

4-28-2008

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 28, 2008

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2008 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

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



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 28, 2008" (2008). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 94.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/94

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

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

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

4/28/08

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:17 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 4/14/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker reported that the Iowa Legislature finished their business Saturday morning and they put into law the Senior Year Plus, which we will be dealing with it but he's not sure how and views it as a very serious problem. They also approved 91% of the salary bill and \$4 million for the science and math program.

Interim Provost Lubker reminded the Senate that the Board of Regents (BOR) will be meeting here at UNI on Wednesday, and Thursday, April 30 & May 1.

Interim Provost Lubker presented Faculty Chair Licari with a plaque in recognition of his service as Faculty Senate Chair this academic year.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari reminded the Senate that they have a lot to cover today, but urged Senators to give all the items on the agenda the due consideration they deserve and to not rush.

Chair Licari stated that it has been a pleasure and a privilege to serve as Chair. He enjoyed most of it, and learned a lot, but the fun thing about the position is that you get an opportunity help others on campus as someone who can facilitate

the work that others are doing, and that is probably the most gratifying, and important job that the Chair of the Faculty Senate has.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

970 Emeritus Status request, Robert D. Koob, President's Office, effective 6/30/08

Motion to docket out of regular order as item #874 by Senate O'Kane; second by Senator Gray.

Motion to grant Emeritus Status to Robert Koob passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Election of Faculty Officers

Susan Wurtz was unanimously elected Chair of the UNI Faculty Senate for the 2008 - 2009 academic year.

Jeff Funderburk was elected Vice Chair of the UNI Faculty Senate.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Chair Licari stated that Calendar Item #951 Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee, will actually be a component of Item #869 Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Chair Licari asked the Senate to take several Docketed items out of order as the Senate should be able to progress through them quickly and there are guests attending for these items.

873 Graduate Certificate in Women's and Gender Studies

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

Motion passed with one abstention.

868 2007 Annual Report from the Committee on Admission,
Readmission and Retention

Motion to accept by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Motion passed.

869 Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook

Motion to accept by Senator Bruess.

Senator Bruess amended his motion to approve; second by Senator Soneson.

Associate Provost Kopper provided information as to why this has come to the Senate for their consideration, noting that following the review of the curriculum package, the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) and the Graduate College Curriculum Committee (GCCC) reviewed the current handbook as there were things that needed to be cleaned up and revised.

Barbara Cutter (History) gave an overview of the kinds of changes that were made.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that there is one issue that needs the Senate's input. Through this process they've tried to align practice with policy and procedure and they discovered that in the UNI Catalog it is stated that changes to the curriculum are effective May 1, however, in the University Policies and Procedures on Curricular Change it is the term following the publication of the catalog and this needs to be clarified. A lengthy discussion followed.

Friendly amendment by Senator Gray to revisit the consultation Forms J and L when it impacts LAC proposals; accepted by both Senator Bruess and Senator Soneson.

Discussion continued.

Friendly Amendment by Senator Gray to accept the Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook as is with instructions that Form J be modified to include consultations that would involve the LAC process so that it would be flexible enough to identify respondents such as colleges or other large bodies on campus.

Discussion continued.

Motion passed.

Motion by Senator O'Kane to establish May 1 as the start date for the new curriculum; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Motion passed with one abstention.

870 Liberal Arts Core Course Proposal to Category 1C - 810:025
Computation Modeling and Simulation

Motion to accept by Senator Gray; second by Senator East.

Discussion followed.

Motion to accept was passed.

871 Education Discussion and Initiatives Team (EDIT)

Chair Licari noted that this is an informational item.

Motion to receive by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator O'Kane.

Senator Smith provided the Senate with information as to how this committee came about, what their purpose is and answered questions from the Senate. Discussion followed.

Senator Neuhaus amended his motion to accept with enthusiasm; Senator O'Kane approved.

Motion passed.

872 EDIT Proposal - Transparent Grading Practices

Motion to approve by Senator Smith; second by Senator Soneson.

