place, what kind of placement experience did they have, what does this major result in people doing, what kinds of positions do they end occupying?

Dr. Sadkowski replied that he hasn't asked to that extent what sort of positions they occupy but he imagines a lot of them would enter in the field of business, a lot of them use this major as an added credential for their primary major, whether it's Biology, History, or whatever. They use this as an added credential to show their greater preparation for their global market place.

Senator Smith responded that Dr. Sadkowski said, "imagine" rather than what he knows based on evidence.

Dr. Sadkowski replied that the high level UI program has well over 200 students.

Senator Smith continued that it would be easy to find out from that program what the students go out and do, what kind of jobs and positions they occupy.

Dr. Sadkowski responded that sure, but it's taken for granted.

Senator Smith replied that he doesn't want to take it for granted.

Senator Devlin noted that she could answer, as this is her degree area, actually her undergraduate degree. People with Global Studies majors such as this wind up working in policy and programming positions, many in government sector jobs, such as county health departments or state department, depending on what the specialty areas are. There are some in private business and they see a lot in the non-profit sectors also, doing programming and policy work with underserved and diverse populations. Around the nation it is a very popular major.

Dr. Sadkowski stated that he didn't mean to be confrontational.

Senator Smith commented that it's himself being confrontational.

Dr. Sadkowski continued that it's a well-accepted major now.

Vice Chair Mvuyekure noted that he likes the idea of global studies and is aware that Dr. Sadkowski has been working on it for three years. His question, which was also his objection three years ago, in terms geographic areas, do they have any reasons why the program is lumping a 53-plus continent with the Middle East? In terms of knowledge and in terms of letting students know, that's misleading, and this is something he is sensitive about this.

Dr. Sadkowski responded they had discussed whether Africa should stand on its own but they simply don't have the level and number of courses at this time to create a separate area for Africa. But it something he hopes they can do in the future. At some universities, Africa is presented alongside the Middle East, and this is the focus they've decided to take.

Vice Chair Mvuyekure noted that at UNI we do have Non-Western Cultures, and Africa is one of them, with a number of courses being offered in that section. Have they thought about that? Also, some people in CHFA who teach African literature are part of the Global Studies and Interdisciplinary students.

Dr. Sadkowski replied that Dr. Deirdre Heistad, Modern Languages, was the primary framer of this area along with others and this is what they decided on.

Dr. Laura Terlip, Communication Studies, Chair, CHFA Senate, noted that a letter was sent to senators with a sum of the CHFA Senates objections to the proposal. She is here today representing the CFHA Senate. The CHFA Senate had a number of

objections; the first one that the Faculty Senate needs to consider is related to what Dr. Sadkowski said. He had noted that they had compromised throughout to get this through. We all know that compromise is a way of settling many disagreements. She really believes that everyone is in support of this proposal but they need to work to build the consensus to make this a really strong program that will really do what we want it to do. She believes what the members of CHFA are saying is that it's not at that point yet. In addition, by asking people in DML to ensure they have whatever level, and having that department not approve this major is a very significant issue that needs to be worked through. We need to really work to make this a major that is endorsed by large segments of the university.

They were given a list of courses that there were some objections to and by the time that list got to the Senate those courses were taken out. How can you take pieces away and still have it be the same thing? They realize it is a compromise but what the CHFA Senate is arguing is they to support Global Studies, they want that to happen but they want it to be really good and they are disagreeing with it's ability to meet the concerns that have already been voice in CHFA. They don't think it's the best UNI can do, we can do a lot better.

Senator East asked what the chances are to make it right or more nearly perfect? This was over a three-year period and this is what came out of it. How close is this to being right enough?

Dr. Terlip yielded to Juan Carlo Castillo, Modern Languages, Vice Chair CHFA Senate.

Dr. Castillo stated that this is a lot closer than we would think. His contact for this proposal has been only with Dr. Sadkowski, who has been totally unwilling to negotiate on this. There are three reasons, the first being a reason of principal. The other two are practical reasons why they think a five-semester foreign language requirement rather than just four makes sense. The first is the principal reason, that they believe you cannot have a global perspective unless you have knowledge of another language. This makes sense for study abroad opportunities as well as international research and also for gaining different perspectives.