Senator Smith reviewed this proposal with the Senate. A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion passed.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, IRA SIMET

Faculty Chair Simet stated that he received a communication from a faculty member who had questions on the voting rights at the departmental level, and how that ties into the faculty constitution, specifically whether adjuncts should vote in departmental meetings, and he is looking into that. Discussion followed.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Electronic Devices Policy

Chair Licari noted that Public Safety is still looking into this as to how to best communicate to people on campus when there is an emergency situation, and will probably be coming back to the Senate next year with recommendations.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING

4/28/08

1660

PRESENT: Maria Basom, Gregory Bruess, David Christensen, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Paul Gray, Mary Guenther, Bev Kopper, Michael Licari, James Lubker, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Steve O'Kane, Phil Patton, Ira Simet, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Katherine van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Absent: David Marchesani, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Michele Yehieli

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:17 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Licari stated that he would like to take this opportunity to say a big "thank you" to Dena for doing an outstanding job on the minutes over the year and all her support, which makes doing the Chair position much easier.

Chair Licari noted that Dena typed up the minutes of the 4/14/08 meeting without the benefit of having a hard copy of Mark Farley's presentation, which she only just received today.

Motion to approve the minutes of the 4/14/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker reported that the Iowa Legislature finished their business at 3:00 A.M. Saturday morning. They have put into law the Senior Year Plus. We will be dealing with it but he's not sure how and views it as a very serious problem. They also approved 91% of the salary bill that we had hoped for which is good news. And they also approve \$4 million for the science and math program.

Interim Provost Lubker reminded the Senate that the Board of Regents (BOR) will be meeting here at UNI on Wednesday and Thursday, April 30 & May 1. In the recent past they have been trying to address everything in one day and they have now gone back to two days.

Interim Provost Lubker noted that the most important comment he has for today is to present Faculty Chair Licari with a plaque in recognition of his service as Faculty Senate Chair this academic year. It is a difficult job and he had done a great job. Until he had the good fortune to attend these meeting on a regular basis he didn't know really how important and difficult a job it is.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari reminded the Senate that they have a lot to cover today, and the room is reserved for the Senate beyond the usual 5:00 P.M. ending time. He urged the Senators to give all the items on the agenda the due consideration they deserve and to not rush.

Chair Licari stated that it has been a pleasure and a privilege to serve as Chair. He enjoyed most of it, and learned a lot, but the fun thing about the position is that you get an opportunity help others on campus as someone who can facilitate the work that others are doing, and that is probably the most gratifying, and important job that the Chair of the Faculty Senate has.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Chair Licari noted that as this is the Senate's last meeting of the academic year, he asked that this docketed out of regular order so it can be acted on at this meeting.

970 Emeritus Status request, Robert D. Koob, President's Office, effective 6/30/08

Motion to docket out of regular order as item #874 by Senate O'Kane; second by Senator Gray.

Bill Harwood, Department Head, Chemistry, stated that Robert Koob served as a professor in the Chemistry Department as well a President of UNI. He served the university well in both capacities over his eleven years here and encouraged the Senate to accept this Emeritus Status request.

Interim Provost Lubker commented that he would like to second that, as he had the good fortune to work with him while Provost for one year and as Dean prior to that. In going to a meeting with President Koob, he asked him how he was able to get these unbelievable, off-the-cuff lectures at the "drop of a hat." President Koob responded that he pretended that he was teaching a freshman Chemistry class, and he figured he knew more about it than anyone else in the room and he talked it out that way, and it worked for him. He was a good man.

Motion to grant Emeritus Status to Robert Koob passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Election of Faculty Officers

Chair Licari noted that the Faculty Senate needs to elect new officers for the upcoming 2008 - 2009 academic year. The Faculty Senate nomination committee has nominated Susan Wurtz as Chair. There were no additional nominations coming forward.

Susan Wurtz was elected unanimously as Chair of the UNI Faculty Senate for the 2008 - 2009 academic year.

Chair Licari stated that two senators were nominated for the position of Vice Chair, Jeff Funderburk and Phil East. There were no additional nominations coming forward.

Voting took place with Senator Patton tallying the votes. Jeff Funderburk was elected Vice Chair of the UNI Faculty Senate.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Chair Licari stated that Calendar Item #951 Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee, will actually be a component of Item #869 Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Chair Licari asked the Senate to take several Docketed items out of order as the Senate should be able to progress through them quickly and there are guests attending for these items.

873 Graduate Certificate in Women's and Gender Studies

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

Senator Soneson stated that this looks like a good proposal.

Motion passed with one abstention.

868 2007 Annual Report from the Committee on Admission,
Readmission and Retention

Motion to accept by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Senator Mvuyekure asked why there tend to be more suspensions in the spring semester?

Senator Patton, UNI Registrar, responded that he doesn't know why but that it is very historical.

Motion passed.

869 Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook

Motion to accept by Senator Bruess.