Dr. Castillo continued, noting that their the first practical reason is that this proposal strongly recommends study abroad. Five semesters, even though it is not a mandatory requirement,



is the level at which 95% of students studying in the DML have gained the level of understanding to study abroad. While not a formal requirement, this is a customary requirement. The third reason why the five semester language requirement makes sense is because this is the formal prerequisite of almost all the electives that are listed in the DML. Therefore, if any student is going to take electives they will have taken five semesters of foreign language.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that Dr. Terlip referred to the a November 5<sup>th</sup> letter to the Senate, clarifying that in that letter there is a statement that "the UCC apparently did not seriously take into account..." The UCC not only looked at the proposal, but looked at all the consultations and in view of the fact that they noted that there was an objection, requested the minutes from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Senate and also requested the minutes from the CHFA Senate. The CHFA Senate minutes were not available and then requested a statement from Chair Terlip and also reviewed the Student Outcomes Goals. She wanted to clarify that the UCC did do its due diligence.

Cyndi Dunn, Anthropology, was present representing herself. She served on the committee and worked with Dr. Sadkowski and other colleagues on this for several years. She noted that Dr. Sadkowski has been as inclusive as one could possibly ask, inviting large numbers of people with expertise in these various areas to be involved in the process and they have had numerous meetings working out both the course list for the different thematic areas and other issues. Everyone is correct that one of the most contentious areas was the language issue. For this major students would have both an area of thematic concentration or more and an area of concentration, such as Europe or Latin America. She agrees that the language concern is a difficult one, one that she really wrestled with. Saying that someone is claiming expertise in a particular area they should have at least minimal competency one of the major languages spoken in that area. Unfortunately, while we have very strong programs in European languages that would cover Europe and Latin America we really don't offer Asian or Arabic languages. We're in a situation where we said for those languages we'd like the students to get them somewhere else if they can but if they can't, okay, we'll go ahead and accept two years of whatever foreign language they've received. It would be a bit ridiculous to say to someone who wants to study Asia, and who should really be getting Chinese or Japanese, you need to take another year of German. It doesn't have a lot of logic to it. She would hope that students focusing on Europe and Latin America would choose

to take more foreign language and would hope that their advisors would be encouraging that and would be competent enough to maximize their skills in that area. This was not Dr. Sadowski's decision, the group as a whole really wrestled with this and the majority chose to put the requirement at two years. She very strongly supports this program and it epitomizes a lot of what they've been saying we're all about, preparing students for a global society in the twenty-first century, that it's interdisciplinary. She doesn't have any hard statistics but she does think it will serve students well as they go out, showing employers that they can be stationed abroad, can work effectively with customers and clients in other countries. Her biggest concern is that not enough of our students will understand just how valuable this major will be to them. She would very disappointed to see the Senate veto this at this stage of the game.

Senator Neuhaus stated that Dr. Dunn raised most of his concerns on this, that we were looking for a perfect program. In his daily activities he doesn't wait around until he has something perfect because he doesn't have that kind of time. His hope that as imperfect as this may be, because we're ignoring a huge population language-wise, Chinese, Hindi, Arabic, this is better than we what we had before. If this can encourage students to take languages, languages that might not be the ones they'd like to take right now, this is a powerful good. From his perspective, students will be better off with this than if the Senate votes it down. Run this program for a year or two, see how it works out and if people in DML have reasons to say it was a complete failure, then bring it back again to look at it. We're cheating students by not allowing them a chance at this.

Senator Devlin noted that two years of language or two years and one semester, that additional semester may not make the most difference in terms of where these students wind up being employed. She's all in favor of them having more language but it may need to be an option. She does view this as a starting place for Global Studies area type of degree at this point. We need to ultimately expand study areas, such as Middle East and Africa as those are priority areas of the world.

Senator East stated that he likes the ideas that everyone else likes, but to him it does look like a jumble of courses and that's not the way anyone should organize an interdisciplinary program. In particular, it bothers him that there's no sort of Capstone experience in this major that says how students put all this stuff together and the student is responsible for making

sense out of all this, which is a problem we have in multidisciplinary studies, there is no looping together of the disciplinary and students have to make it on their own.

Senator East also noted that he's not particularly enthused about the varied number of hour this program has, depending on how much foreign language you have. There are other hours added in if you happen to choose a particular area, with a couple of hidden prerequisites. It's almost like false advertising to say that this is a 33-hour major with students ending up with 59 hours depending on the thematic area a student chooses. How do you fix this? Ultimately, it's a matter of taking it as it is and hope it can get better or fail it because it's not perfect?

Motion by Senator East to extend the meeting 15 minutes; second by Senator Lowell. Motion passed.

Discussion continued with Dr. Terlip saying that in no way did she mean to say that something had to be perfect, we just needed to get to a better place and that we can do better. Also, if faculty want to give something a try we need to look very carefully what outcomes and assessment plans there are because another major objection of CHFA Senate was that at the time it was presented to them there were no measurable outcomes or assessment plan in place to figure out if this was going to work at all. The Senate could be approving something that will be going on for a long time. Maybe trying it for a couple of years is the way to go but we need to go back and make sure that there is a way to measure that because it's not there right now.

Senator Balong clarified that originally it was a six-semester language requirement and it's now four semesters and DML wants five. What is that one additional semester going to do?

Dr. Castillo responded that the fifth semester would be a writing course, which for those in language is very important because it is a gateway course which becomes a prerequisite for a lot of other courses, some of which are considered in this proposal as electives. It is also a way to assess the proficiency of the students. No student comes from high school at that level. That would guarantee that these students would take a course with DML and they could in turn guarantee the proficiency of the student.

Dr. Sadkowski responded to Senator East and the "laundry list" issue, noting that with this kind of program there are all sorts of permutations in the way students can study a particular area.

This isn't a business degree where you have to do a certain number of accounting hours, a certain number of management. And that speaks to Dr. Terlip's comments about course management, that you cannot use a more rigorous discipline to compare with this program because the world is far too big, too diverse and the more electives we give students the better for them to understand that diversity and to be interdisciplinary.

Dr. Sadkowski also stated that this would be a secondary major for a majority of students focusing on a primary major. The Capstone experience was something the committee talked about and they wanted to include some kind of independent study at the end or a seminar. They are well aware of this issue but this university is in a crisis and they cannot ask different departments to create new courses for them. They will try to get by with very strong advising to make sure students are focused and pursuing as much as directed course of study as possible.

Dr. Sadkowski also noted that the outcomes assessment was emailed to CHFA to two years ago.

Dr. Terlip responded that that was the goals for the program, not the outcomes assessment.

Dr. Sadkowski stated that was a statement of goals and that statement hasn't changed since then. They will continue to work to devise the instruments and Dr. Xavier Escandell, Sociology, is engaged in helping to create them. That is a concern they have as well, that students are acquiring those skills.

Finally, Dr. Sadkowski noted that there have been various area study programs here at UNI, with three of them just being eliminated in order to put this one forward. One of the concerns was that those programs had very few students overall. The issue of language is critical to this Global Studies program and they can't discourage students by forcing them to take a language that would ultimately be valuable to them but they are also interested in preparing them. This is the standard around the country, two years. It is not two and a half or three years, it is two years and it's an International Studies major, it is not a DML program. Because this will be a secondary major those courses listed from DML will be easily accessible to those students already.

Senator Soneson stated that he's troubled that a Global Studies program is being proposed without the full consent of DML. If

the proposal included five courses would DML get behind the proposal?

Chair Wurtz stated that that would be a departmental question and cannot be answered today but she would like a response.

Dr. Castillo responded that the general consensus of the DML is that yes, they would support the proposal.

Senator Funderburk noted that there's no way to make this happen both way. He noted that in opera they've run into students with no Italian and it doesn't matter how many years of German you study it doesn't improve your Italian. Either the DML component had to be diminished in order to have the broad options or the focus needed to be narrowed and increase the language component. This seems to be a reasonable compromise, with the primary idea that this will not be a major in Global Study; it will be an additional major in something they're already doing. It does seem like a tough decision.