Discussion followed on whether the motion should be to approve or to accept.

Senator Bruess amended his motion to approve; second by Senator Soneson.

Associate Provost Kopper provided information as to why this has come to the Senate for their consideration. She noted that following the review of the curriculum package, the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) and the Graduate College Curriculum Committee (GCCC) reviewed the current handbook as there were things that needed to be cleaned up and revised. An email was sent to departments, department secretaries, etc. and what is before the Senate today is accumulation of all of that input, and a lot of hard work to align policy and procedure.

Barbara Cutter (History) gave an overview of the kinds of changes that were made. One of the things they focused on was trying to make the handbook user friendly. They also update it to reflect new policies such as no new extended programs and adding new forms. They also gathered more supporting material so there is a history on the rationale on certain changes, which is important so that those changes are clear, such as with current extended programs. Those can be restated but additional hours cannot be added to them. Some things were taken out of the appendix such as committee membership lists, which will be put on a web site that will make it easier to update. A summary of additional minor changes was sent to the Senate, which should be included with the updated handbook. The Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC) was also asked to update their section and those changes were integrated into the handbook.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that there is one issue that needs the Senate's input. Through this process they've tried to align practice with policy and procedure and they discovered that in the UNI Catalog it is stated that changes to the curriculum are effective May 1, however, in the University Policies and Procedures on Curricular Change it is the term following the publication of the catalog and this needs to be clarified.

Senator Soneson asked how she would like to see the curricular changes be put into effect?

Associate Provost Kopper replied that it doesn't matter either way, and asked Senator Patton about how that practice came about.

Senator Patton responded that the idea was that once curriculum had been passed by the BOR they wanted it implemented just as soon as possible for the benefit of the students. A few years ago President Koob was asked if they could move to the start of the summer session to implement changes, which he agreed to. They picked May 1 as a practical date to reflect the start of the summer session due to the May sessions, assuming the changes would be approved by the BOR during their last regular meeting. However, they're not "married" to either date.

Senator Soneson asked Senator Patton what he felt would be best for students?

Senator Patton replied that he always assumes that these proposals are better than what we had before, so the sooner they're implemented the better.

Senator Funderburk asked if any logistical concerns have come up with the May 1 deadline?

Senator Patton replied that the biggest problem is an internal one with updating degree audits and so forth to get all of those changes in as quickly as they can. Knowing that a proposal is coming forward, they start working ahead in anticipation of it being approved. They like to get the degree audits and major worksheets completed by June when freshmen and new transfer student orientation begins.

Senator East asked when the catalog becomes publically available, either online or in print? It seems that there should be little effect on the graduating students and they can always advise

students that this is what it's going to be. He sees very little difference between May 1 and August or September 1. Students can re-declare to come under a new system if they wish. He doesn't see it as critical in any sense. It seems that you ought not to have a curriculum in effect that's not publicly available. And if it's not publicly available it seems that the deadline should be sometime after that happens. It's not clear to him that it is available on May 1.

Diane Wallace, Coordinator Students Statistics and University Catalog, Registrar's Office, noted that the online version is usually available in June or late May. She did note that it is beneficial to students to have a May 1 deadline. The Registrar's Office goes with when programs are declared with a catalog year. For Biology majors, they're making changes beneficial enough to students that with a May 1 deadline six students would be able to graduate and not have to go to the summer or fall sessions. If the Senate is looking for a benefit for students it should be the May 1 deadline. The print form will be out the end of July. Departments are already advising with the new curriculum because they won't be offering the same courses as for students currently in their programs.

Chair Licari stated that there is also a technical concern in that May 1 may be early in the sense of the BOR activities. The BOR will be approving UNI's curriculum package at their next meeting, which is May 1.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that the BOR has already approved part of UNI's curriculum and will be addressing the rest of it. They have moved dates up in this handbook so things will be through the BOR by their May meeting.

Senator East asked for clarification, students completing courses this semester can graduate this semester if this is put into effect May 1. It doesn't make sense to him, how can you graduate in the spring semester, which is not over by doing this? On May 1 they can complete a new declaration of major so they come under the new guidelines and then graduate under those guidelines, yet this semester.

Ms. Wallace replied that that is a possibility, as May 1 is still technically considered spring semester, and departments have been advising their students who have already completed course work along those lines. Graduation for spring is not finalized until mid-June.

Senator Patton noted that they have always followed the practice that if the policy has been approved at the BOR level they will implement it, and they implement it as departments wish to the benefit of the student. If they use May 1 and the Biology Department wishes the current students to re-declare under the May 1 guidelines, the Registrar's Office will accept it and process it. The department always has to approve that change, and if they approve it the Registrar's Office will implement it.

Associate Provost Kopper added that Victoria DeFrancisco, Interim Associate Dean, Graduate College, led the way in terms of additional language these changes.

Senator East asked about the consultation process, is there any way to document the process? If a department sends out a consultation and they don't hear anything within a period of time, what happens if it gets lost in transit? In that past information on changes and who was consulted was not accessible.

Associate Provost Kopper responded that they will be meeting with ITS personnel this week to see if, in addition to streamlining the handbook, they also want to streamline the online process. One of the things that also came about from discussion is can consultations be done electronically, such as a tracking system that would help the process and document it? They also want it to be a more open system so it will be easier for people to see what's going on and where things are.

In response to Chair Licari's call for questions or concerns on changes to the Liberal Arts Core (LAC), Ken Baughman, English Language and Literature, a member of the subcommittee of the LACC that was involved in establishing these procedures, noted that what they sought was to find some balance between providing opportunity for proposals for changes in the LAC to be brought forward and a step-by-step process which would establish a means for there to be consultation with interested parties. In looking at the Curriculum Handbook that has been used in the past, there was very little reference as to how changes in the LAC might be brought forward. Up until now, the handbook seemed to focus primarily on changes in major and minor programs and they wanted some step-by-step processes to make clear that there is a way for proposing changes in the LAC, and that there is also a way for responses and input for consultations to take place.

Senator Gray noted that in regards to LAC changes and the consultation form, it still doesn't seem like there's a specific

form that is appropriate. Is there an appropriate consultation form that one could send out, noting impacts changes to the LAC will have?

Siobahn Morgan, LACC Coordinator, responded that it depends on what kind of change it is. Asking to add an existing course into the LAC does not go through the curriculum cycle since that has already been done, and would just involve consultation with the LACC and it is then brought to the Faculty Senate. If it is a new course, they have added a "New Course Proposal" form, which includes an LACC consultation, and information on this would be conveyed from the LACC members to their constituents. There are now more explicit instructions about the consultation of new courses or changes to existing courses in the LAC being included in the curriculum cycle. The new Form L is for changes to the structure of the LAC, not individual course changes.

Senator Smith asked how this new procedure would deal with something such as when the LACC added the new Capstone alternatives. It's not a specific new course but opening it up to a set of new courses, does that kind of change fit easily within these procedures, how do they see this working out with something like that?

Dr. Morgan replied that if you want to redefine a category and change what should be in that category, than it should go under the Form L guidelines. If you just want to add something to an existing category than it goes with the old process. Something such as adding new courses to Physical Science, then they would go through the regular process of adding an existing course to Physical Science. If you want to re-define the Science category as a whole, that should go under the Form L guidelines.

Senator Bruess asked which one was Docketed Item #870, 810:025 Computational Modeling and Simulation?

Dr. Morgan responded that it was approved by the UCC, and since it is an existing course, it was taken to the LACC for approval and now is being brought to the Faculty Senate for approval. A single course change is not a structure change and that goes under the old rule.

Senator Gray recommended a change in wording for Revised Form J, because even if it does impact the LAC it says to use Form J. There is nothing in the text on Form J about impacting the LAC. A department head can initiate it but the LACC should be the

responder rather than the department. The wording for Form J is somewhat confusing.

Senator Basom noted that the final statement on Form L states, "report on formal consultations with all college faculty senates" but there is no line for the Faculty Senate. Using a different form might make it easier.

Dr. Morgan suggested that the responder's title not be labeled "consultation from" and it be left blank.

Senator East remarked that currently the form has two people, the department head and Curriculum Committee Chair, and he'd hate to see those titles left off because the department head is not the faculty. It is critical that they be there so you'd either need an alternative form specifically for LAC proposals indicating who needs to respond. Clearer directions are needed.

Senator Gray noted that he agrees with what Senator East suggested in the sense that the "To" field dictates the protocol and procedures for response. Leaving that blank you might get a different response from the LACC. If you have the department head as a designee or whom it is addressed to, you know what the policy and procedure is for that department head to respond.

Friendly amendment by Senator Gray to revisit the consultation Forms J and L when it impacts LAC proposals; accepted by both Senator Bruess and Senator Soneson.