Senator Smith commented that he's not that sympathetic to the DML argument; he's comfortable with the existing language requirement and doesn't think students need five semesters to be "globally aware." He is concerned about the program structure. The core of this program is basically some Liberal Arts Core (LAC) courses. If this is a field of study you would think that it would have a core body of knowledge that's at a somewhat higher lever than what we would have in our LAC. In looking at the thematic areas, they seem to be wide open, such as Global Studies in Gender. Why not Global Studies in Sports or Leisure Services and Education? Some of the arguments made in support of this program are that there's a lack of global perspective among UNI students, which he agrees with but can be addressed through the LAC.

Senator Smith noted that Dr. Sadkowski had mentioned that we have had some unsuccessfully programs in area studies, Russian and East European Studies, Asian Studies major and minor. He was expecting those to be phased out but hasn't seen the paperwork saying these are going to be dropped as they should be because there is no demand. The argument that there aren't additional costs bothers him. Some of the reasons that there aren't is because they aren't adding new courses but maybe they should if they want a really good program, offering courses specific to the program. Even if you don't, the claim about having this major without adding additional costs is not true. If someone takes the Latin America area and chooses Portuguese

then you have an obligation to offer courses in Portuguese and currently every course in Portuguese is consistently and seriously under-enrolled. We're forced to offer that course to satisfy the commitment made to students and that costs us money that right now this university cannot afford. That is his primary objection. This would be a good thing to do in decent budgetary times but right now we should not be adding new programs that are going to force us to offer low enrolled courses.

Senator Basom responded that she believes we need more students in this kind of global and international competency, and if we need to cut something else to get this than that's what we need to be doing at this time. The world is global and international and English is not the world's first language. She was on the Global Studies committee when this first started but was not here in the fall for those conversations with DML and CHFA. The committee did struggle with issue and in the end it was decided to compromise because our institution has a very weak foreign language requirement. To have students take additional foreign language really prolongs their degree and it also means that they choose not to do this kind of a degree. The hope is that they will choose to double major with a language and choose to study abroad. Students who come from high school with Spanish have a different background but they don't come from high school with Chinese, Japanese or Arabic. While five semesters would be better, we can go to five semesters after we raise our foreign language requirement.

Motion by Senator Schumacher-Douglas to call the question; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Global Studies Major passed with one nay and 3 abstentions.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS, continued**

903 Category 3B Review - Literature, Philosophy and Religion,  
Liberal Arts Core Committee

904 Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct

Chair Wurtz noted that the Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct is somewhat pressing due to federal regulations.

Discussion followed as to how to proceed.

Motion by Senator Schumacher-Douglas to extend the meeting 10 minutes; second by Senator Balong. Motion passed.

It was noted that there was no longer a quorum present and as a result it was decided to move to item #904 Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct ahead.

Chair Wurtz noted that this was brought to the Senate by Anita M Gordon, Director of Research Services, Sponsored Programs because UNI receives grant money, and as such we must abide by federal mandates and have certain processes in place to respond to any allegations of research misconduct. This is a broad-based policy and focuses on research misconduct on the part of faculty, on the part of students involved in research, and on the part of staff also involved in research. This isn't a question of approving it or not but do we approve of the way it's put together. The panel on Faculty Conduct is no longer operating and it is unclear as to when and why it was disbanded, and she's not sure how the Senate would do a panel at this point, but she can say they we will.

Christine Twait, Assistant Provost for Sponsored Programs, was present to discuss this with the Senate. Ms. Twait noted that the federal government keeps adding more and more in terms of regulations and policies that we have to have in place if we are to continue to seek grant funding. The Research Misconduct Policy is one of those. This policy is through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, similar to our Human Subjects Research Policy that we have to have in place for the Institutional Review Board.

Ms. Twait stated that much of the content that exists in the policy is required by federal regulation. There is some flexibility in terms of comprising committee representation, being able to pull from the Faculty Senate committee on Faculty Conduct, as well as comprising other committees.

The definition of research misconduct by this policy is "fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific community for proposing, conducting or reporting research." This policy not only covers faculty misconduct but also covers staff and students at the institution and all forms of research and endeavors based on research such as research journals, presentations or published results. They will use the

same definition of research that they use on campus for human subject research. Individual integrity and academic research is the expected norm, which is woven into this policy. While it's called research misconduct it is really research integrity and with this policy they will also be doing research integrity training on campus, another new requirement in order for UNI to obtain National Science Foundation funding, and certify that that is in place by January 2010.