Chair Licari noted that the original motion was to approve the Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook. Discussion followed on how to word the amended motion, with Associate Provost Kopper stating that we will be going into a new curriculum cycle in the fall with college meetings being scheduled right away and this needs to be wrapped up for these meetings. The UCC will be meeting on Wednesday, and if the Senate is comfortable with allowing the UCC to revisit it, they will take the Senate's suggestions into consideration and move forward.

Senator Neuhaus remarked that if the Senate is comfortable with that that implies if the Senate discovers something different in the fall then it will be too late and we would not be able to be changed it until the subsequent year.

In response to Senator Soneson's question, Senator Gray stated that he doesn't think that this amendment should hold up the

approval of this item. He does want discussion about how to deal with consultations in the event that it impacts the LAC course to move forward, noting that this deals specifically with a brand new course being put forward this past term, and stating in the proposal that they would seek LAC approval. There wasn't a clear guideline or framework for the consultation because it was perceived as a new course and didn't get LAC consideration. The policy and procedure in place for that scenario, a new course that they intended to seek LAC approval for, wasn't very clear and as a result the consultation ended up getting messed up, as some of the assumptions they were under didn't happen.

Senator Neuhaus replied that he would be comfortable in putting that in as just a "please take care of" just as he's pleased with the idea they are trying to make it more obvious in an online form. When he was on the GCCC things just showed up at the last minute, which should never have happened. We have to go on good faith that that's going to be taken care. He's comfortable with that just as much as he's comfortable with the idea that we're recommending that it be clarified.

Senator Soneson ask if those that are responsible for clarifying this understand what needs to be clarified?

Dr. Cutter responded that she understands about a one course consultation, that would be using Form J and done at the department level. She wasn't sure what was being suggested with Form L.

Senator Gray explained that his department, Computer Science, was proposing a new course and intended to seek LAC classification of that course but before they sought LAC classification it was perceived as a new course and processed through the UCC and approved as such. As it went through the LAC review it came under different scrutiny and a different review process. A different consultation form would have been appropriate as a new course that had dual intention, being a new course and seeking approval as a LAC course. It didn't just impact on department; it impacted the college as well and the institution.

Dr. Morgan replied that part of the problem with that situation was the original consultations didn't go out and she wasn't notified nor were the other departments notified as well as they should have been. This doesn't have to do with Form L so much as Form J, not having an LAC check-off line. Form J needs to be a bit more diverse in respondents. There could be a situation

where a college is responding to a course, such as a change in a math course that the College of Business may want to respond to. Maybe that form need not be so restrictive in who responds.

Senator East asked if consultation that goes on with respect to a course being proposed as an LAC course, the only consultation that merits approval comes from the LACC, presumably because the LAC has university-wide representation and those people are extremely effective about notifying the whole university about this and getting back any thoughts about it.

Frank Thompson, Finance, also a member of the subcommittee of the LACC that was involved in establishing these procedures, responded that there is diversity within it, but ultimately the bottom line rests with the Faculty Senate. They can go through the due diligence of looking at proposals and whether or not they have the appropriate consultation, which takes some of the burden off the Faculty Senate but ultimately it's the Faculty Senate that's going to look at the proposal and ask what are the merits of it, as they've been elected to represent their constituents.

Senator East continued that it seems to him that if we're really interested in this being a faculty process, they would try to make the curriculum process extremely transparent. If he were an advocate of the LAC he could go to the UCC and ask to see every LAC proposal change. Currently that's not possible. It is not a transparent process, he can't see curriculum packages and so he has to rely on the LACC, which he thinks is a flawed way to do it. He has to rely on the Senate, which he thinks is a flawed way to do it. We should actually try to rely on people who have the energy to go do those things because they are interested and willing to do so. He wants to encourage the process to work toward that end so we can all see any part of the curriculum process easily.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that that is one of the things that the UCC is hoping to do, and why they are meeting on Wednesday to hopefully develop a web site to try to do exactly what Senator East is talking about. Whether they can do every aspect or not, they will be bringing the people to the meeting to open it up, whether it's a link with new courses, tracking new consultations, a link to new LAC courses, whatever. They can't guarantee that this will happen but they are hopeful.

Senator Neuhaus noted that a year or so ago Dr. Shashi Kaparathi, Interim Director, Institutional Research, created something

whereby if you were on the committee you could look at that but the problem was that you could also possibly modify files. If those files are protected, then all that would need to be done would be to make it a larger viewer ship.

Associate Provost Kopper responded that that is what they're hoping for.

Chair Licari stated that right now there is a concern about Form J, in that it is not flexible enough to be used in the way they were intending it to be used. The Senate has a choice, they can adopt the handbook as is or not approve it, and re-address it next week in a revised format, or the Senate can pass it now with language in the motion instructing modifications to be made to Form J and we would trust that the appropriate modifications would be made.

Senator Bruess suggested making a third Friendly Amendment, if it's agreeable with Senator Gray.

Friendly Amendment by Senator Gray to accept the Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook as it is with instructions that Form J be modified to include consultations that would involve the LAC process so that it would be flexible enough to identify respondents such as colleges or other large bodies on campus.

Senator Bruess asked if this would give it the May 1 implementation date?

Associate Provost Kopper replied right now our practice is out of compliance with our procedures, we implement May 1.

Chair Licari stated that the only thing the Senate is now considering is approving the Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook, with special instructions on Form J.

Motion passed.

Motion by Senator O'Kane to establish May 1 as the start date for the new curriculum; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Senator East reiterated that this means this will begin with the May 2008 term.

Motion passed with one abstention.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that she would like to thank Diane Wallace, Dr. Victoria DeFrancisco, Dr. Cutter, the LACC, and Coleen Wagner, Secretary, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Office, the UCC, and the GCCC, as they have all done amazing work on this.

870 Liberal Arts Core Course Proposal to Category 1C - 810:025
Computation Modeling and Simulation

Motion to accept by Senator Gray; second by Senator East.

Dr. Morgan noted that this was a course that was proposed during the current curriculum cycle and is scheduled for this fall with 30 seats available. It is a course that does not fulfill a requirement for the Computer Science major, it's a course simply designed for the LAC dealing with the math component, quantitative communications area, 1C. They did have consultations with the Math Department on this and they support this course but have concerns about the ability of any student to take this course because of the abstractedness of the material, which is why there is the recommendation that students' ACT score be comparable to having a good handle on algebra. They feel that they will be able to populate this course this summer during orientation.

Senator Mvuyekure asked that "no text required" be changed because there is one from which topics will be take from, and he reads the on-line sources as being sort of an electronic textbook.

Senator Gray responded that there is not a formal textbook that they will have students purchase; however there will be on-line references. This is a course that's addressed to the audience that's enrolled. They are looking a very wide audience for this course, and one that will be fun to teach. If they get a population of art or music majors they will talk about how you can use computational models to verify whether or not an anonymous composition is really one of Bach's, or with literally works, how you can model and classify lost works of Shakespeare. With science majors they can talk about modeling of infection and disease, or humanities, arts and the social sciences can talk about hoe geographic information can be used to model how a SARS outbreak in New York would have a different impact than one in Nevada because of the landscape. Over the last fine years

he's taught workshops over the summer for various disciplines, workshops on Computational Biology for biology educators, Computational Physics for physics educators, Computational Chemistry for chemistry educators, and they discuss how to use the tools of computational science to enhance the education at the undergraduate level. This course will collectively integrate all the things they've done in those workshops for the past five years. They've included humanities, arts and social sciences for the past two years. He believes that there are a lot of all encompassing topics to cover a LAC class.

Senator Mvuyekure commented that this is good, especially at a time when textbooks for students are costing so much.

Dr. Gray noted there are a number of on-line resources, such as Schroeder's Institute, Interactive Aid, and computationalallabortatory.org. There are a lot of on-line references that they could cite in lieu of a textbook.

Motion to accept was passed.

Senator Soneson commented that this looks like a good course.

871 Education Discussion and Initiatives Team (EDIT)

Chair Licari noted that this is an informational item.

Motion to receive by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator O'Kane.

Senator Smith stated that he asked Chair Licari to include this as an informational item. This evolved out of the Curriculum Task Force that Interim Provost Lubker initiated a year ago. The intent is to have a relatively informal faculty centered group that would initiate changes in curricular and other kinds of things in the belief that many times the formal committees, the UCC and the LACC, are very much caught up with their ongoing work load and they don't always have the time to develop initiatives and pursue them. This group, coming out of that task force, became missioned as a more permanent informal body that was centered on faculty that would have no power and would basically exist to study issues and offer recommendations to other bodies, the Faculty Senate primarily. The charter gives a sense of how the body works and a membership roster with current members is included. This has been given to Interim Provost Lubker and he's on board with this but does not intend to set their agenda but will assist in gathering information. One of

the initiatives that they have in mind is the foreign language requirement, should it be revised? They have also approved the Transparent Grading Practices proposal, which is the next item on the Senate Docket.