Ms. Twait continued, noting that faculty, staff and students have an obligation to report when there's evidence of misconduct. The university must provide rigorous leadership in the pursuit and resolution, treat all parties with justice and fairness, and be sensitivity to the reputations and vulnerabilities of all parties. That is also woven in the policy as well. If there are allegations of misconduct that's deemed to go into the inquiry stage, and then determined that it does not need to go into the investigation stage, it is included in our policy that the reputation of the individual who had an allegation of misconduct against him is protected. Procedures of dealing with allegations are to preserve the highest attainable degree of confidentiality. Integrity of the process must be maintained, and which is why UNI has structured their policy the way they have. The UI had some issues several years ago with policy and confusion about where to go in terms of utilization of policy and they are working very hard within the university system to make sure that doesn't happen. It is clear in terms of the Intellectual Property Policy and how it interacts with the Academic Ethics Policy and Student Close Contact Policy. Procedures should be as expeditious as possible. This was recently changed, as the timeline was not tight enough, so there are much shorter timelines now. Faculty would understandably want any allegations of research misconduct against them dealt with and resolved as quickly as possible. There are three stages in the policy, inquiry, investigation and determination. UNI has a Research Integrity Officer, Anita Gordon, with the deciding official the Provost Office, both requirements of federal regulations. There is also a requirement that we must certify that this policy is in place by February 2010. This will move to the UNI Policy Committee and then the UNI Cabinet, which is why they have been pressing for time. They are open to suggestions and any concerns people may have in regards for how this works with other policies.

Chair Wurtz noted that the flow chart that was sent to senators is not completely accurate. What is required from the Faculty Senate is that we say that we want to participate in this



process to the extent that it would be a Faculty Senate Committee, going back to the whole Committee on Committee's issue.

Ms. Twait stated that if the Research Integrity Office has found that it does merit inquiry and involves faculty, staff or students, they would form an inquiry committee of faculty, or staff or students depending on who the inquiry involved. For composition of the inquiry committee for faculty they were looking to the Faculty Senate.

Chair Wurtz commented that we would not have anything to do with the composition of a committee for students or staff.

Senator East stated that it looks like it is a matter of naming the committee dependant upon the context of the possible problem. It would not be standing committee that would need to be named as they have to be able to evaluate and we can't have someone from CHFA evaluating a Biology research integrity problem. You can't have a standing investigative committee. It doesn't seem like this is something that requires a standing committee, or perhaps any Senate representation on it, because offices that have this have to select reasonable and appropriate people to serve. The Senate might want to have a voice as to whether this is an appropriate structure but he can't imagine us naming a standing committee to do this.

Senator Funderburk noted that in reviewing this there's issues about appointing a committee. His concern is with the potential investigation of these things and it strikes him that we ought to have coordination with something else on campus that is involved with a professional investigative body. Compliance and Equity Management is the only thing we have that is close and there should probably be some correlation there.

Ms. Twait noted that the Office of Sponsored Programs handles research compliance on campus. UNI has been coordinating with UI in terms of the Research Integrity Policy and in consultation with them. UNI has not had an instance of research misconduct come forward because we have not had a policy and so this has never been enacted and we don't have experience in it. We have developed a relation with UI for them to guide us, and they have offered to come assist as needed because there are issues with securing computers and research records.

Senate East asked what action is required of the Senate?

Chair Wurtz replied that the action that would be appropriate would be to recognize the process and decline to have role in the composition of committees, which leaves them free with no worries. The other option is to recognize the process and accept that the Senate would like to have a role in the composition of committees, which then gives the Senate the obligation to decide on how we'd want to constitute that role.

Senator Breitbach noted that a third option would be to move this forward to the Provost with the option to come back to the Senate at a later date for assistance in determining an ad hoc committee as needed.

Motion to table by Senator Breitbach; second by Senator Bruess.  
Motion passed.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Senator Bruess to adjourn; second by Senator Neuhaus.  
Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden  
Faculty Senate Secretary