Senator Gray asked a procedural question, receiving versus accepting. If the Senate receives it, it doesn't acknowledge the groups' existence but if the Senator accepts it that would formally acknowledge the group and give the group an elevated status from a task force to a formal committee.

Senator Neuhaus asked that if by making this a formal committee it in any way burdens the group with procedural things they'd rather not be burdened with?

Senator Smith replied that they don't want to be too burdened, they don't want to be a formal committee that is forced to have representation, they want representation from people who want to be there.

Interim Provost Lubker commented that the appeal to him was just that, the people that would be in it would be people that want to be in it. This being the United States, people can gather together like this to bring up ideas and put forth suggestions. He thought it was a great idea. How it should be done remains to be seen.

Senator Smith remarked that if the Senate would like to endorse it the same way Interim Provost Lubker has, without saying it's a formal committee, endorsing the idea of it, the committee would be very pleased with that.

Chair Licari stated that there's no requirement to establish this as a formal committee in order for EDIT to continue to report to the Faculty Senate with ideas, any one can do that. If the Senate wants to receive the report and offer our support for EDIT, then we can chose to do that as well. It may be that Senator Gray is looking for something a bit more positive from the Senate.

Senator Neuhaus noted his concern is that by the Senate's action people will come to this committee because a department head or a dean has said they need representation.

Faculty Chair Simet commented that you can accept it because the Senate is accepting all parts of it, and are endorsing it.

Senator Neuhaus amended his motion to accept with enthusiasm; Senator O'Kane approved.

Motion passed.

872 EDIT Proposal - Transparent Grading Practices

Motion to approve by Senator Smith; second by Senator Soneson.

Senator East noted that this proposal discusses "the instructor should be provided with grading information from a comparison group of courses/sections" and later talks about within the department, does this apply to LAC courses?

Senator Smith responded that yes it would. As many of those are taught in multiple sections the comparison group would be sections of the same course.

Senator East continued that his concern was with courses that are taught in different departments, how is that information readily available, such as the environmental Capstone course?

Senator Smith replied that their assumption was that department heads or the LAC Coordinator could work out the logistics.

In response to Senator Smith's question if that would be a problem, Dr. Morgan replied she's been providing information on the LAC courses to review teams in a short period of time, and has seven years of grading data that she can provide however it's needed.

In response to Senator Neuhaus' question about whether this was focused at new faculty, Senator Smith responded that both new and experienced faculty often don't really have a sense of what grading practices are. It may be more relevant to new faculty but it's also relevant to experienced faculty.

Senator Soneson commented that he has thought about this procedure for a long time and it's his feeling that no matter where a particular teacher falls within a scale, it's helpful to know where they do fall, as that helps them think about the equity of what they're doing. They can think about it by seeing that kind of scale. The purpose is not to point fingers to anyone because we all have the freedom to give the kind of grades we want, what we think are responsible grades. It does help us rethink what kind of grades we're giving. And also

gives us a basis for talking with colleagues about their grading practices. This can be very helpful in the long run by bringing classes that are in the same group a little more in line. If someone grades too hard students can very easily start resenting that class and that teacher, and can build bad moral. Students know what other students are getting in other like classes. On the other hand, if someone is way out of line, they have to start thinking about the extent to which they're providing "candy" to their students.

Senator Funderburk stated he's curious to know who's going to determine comparable courses? There are several courses taught on campus in which there are no comparable courses.

Chair Licari remarked that he would echo that as well. There are courses in his department that are taught by himself and another faculty member that have no comparable courses, and was that a topic of discussion for the EDTI committee?

Senator Smith replied that he's not aware that there would be serious difficulties; they felt that department heads, acting in good faith, could propose or suggest what was comparable, and if faculty felt like it wasn't a good comparison they could work that out. They didn't want to be overly descriptive in terms of how, they felt it should be left open and people would honor the intent of it by working collaboratively.

Senator Mvuyekure asked how this proposal fits in with the other discussions about rigor and academic excellence that Sue Joseph began and Ira Simet has continued with. He would feel more comfortable if this proposal were tied to the whole concept of high standards and rigor in teaching

Faculty Chair Simet responded that a large number of people on the EDIT team have participated in those types of idea exchanges. As long as there's a lot of cross talk the driving force, in addition to standardization, would also be to match expectations with grades. There is amply opportunity to give the structure that's being proposed here informational flow between those two parallel discussion groups.

Senator Neuhaus noted that there is a sort of "black market" form of this out there already which is student run. This might bring a sort of rigor or counterpoint to that type of thing.

Senator Patten commented on some of the information that is out there and available, such as the grade distribution report that

Dr. Morgan was talking about, which is run for all courses within the institution and are distributed to department heads and deans. What Senator Neuhaus is talking about is the "Pick a Prof", and under public disclosure laws in the State of Iowa they provide to that organization all grade distribution of all courses taught at UNI each semester, without instructor name. It is a very common practice based on state open records laws. Students then have the opportunity to enter in their comments in a blog-type format.

Chair Licari remarked that about the only people that don't have this information is the faculty.

Senator East asked the Provost's opinion as he was asked to establish the policy.

Interim Provost Lubker responded that there will be some work involved in this and some department heads will balk at doing that but he's in favor of it because, if nothing else, it will get people talking about it.

Senator Funderburk noted that it sounds like the comparisons are all to be within the departments.

Chair Licari replied that that wasn't necessarily so. LAC courses would be compared within one of the categories.

Senator Funderburk supports it but is concerned with implementation across the board.

Senator Neuhaus added that he was just looking at this as an opportunity if faculty wanted to know, to make them aware. If a faculty member has a question as to where he's at, that information is available, and not everyone has to.

Senator Smith noted that certain higher GPAs are justified section to section. Again the idea is to put the knowledge out there and trust our colleagues and administrators to use it intelligently.

Dr. Morgan commented that in terms of comparison groups, there are many ways this could be done; compare all :0XX level courses in a department, all :1XX level courses, comparison to courses that are for majors only, comparison to courses that are for non-majors. It need not be only a specific discipline, and it would be up to departments to define their comparisons.

Senator Gray stated that if it truly is transparent grading practices then he would recommended including the whole spreadsheet, every college, every department, why limit it to comparable courses?

Senator Soneson remarked that he likes Senator Gray's idea. It's helpful to know what's going on in the larger university. A lot of the computation is already done by the Registrar's Office and if the students already get it why shouldn't the faculty?

Senator East noted that Senator Gray's idea is a very reasonable one, to give the people who want the data the data. On the other hand, having it going through the process of deciding what courses are comparable with some neutral party doing the work is also a good idea.

Senator Funderburk commented that he likes Dr. Morgan's idea of the :1XX courses being compared, and so on because how you pick your subset gives you a totally different set of answers.

Motion to approve the EDIT Proposal - Transparent Grading Practices passed.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, IRA SIMET

Faculty Chair Simet stated that he received a communication from a faculty member who had questions on the voting rights at the departmental level, and how that ties into the faculty constitution, specifically whether adjuncts should vote in departmental meetings. He is looking into that but doesn't know how widespread that practice is, if it is at all. He looked at the constitution and it defines faculty-voting rights pretty tightly but doesn't say anything about other levels. The question is how far down do those guidelines go. His initial reaction is that they go all the way down through colleges and departments. He will be looking at that in a little more depth and asked for insights and input from the Senate. Again, he doesn't know how widespread this is. In talking with drafters of the faculty constitution, their intention was that it would apply to all levels, university wide, collegiate, departmental. Their take was that if they had wanted to give voting rights to adjuncts, lecturers, etc. they would have put that in the constitution, and since it's not in there it was specifically meant to be excluded. He would like to know if this is an isolated incident or if it's more widespread. The situation is

that a department has granted voting rights to a large number of non-voting faculty within their department.

Senator East asked what the definition of voting faculty is?

Faculty Chair Simet replied that in the constitution it is defined as people who hold the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor, and have a probationary or tenured appointment.

Senator Funderburk noted that there have been issues and questions addressed to the Union on this repeatedly over the past two years from many fronts, particularly in areas where the adjuncts and temporaries outnumber the actual faculty.

Senator Smith commented that it's been an issue in his department where they've had adjuncts and term people voting on curricular matters. You feel a little touchy about objecting to it so it would be good when Faculty Chair Simet makes a decision to spread it around to give some leverage to the faculty who would like to be more restrictive.

Faculty Chair Simet added that the constitution does say that non-voting faculty are welcome to make motions, participate in discussions but they just can't be part of the final vote.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Electronic Devices Policy

Chair Licari noted that Public Safety is still looking into this as to how to best communicate to people on campus when there is an emergency situation, and will probably be coming back to the Senate next year with recommendations.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary