

11-28-2011

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda, November 28, 2011

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2011 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 Agenda, November 28, 2011" (2011). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 181.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/181

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

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

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
11/28/11 (3:16 p.m. – 4:36 p.m.)
Mtg. #1703

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

No press present.

Provost **Gibson** had no comments

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** offered a reminder for faculty to spread the word regarding nominations for the Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence which are due soon.

Vice-Chair **Breitbach** had a couple of comments on her appreciation of several campus buildings and the parking ramp.

Chair **Funderburk**'s comments included an update on the Library archival project of Faculty Senate records and a reminder for Senators to prioritize attendance and to send an alternate when they cannot attend.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for November 14, 2011 were approved by voice vote with no corrections submitted. (**DeBerg/Neuhaus**)

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1102 1000 Consultation regarding Faculty Activity Reporting, regular order (**Bruess/Smith**). Passed.

1103 1001 Emeritus Status Request, Sue Joseph Mattison, HPELS, effective August 1, 2011, regular order (**Roberts-Dobie/Boody**). Passed.

- 1104 1002 Emeritus Status Request, Beverly Riess, Student Field Experience, effective June 30, 2011, regular order (**Neuhaus/Boody**). Passed.
- 1105 1003 Assigned Student Participation in Co-Curricular Activities, regular order (**Smith/DeBerg**). Passed.
- 1106 1004 Recommended Changes to Faculty Senate ByLaws, at the head of the docket for the Dec. 12th meeting, out of regular order (**Peters/Neuhaus**). Passed.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items [1097/995 considered last, out of order (**DeBerg/Boody**)]

- 1096 994 EPC recommendation to accept petition (1082/980) by Russ **Campbell** to change the mid-semester designation for the Spring semester to after the 8th week of class, regular order (**East/Kirmani**). Motion to accept recommendation (**Degnin**—alternate for **Swann/Bruess**). Passed.
- 1097 995 Review of LAC Category IV, Natural Science and Technology, regular order (**Smith/Kirmani**). Motion to receive the Report (**Smith/Bruess**). Passed.
- 1098 996 Emeritus Status Request, Carol Phillips, HPELS, effective May 2011, regular order (**Dolgener/Boody**). Motion to endorse request (**Dolgener/DeBerg**). Passed.
- 1099 997 Emeritus Status Request, Cynthia Herndon, HPELS, effective July 1, 2011, regular order (**Neuhaus/Dolgener**). Motion to endorse request (**Terlip/Degnin**). Passed.
- 1100 998 Emeritus Status Request, Dennis Cryer, HPELS, effective July 29, 2011, regular order (**Roberts-Dobie/Boody**). Motion to endorse request (**Roberts-Dobie/DeBerg**). Passed.

1101 999 Emeritus Status Request, Nancy Hamilton, HPELS, effective June 30, 2011, regular order (**Dolgener/Roberts-Dobie**). Motion to endorse request (**Dolgener/Roberts-Dobie**). Passed.

5. New Business/Old Business

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 4:36 p.m. (male/**DeBerg**). Passed.

Next meeting:

December 12, 2011

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:15 p.m.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
November 28, 2011
Mtg. 1703**

PRESENT: Robert **Boody** (alternate for Deborah **Gallagher**), Karen **Breitbart**, Gregory **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Francis **Degnin** (alternate for Jesse **Swan**), Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Gloria **Gibson**, James **Jurgenson**, Michael **Licari**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Susan **Roberts-Dobie** (alternate for Chris **Edginton**), Michael **Roth**, Jerry **Smith**, Laura **Terlip**, Katherine **Van Wormer**, Susan **Wurtz**

Absent: Syed **Kirmani**, Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m.: Call to order. Take a deep breath everybody. Welcome back. I hope you are not too rested from Thanksgiving.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Funderburk: Press identification? I see none. Yeah, everybody is excited already.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Funderburk: Comments from Provost Gibson?

Provost **Gibson:** I don't have any.

Funderburk: Excellent start today. (laughter all around)

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Funderburk: Faculty Chair **Jurgenson**.

Jurgenson: I have one comment. Solicitation for nominations for Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence has gone out, and I believe they're due soon, December 3rd, maybe. I would encourage you to remind your colleagues to nominate deserving faculty. I know there are a lot of them out there, and they don't get nominated.

REPORT ON COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION FROM VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH

[Senator **Breitbach** arrived at the passing of 1096/994, and Chair **Funderburk** asked to return to this portion of the meeting and if she had any comments.]

Funderburk: Ok, since we have Vice-Chair **Breitbach** here, we'll back up to the Comments.

Breitbach: I'm going to make a couple of campus comments because I get to make that nice walk [from Price Lab School to Maucker Union], and it is a beautiful walk coming up the hill, and it's—and it's beautiful for a couple of reasons. First of all, I get a lovely view of Bartlett and Commons and Lawther, and I can't tell you how happy I am that we are going to renovate those buildings and not tear them down, because they are absolutely architecturally gorgeous, and we should be renovating them. So, I—you know, I get that perspective when I walk up the hill. Second, the parking ramp. I am going to love that ramp when the snow and the sleet start to fall from the sky here in Iowa, and I know for a fact that that parking ramp is never full. So if you don't like the sun beating on your car during the summer months, and you don't want the sleet and snow piling up on your car during the winter months, I encourage you to use the ramp. It does have spaces available. It is a little depressing, though, because the sun is so low in the sky, and the shadow cast by the Towers, it makes it feel rather

depressing. It's almost like it's on verge of getting dusk. So, just some campus comments. That's it.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Funderburk: Ok, Vice-Chair **Breitbach** is always rushing to get over from class, so we will let her do her comments in a bit. I've got a couple to read for you, and if I got part of these names wrong, Chris (**Neuhaus**) here will correct me. First is, our archival project again. [reading] Work is proceeding terrifically well on the project to digitize the Minutes and Agendas of the Faculty Senate. In the Library Technical Services area, Cynthia **Coulter** and William **Maravetz** are overseeing the project, and now Gerry **Peterson** from the University Archives is involved as well. Of special note are the students who managed to have all the records currently housed in the Faculty Senate office digitized before Spring Break [sic, Thanksgiving Break]. That amounts to roughly 12 years of Minutes, Agendas, and supporting documents. The "magnificent seven" include: Alida **Aberle**, Marykaye Q. **Barnes**, Alexandra **Dewitt**, Christine **Feldmann**, Christopher **Harris**, Jackie **Meyer**, and Andrea **Smith**. Their assistance on this project is greatly appreciated and their work will benefit many future generations of researchers who need to access documents related to the actions of the UNI Faculty Senate. So we really appreciate the work that they have been doing.

Also, I have met with Keith **Kennedy** in the Production House in order to determine a strategy for implementing greater change to the Senate website in a more appropriate time frame. It is hoped that there will be significant progress on getting the newly archived materials available on the site in the coming weeks.

On a less cheerful note, and this may be preaching to the choir, but I will read it anyway. [reading] As we have progressed through the current school year, attendance by elected Senators has been on the decline. I certainly understand that there are occasions that arise that can result in occasional absences; however, it is important that alternates be sent whenever possible. If the work of the Faculty Senate is to be conducted

efficiently, it is imperative that those faculty members who have willingly accepted appointments to this Body take their responsibilities seriously and endeavor to come to meetings consistently and also arrive well informed as to the items being considered. We have a number of important items to consider these two final meetings of the semester, and then we will begin work on considering items of curricular change. Faculty members insist on the right to be consulted on important matters related to the operations of this institution, but with this “right” also comes the “responsibility” to shoulder the burdens of faculty leadership and service to our profession with the same diligence that is consistently displayed within our respected disciplines. We owe it to ourselves, our students, and to the Good of the Order. [reading ended] Probably many of you read similar things in your classes today. (laughter all around) What the heck. Ok, let’s move ahead, hoping that **Karen** is able to join us soon.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Funderburk: Approval of the Minutes of November 14. Do I have a motion to approve or any additional—my understanding is other than the corrections I had, there were no corrections submitted.

DeBerg: I move to approve the Minutes.

Funderburk: Move to approve. Second? Senator **Neuhaus**. All those in favor? (ayes all around). Opposed? Hearing none. Minutes are approved. On to items for docketing.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1102 for Docket #1000, Consultation regarding Faculty Activity Reporting

Funderburk: 1102, Consultation regarding Faculty Activity Reporting. Motion to docket? Senator **Bruess** to docket?

Bruess: Move to docket in regular order.

Funderburk: In regular order. Do we have a second? Second from Senator **Smith**. Any discussion? Senator **East**.

East: I was unable to tell exactly what was—what this was about. Maybe I just missed something. The material I saw online said—showed previous reports or something, but I didn't see what....was this information that says we are going to be asked something or

Funderburk: What you have on that is all I have. But I'm trying to get Sherry's attention

Nuss: Oh, I'm sorry. (projected screen had gone black; moved mouse to bring Agenda up again)

Funderburk: So we could actually view that, if there's additional questions on that. This was just a request to come in to have a consultation session to talk about this.

East: Oh, it's a consultative session about possible

Funderburk: Right. Yeah. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: And there's no new form or anything. I think the consultation was about coming up with a revised instrument.

East: Ok. Thank you.

Funderburk: Any other questions or discussion? Ok. Motion is made and seconded, regular order. All those in favor, “aye.” (ayes all around) Opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion passes.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1103 for Docket #1001, Emeritus Status Request for Sue Joseph Mattison, HPELS, effective August 1, 2011

Funderburk: Item 1103, Emeritus Status Request for Sue Joseph Mattison. Motion to docket? Senator **Roberts-Dobie**. Do we have a second?

Boody: Second.

Funderburk: And that’s a regular, I’m assuming? Regular order, and that was Senator **Boody**. Discussion? All in

Dolgener: Question.

Funderburk: Yes.

Dolgener: So what does Emeritus Status mean?

Funderburk: In essence, I guess the easiest way to put that without having the stuff in front of me is that the time has been served here long enough to qualify to maintain your few privileges of being emeritus faculty.

Dolgener: So it’s not necess

Funderburk: It doesn’t necessarily mean retirement apparently, unless there’s some additional clarification of things in the emeritus forms that I’m not aware of. Ok? Any other discussion or questions? All those in favor, “aye.” (ayes all around) Opposed? (none heard) And abstentions, none? (none heard)

Consideration of Calendar Item 1004 for Docket #1002, Emeritus Status Request, Beverly Riess, Student Field Experience, effective June 30, 2011

Funderburk: #1104, Emeritus Status for Beverly Riess. Motion to docket? Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: In regular order.

Funderburk: Regular order. Senator **Boody** again on second for that. Any discussion/questions? All those in favor? (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) And abstentions, none.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1005 for Docket #1003, Assigned Student Participation in Co-Curricular Activities

Funderburk: #1105, Assigned Student Participation in Co-Curricular Activities. Do we have a motion to docket? Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Move to docket in regular order.

Funderburk: Regular order. Second?

DeBerg: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **DeBerg**. Questions? Discussion? All those in favor? (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Excellent. We are doing very well here.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1006 for Docket #1004, Recommended Changes to Faculty Senate ByLaws

Funderburk: Recommended Changes to Faculty Senate ByLaws, #1106. There was some discussion from

Peters: Yeah, I move to docket that at the head of the order.

Funderburk: Motion to docket at the head of the order. Do we have a second?

Neuhaus: Second.

Funderburk: Senator....which one? I heard the deep voice, but—Senator **Neuhaus** on the baritone voice on the second here. Senator **East**.

East: At the head of the order today?

Peters: No, for next—sorry, for the first item on the Agenda for next meeting.

East: Oh, ok.

Funderburk: Ok. Modified, and I'm trusting that's ok with the second?

Neuhaus: That's all right.

Funderburk: So at the head of the order on the 12th of December, I believe is the right date.

Peters: Yes.

Funderburk: Questions? Discussion? All those

DeBerg: It's an important topic. That's an important topic, so that's good.

Funderburk: All those in favor? (ayes all around) Opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? None. All righty.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Funderburk: Going forward, I guess a couple of notes about the next two items coming up. The EPC recommendations, Gayle (**Rhineberger-Dunn**), the Chair of the Committee, could not get any of the other Committee members to be here. She's in class until 4:00 and said that if we needed her input that she couldn't be here until 4:00, if we needed to delay this. However, the—one of the members for the next item is in the same boat of not being able to be here until 4:00, so I think we'll start. If it's ok, we'll start on the EPC recommendation, and if there's significant discussion or complaints about it, we might need to table it until **Gayle** can get here to answer some of those concerns.

DOCKET #994 , EPC RECOMMENDATION TO ACCEPT PETITION (1082/980) BY RUSS **CAMPBELL** TO CHANGE THE MID-SEMESTER DESIGNATION FOR THE SPRING SEMESTER TO AFTER THE 8TH WEEK OF CLASS, REGULAR ORDER (**EAST/KIRMANI**)

Funderburk: So EPC Recommendation to Accept the Petition by Russ **Campbell**, who is also in attendance today, to Change the Mid-Semester Designation for the Spring semester to After the 8th Week of Class. I suppose we need a motion to accept.

Degnin: I move to accept.

Funderburk: Senator—substitute-Senator **Degnin**. (light laughter) A motion. Do we have a second?

Bruess: I'll second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Bruess**. Very good. Any discussion questions on this item? Senator **Smith**, I think you have something you would like to say or ask.

Smith: I'd like to know the rationale on what's—what are we changing here? What's the rationale?

Funderburk: So **Russ**, would you like to—please join us at the table for the microphone.

Campbell: Ok.

Funderburk: Professor **Campbell**, for the record.

Campbell: Well, personally it always bothered me that my mid-term grades were due at the end of the 7th week in the Spring instead of the end of the 8th week. But last semester I was attending some workshop with someone who said it really bothered her because she was teaching a half-semester course Fall and Spring, and she had to fit it into 7 weeks in the Spring, where she had 8 weeks in the Fall. The mathematics, as the Regents tell us, we have a 16-week semester, including Finals, which makes it look like 7 weeks, and then you can do your final work during the 8th week, and then you'll take, for the 2nd half the semester, 7 weeks left, and then you can have the final week, which is used for the half-week [sic] semester courses, so it makes a lot of sense. I briefly asked Phil **Patton**, and he, or I heard that he said that he didn't remember what the original rationale was, which might have gone back to sometime back when it was Iowa State—(laughs), no, not quite that far (light laughter around). But, I don't know what the original rationale was for it, but with the present emphasis that we have a 16 week semester, including Finals, 7 weeks with the 8th week for testing, and then 7 weeks and then the Final Week, makes a lot more sense.

Degnin: I would like you to know it's been confirmed with Phil **Patton**. He thinks it's a good idea, as well, actually.

Funderburk: That was Senator **Degnin**, for the record. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, this is neither here nor there, but why in the world doesn't our Spring Break come at the end of the—at the right time? (laughter)

around) That makes no sense to me. You have to come back for a week for the 2nd block?

Campbell: I mean, that's because of their desire to make it consistent with the Cedar Falls Schools.

DeBerg: Oh. No, they—they make it consistent with us.

Campbell: Petition the EPC to (light laughter around)

DeBerg: This might be something you want to look into then.

Funderburk: No, it's out of our pay grade. (light laughter continues)
Senator **Boody**.

Boody: Well, we've heard some of the rationales why. Are there any known down sides?

Funderburk: I can only say that while it has been published nothing has come forward to me.

Smith: (quietly) Let's call the question.

Funderburk: Ok.

DeBerg: And **Phil** is in support of this?

Breitbach: Uh huh. Very much.

Funderburk: Ok. Seeing no other comments or questions, all those in favor, "aye." (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard)

DeBerg: Wow. Unanimous. That doesn't happen very often. (laughter)

Funderburk: No abstentions. Very good. Thank you very much.

Campbell: Better leave while I'm ahead.

DOCKET #996, EMERITUS STATUS REQUEST, CAROL PHILLIPS, HPELS,
EFFECTIVE MAY 2001, REGULAR ORDER (**SMITH/KIRMANI**)

Funderburk: (following **Breitbach's** comments, who arrived late) So this next item [1097/995] we can do one of two ways, since we have a protagonist. I guess our antagonist will be arriving at 4:00. We can either go ahead and see if we still are going, or we could shoot ahead and do the 4 emeritus items, which might be fairly quick, if we are ok with doing that. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I move that we take the Agenda out of order and put off the discussion of the Liberal Arts Core category as long as possible. (laughter all around) But still get it in. (more laughter all around)

Funderburk: As that was a formal motion, is there a second?

Boody: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Boody**. Discussion? All those in favor? (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Ok, then we will move ahead then with item 1098, Emeritus Status Request from Carol Phillips, HPELS. Is there a motion to—a motion of anything? Senator **Dolgener** [who indicated so]. Do we have a second?

DeBerg: Second.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**. Discussion? Comments? Testimonials? Senator **Degnin**.

Degnin: Just a question. What's the normal requirements for emeritus? Are there any?

Funderburk: There are a number of years required tenure here at UNI, and teaching evaluations. Things along those [lines]. Yes, there's a set of

credentials, and by the time they finally get to us, they've been signed off on at 3 different or 4 different levels. Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: I'll make a comment about Carol **Phillips**, which also applies to the rest of them [today]. So (light laughter around)—but all of these people have been here for a long time. They have been very valuable members of the School of HPELS and well-respected within their profession, and so I would—I would support all of them for emeritus status.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I remember how much service **Carol** did on University committees, and I think she was like one of the founding members of the Committee on Admission, Readmission, and Retention, and had seemed to be there for probably 20 years and did a wonderful job. So, I really enjoyed working with her on—in that setting, and she did great--a great job for UNI.

Funderburk: Any other comments? Hearing none, all those in favor, "aye." (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Very good.

DOCKET #997, EMERITUS STATUS REQUEST, CYNTHIA HERNDON, HPELS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2011, REGULAR ORDER (**NEUHAUS/DOLGENER**).

Funderburk: #1099, Cynthia Herndon, emeritus status from the same designated College. Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Move.

Funderburk: Move. Second?

Degnin: I'll second.

Funderburk: Senator **Degnin**. Ditto comments from **Dolgener** and Senator **Terlip**? (light laughter around)

Terlip: Well, I think this group really owes **Cindy**, as a past Chair of the Senate and served on the Senate many times, and does a lot of wonderful service at times when like controversial issues, she was a very calming voice and was a delight to have. She also really did good work in the dance program and not just us, so she should really be commended.

Funderburk: Associate Provost **Licari**.

Licari: Yeah, echoing Senator **Terlip's** comments, I served with her on the Senate. I was the Vice-Chair of the Senate while she was the Chair, and I learned a lot by watching her maneuver through some controversial issues, and so I appreciated the opportunity to work with her.

Funderburk: And I'll say officially also her--one of her—her son was a student of mine, so I got to know her early on here--worked with her through those things. She's obviously a great mother as well, and her son's now completing his Doctorate in Music at North Texas these days, so it's been fun to work with her. She's been a great help through the years. So, one of the good ones. Any other comments? All those in favor, "aye"? (ayes all around) Opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Passed. Very good.

DOCKET #998, EMERITUS STATUS FOR DENNIS CRYER, HPELS, EFFECTIVE JULY 29, 2011, REGULAR ORDER (**ROBERTS-DOBIE/BOODY**)

Funderburk: Emeritus status for Dennis **Cryer**. Motion for—Senator **Roberts-Dobie** (who indicated). Second from—here's your chance to get in the Minutes.

DeBerg: I'll second.

Funderburk: Ok, too late. Senator **DeBerg** again. (laughter around)

DeBerg: Sorry. I don't have good impulse control. (more laughter around)

Funderburk: Ok, any comments?

Roberts-Dobie: I have. I would like to read this into the record. [reading] I owe Dennis **Cryer** a deep debt of gratitude. I had the privilege of teaching with and learning from Dr. Dennis **Cryer** for the past 9 years. For more than 30 years, the UNI Health Promotions students have benefited from his meticulous attention to details, including citing the page number in the APA Manual that they should consult. His undying dedication to making sure internship students and supervisors were supported beyond any other internship model I've ever seen, and his great concern for ethical practices always placing ethics before any of his own gain. He was the type of colleague we should all aspire to be: trustworthy, dedicated, sacrificial with his time, and a joy to be around. Our great loss is his grandkids' and the fishing world's great gain! (light appreciative laughter around)

Funderburk: Other comments? All those in favor, "aye." (ayes all around) Opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard)

DOCKET #999, EMERITUS STATUS REQUEST, NANCY HAMILTON, HPELS, EFFECTIVE JUNE 30, 2011, REGULAR ORDER (**DOLGENER/ROBERTS-DOBIE**)

Funderburk: And the last of the Emeritus Status Requests for today for Nancy **Hamilton**. Motion? **Dolgener** (who indicated). Second? From.....going from no one to everyone.....which Susan? Ok, Senator **Dobie**. Ok, discussion and comments or prepared statements? Nothing? All those in favor, "aye." (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) And abstentions? (none heard) Very good.

DOCKET #995, REVIEW OF LAC CATEGORY IV, NATURAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, REGULAR ORDER (**SMITH/KIRMANI**), NOW OUT OF ORDER (**DEBERG/BOODY**)

Funderburk: Ok, so backing up to Item 1097, Review of LAC Category IV. Dr. [Deirdre or Dee Dee] **Heistad**, if you want to join us closer in case someone asks questions. Or you can stay further away, if you like. (light laughter) Your call. (laughter) And I think that it is—just so we all understand, we've got 3 members of the LACC committee, not to be

confused with the LAC Review. Is that.....? Senator **Smith** is on that. Senator **DeBerg**. Senator **Dobie**. Is there anyone else? So that we have multiple members from that Committee to talk about it. So, do we have a motion then regarding the Review of the LAC Category IV? Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I move that we accept the Report.

Funderburk: Move to accept the Report. Do we have a second? Senator **Bruess** (who indicated). Discussion? The floor is now open for discussion, questions, commentary. Senator **East**.

East: This is accepting the Report from the LACC?

Funderburk: That is my understanding, yes, correct. If I understand, the way this is done is the LACC Report's made to us and the LAC Report submitted as background material, basically. Clearly associated but.....did everybody just give out in the e-mail exchange prior to this? Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Well, I guess I just have a couple of questions; actually, I have a bunch of questions, but I'll start with a couple. One of the things I noted among many was that this Report was submitted—well, it was submitted December of 2010, I believe, and then the—well, there's two things I need to say, and one was that I think it was supposed to have been finished a few years earlier. That's a question. And then the second question was the response is dated Fall 2011, so I guess my other question was had there been some dialogue going on between one side and the other during that time period? End of questions for now.

Heistad: Well, I can tell you what I know, and what I know is that you're right. My understanding is that the Category IV Review was scheduled during the 2007-008 school year, and generally what happens is a committee. Ideally, a committee considered the Spring before the Review begins. Maybe contacts are made with the Dean's office. There could be a Chair selected. You know, that type of thing. So the Review begins in the Fall, and then as the Review Team reaches the final portions of the Review,

they go, and they meet with the LACC with their Draft Report, prior to submitting their Final Report. In this particular case, my understanding is that there was a meeting in December of 2007, which makes sense to me, that they came in with a draft; they had clarifications; they had a discussion/comments; and then at that point a Final Report would have been expected in the Spring of 2008 at which point the LACC would have then responded to the Final Report, come in front of the Faculty Senate, and said, “Ok, these were the Committee Recommendation--these are our Recommendations.” Now what then happens is that after those recommendations are discussed by the Senate, a meeting is called by the LACC. The Provost is invited. Deans are invited. The Committee is invited. Department Heads can come, so that there can actually be a discussion about, “Well, ok, here are the different Recommendations. What do we—how do we want to move forward? You know, what’s feasible? What’s not feasible? What are the priorities?” So that’s my understanding of the timeline. Now, I became Director in January 2000—what? 11? Right? And this report was already submitted as a Final Report. I received the Report from **Betty**. Siobahn **Morgan** is here, too, in case we want to go through the entire history of all the Directors or Coordinators involved. But that’s the timeline that I’m aware of.

Now, in this particular case, the—the next step for us would be that after the Senate looks at these Recommendations, and says “ok,” well, they—the LACC had Recommendations; many had Recommendations. I think it’s pretty clear that they don’t always align. There is some overlap. There’s some agreement; there’s some disagreement. That then the conversation would take place with the Provost, the Deans, Department Heads, Committee members, so that we could all sit down at the table and say, “Well, ok, can we prioritize and agree, basically, how to close the loop on improving the learning in this Category?” That is the ultimate goal, is to improve the learning in the Category. So, I would anticipate, or would have anticipated maybe prior to this meeting, that that meeting would take place in the Spring of 2012, early on in the Spring.

Peters: So what

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I'm sorry. So their Final Report would have been expected in the Spring of 2008, but it wasn't submitted until December of 2010, and that was just a delay? There's no....

Heistad: Yeah. I think that there might be

Peters: on their end of things?

Heistad: reasons, yeah. I mean, that's—that's what I know about it. We could invite Dr. **Morgan** to the table. I mean, like she might have more information, but my understanding is that—what I know is that the Final came in December of 2010 and was there when I began as Director in 2011.

DeBerg: After—only after beating the bushes for a few months to get this out. It's really frustrating on the part of the Committee to not get anything year after year.

Funderburk: Dr. **Morgan**, do you wish to comment, or do you just want to wait for a direct question?

Morgan: No, well, I would only have to say that there were various reasons why the Committee—the Review Committee did not finish the Report in a timely manner. I'm not going to judge the validity of those reasons, but they did have concerns about their work being considered seriously, that it wasn't just a process that produces a Report that is ignored.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, I've got a question I think mainly for **Siobahn**. What about the Outcomes Assessment thing? Were they aware of our expectations on Outcomes Assessment and simply failed to address that? To me, that's just the most serious failing in this—in the Report. And I just wondered why did that happen, because now they are saying, "Oh, we did fine on Outcomes

Assessment.” Well, I don’t see where they did anything on Outcomes Assessment. What—what’s that.....

Morgan: Well, I—I would have to say again, not—I think there’s only one thing that **Dee Dee** got wrong in that when we had the discussion with them in December of ’07, they did not have a draft for us. That doesn’t come until like March when we get a draft, and then we send it back, and then they review it. The December discussion is usually a “how things are going,” and “getting the work done,” and things like that. So there was no draft ever seen as far as I know. In my time with being on the LAC, there was no draft ever submitted, so I was not aware of its status, and when the Final Report was submitted, it didn’t have that information. Obviously, if there was a draft, then it should have been sent back, and say, “You didn’t address this.” Or at least, “Do a Supplementary Report covering this.” I think the issue may have been—and again, I don’t want to speak for anybody else—an interpretation of what “assessment” means. So that is maybe where the problem may lie.

Funderburk: Additional comments, questions? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Well, I just—I have the Category Review Procedures in front of me, so just to make sure that I understand what everyone’s saying. I mean, the Review Procedures specify that the Review Team is supposed to start out by meeting with the Student Outcomes Assessment Subcommittee of the LACC to discuss SOA planning. It specifies that there is supposed to be a liaison to the Review Team, that it’s supposed to give an Oral Update to the Committee at some point and submit a Draft Report. And so I guess that what I’m hearing is that these things just didn’t happen?

Morgan: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, but for various reasons. I think the liaison was—was a person in the former College of Natural Sciences who may have been on leave? Or wasn’t—wasn’t in contact with the Committee members or Review Committee members. I mean, there was—there were multiple balls dropped here.

Peters: Ok, that’s—yeah.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I know you've got the—did the—were the procedures the same in 2008 as they are now? That would be my question.

Peters: Yes. They were last amended in March of 2005. (other voices agreeing)

Funderburk: Dr. **Heistad**.

Heistad: That—that actually—but that brings up a good point, which is the fact that when I became Director of the Liberal Arts Core, I realized right away that the Procedures might not be working the way that we want them to work in that the Procedures don't generate Reports that actually allow us to move to the phase of improving student learning. We do get caught up in kind of—I don't know, but maybe a way to generalize it would be that we get caught up in kind of looking at our teaching and that what we're—what we don't really make it to is really looking at, "What are the students learning in these—not just these courses, but in this Category?" And so one of the things that I've done is I went to the LACC and requested permission to create a group, a type of task force, that's actually going to meet tomorrow to begin looking at the Review Procedures. And so to then take some type of Recommendations back to the LACC so that we can make these Reports 1) less burdensome for the faculty, and 2) more meaningful in that they're actually going to generate a discussion and can improve student learning. So I think that **Siobahn's** point is well taken. It's not from the perspective of the LACC, it's—for example, it's not the first Report that's come in late. It's not the first—I mean, it's—it's a less than perfect Procedure, but it is hard having gone through several changes in Directors, having what we deem as very little assessment and now having a Report that's quite old, when you look at the data, to really do too much with it at this point.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, in my history on the Committee, we have never received a Report, though, that had no Student Outcomes Assessment in it. I mean, I don't know what else to say. This is unique in my experience on this Committee. So—and I did send them the wonderful SBS Category as an example that had a Cadillac Student Outcomes Assessment section, so it isn't as if they got no help from the Committee even in the, you know, this lacuna between Directors. So I have but no sympathy.

Funderburk: Senator N

DeBerg: It's like—how—I mean, it's like they never even heard of Student Outcomes Assessment except to know that they needed to write a paragraph here that kind of explains why they didn't do it.

Funderburk: Senator Neuhaus.

Neuhaus: Well, when I read this, part of me wonders, "Is this coming about because we have some sort of lack of metrics that are needed for this?" And I guess the other question is, "Does anybody's memory go back far enough to remember what the previous Report was like? And were they really that different? Or was it simply carrying on of a tradition that had gone on?"

Morgan: I can—I can address the previous Report. I looked at the previous Report and did, I believe, discuss with the Committee, the Review Committee, the option of doing a Student Survey, which was the Assessment Method used in the previous Review of this Category. That was—that was the mechanism used, a Student Survey. And, you know, a lot like **Betty** gave them the Category V Review, you know, I gave them options. Whether—I don't know why they didn't want to follow up on those. They do make the recommendation that the best way to assess student learning in this Category is to talk to people 5, 10, 15 years down the line to see if it made any impact on them. I mean, logistically that's difficult to do, and you might not get timely responses, but I—for whatever reasons, I don't know why, you know, why they did what they did, or didn't do what they did. But I—the last Review did involve a multi-tiered survey

of students' impressions. So it was a very subjective Review or Assessment Method.

Funderburk: Any other comments or questions? I guess one question I have is how we should proceed? I mean, we seem to have a fairly one-sided discussion with this. Should we recess for 10 minutes allowing

Neuhaus: I've got one more question, please.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: One of the last comments that's here, number 9, we're talking about a Coordinating Committee. What—what sort of a vision do we have for that? Is—is that going to be a group that will go out and look at various metrics as they are applied at other universities? Or—or does it—what all would that encompass?

Heistad: Well, I think that I've been here for 11 years now, and I've been teaching in the LAC, and I participate in many of these Reviews, and this idea of having these Coordinating Committees certainly isn't new. It's been here. It's in every recommendation. It's in every response, and I think that one of the—one of the drawbacks at the present time to actually creating a meaningful Review—or a Coordinating Committee—is that every 6 years they're nailed with this Category Review. And if you can time being the Coordinator of the Coordinating Committee on years 1, 2, and 3, it's not such a bad gig. But 4, 5, and 6 (light laughter around)—you know, 7, 8, 9, watch out. So who wants the job quite honestly? So, part of it I think that—as my responsibility as Director of the LAC is that if I can get to the point that we have some Review Procedures that are more meaningful, that can be kind of an ongoing, less-burdensome, more-normative process, that, like good assessment, it should just be embedded in the workings of what we are doing. And so, in this—here we are using this word “Coordinating Committee” because we understand that it has to be a part of the recommendation. We know that we want more faculty input. Now, the reality of the Coordinating Committee is that part of it is just having just more conversations with the faculty, and Dr. **Licari**, Dr. Susan **Hill**, and I

went out this semester and, you know, wanted to actually talk with the faculty who are teaching in the courses. We have some tenured faculty; we have adjuncts; we have term; we have a variety of different faculty, to find out what is needed. You know, how—how are you participating in these Reviews, and, we had everything from the faculty who came and said, “I spent years on those Category for a Review, and I’m pretty ticked off,” to “I’ve been teaching in this Category for 10 years, and not one person has ever asked me a question about it.” So, there’s a lot of variety. And I think that, to begin that process, it is through the Review Procedures. It can’t be a once-every-six-years snapshot of what’s happening in the LAC. It really has to become more meaningful than that, and that’s something, of course, that as educators we want, but I also think that at some point that the HLC—that if we’re—if we’re going to go through these Review Procedures, they should be meaningful, you know, and they’re telling us that that should be the case.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: To me, the, as—as Senator **Smith** has said, the—the true difficulty with this particular Review Committee, and my guess is with all the others and with the onerousness of serving on such committees is the lack of a real Outcomes Assessment Plan. And if you have an effective Outcomes Assessment Plan that’s continually collecting data, then the Review Committee looks at the data in year 5 or whenever it is and makes some interpretation of it, saying, “We’re meeting our goals,” “We’re not meeting our goals.” “If we’re not meeting our goals, what shall we do?” And so it becomes a much less onerous task. It becomes a much easier task, and it becomes a task that someone can have some pride in accomplishing rather than feeling like “I have to cover my butt with this Report so that we can continue to offer the classes that will allow me to keep my job.” And I’m not ref—when I’m making that statement, the most recent—the—that statement is not meant to refer to this particular Review Committee. I mean, I’ve read Reports from other committees, and that seems to be the standard process, is, at least as far as I can tell is, “Let’s put enough verbiage in there to make sure that we keep our jobs and keep the courses that I want to teach and not worry too much about Outcomes Assessment.”

If we really want to do this, then it seems to me that the thing is figure out how you are going to assess the goals of the Category, regardless of the Category, and start collecting the data, and the Review Committee then has only to say, “Did we meet our goals?” Or “Wait a minute. Maybe the data doesn’t tell you whether you met your goals, and you need to go back to revising the assessment.” But at least you’ve got clear-cut tasks rather than some process whereby you, again, cover your butt and try to keep your job or your course. And so anything the LACC can do to make that happen with this critical part of our curriculum would be a success.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, and I think to be fair to the—the Committee who worked on this, back when this first Report started, most of us were trying to get our Outcomes Assessment Plans down for our Majors, and there was really not much support or no coordination of trying to do it for the Liberal Arts Core. We had “outcomes,” but we didn’t have “assessment plans.” So to fault them, I think, is a little misguided given that everybody was just trying to get up to speed. It’s not an excuse, but I think it accurately reflects where we were at the time.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I think the—based on some comments, it’s obvious that the lack of outcomes assessment was noticed, to say the least, by the—by the LACC (light laughter around), and your—your first point on your Report is—seems to suggest that the Category needs to come up with meaningful assessment soon or else risk some recommendation from the Committee that their courses be dropped from the LAC. My question about that is that—is setting aside the merits of that as a solution, is there any difficulty in making that kind of recommendation right now when we suspended all the rest of the Review Processes, and we effectively said to every other Category on campus, “Our Review Process is so up in the air right now between the Assessment Academy and potential changes that we’re not going to make you do a Review. Oh, but here’s one bad Report from several years ago, and we’re going to come down hard on you” ? I mean,

that, to me, seems problematic, even though I have to say I generally agree with what your Committee has said, that seems very problematic to me.

Heistad: I think that—that that’s a really good point, and part of the work of the LACC is that over the years, it—it is a working Committee. It is a Committee that—that meets traditionally every Friday early and does a lot of work. And, of course, with the types of reports that are being reviewed and, of course, the fear of reports being put on shelves and not closing a loop to make improvements, I think that those types of comments that are coming out kind of across campus in the way I’ve seen them in other types of reports, it’s an effort as saying, “Look, if we’re going to put the time in, there’s—if this is really important, there has—there have to be consequences. There have to be ramifications. Does the LACC think that that’s actually within its jurisdiction?” And so, you know—but at the same time, the question is—is that if we are going to enforce—if we say that Assessment is that important, well, then is it important when people don’t do it? It seems like it should be, so you know.

Peters: I’m just pointing out that it’s kind of hard to say at the same time, “Assessment is not important enough so that we can’t suspend it for 2 years, yet it is important enough that we need to come down on this one Category for not doing it well enough several years ago.” That’s a concern.

Heistad: (several affirmative interruptions as **Peters** finished his thought) Yeah. I think that that’s a point well taken now, but you do need to keep in mind that at least from the perspective from the Liberal Arts Core, in general, because of other processes in place, if we all believe in different types of assessment, you know, direct, indirect, baseline, summative, informative. I mean, we are engaged in other processes. For example, whether or not we agree with the Liberal Arts Core Review Steering Committee work—I mean, we are in the process of doing some pretty—having some pretty large discussions about student learning in terms of piloting the Cornerstone course. We have spent a lot of energy creating an Assessment Plan that potentially could be looked at as perhaps a model, so I think that—that I wouldn’t look at it as not—as assessment not taking place. I think that I believed that the assessment—the Review Process that

we have right now is very burdensome to the faculty, and if we are asking faculty to consider major changes to the Liberal Arts Core, it only seems fair that by saying, “You know what? We can bump these back a year.” It’s less—it’s less for me a request not to do assessment. It’s a request to give the faculty the space they need to have the discussions so that we don’t then turn around and say, “Look, we were so busy writing this Category II Report that we couldn’t even participate in the discussion.” So that’s how I see that request. And perhaps I read it differently, but that’s how I saw it as it came out of the Liberal Arts Core Committee.

Funderburk: Dr. [Kenneth] **De Nault**. Since you are here, would you like to join us at the table? We delayed as long as we could.

De Nault: Sorry. I had a class.

Funderburk: Oh, exactly. And I explained that you had class. We delayed as long as we could to get started. There’s a chair here or wherever you like. I’m sure there are plenty of people happy to leave the table, if you want their chair. (light laughter around) Other comments or questions? Senator **East**.

East: Assuming we passed the motion to accept the Report, what is the outcome? What is the outcome of that? I mean, it seems to me that this is—these are just—they become two more Reports that kind of get put on the shelf. I mean, there does—there’re Recommendations from the Committee, clearly, but there’s no action that—being requested from the Senate, as far as I can tell, it’s just to “accept the Report,” and so presumably then this Report would go on the shelf as would the background Report of the—from the Review Committee, and presumably LACC would move on from there, perhaps revisiting with the Review Committee or people in that area or at some new Review Committee. But is there any real action from our accepting the—outcome from our accepting the Report.

Funderburk: And I’m thinking Dr. **DeBerg** is wanting to respond to that. So, Dr. **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, a couple of things. It's always important to a Standing Committee of the Senate to keep the Senate informed, so that—we think that this is important information for the Senate to do. But last Fall we started a process that served really well for 2 categories, and that is meeting with the Provost, the Dean, the Review Committee, and the Liberal Arts Core Committee to actually work on getting some kind of strategy and commitments from Administration to close some of these loops or to adopt strategies that might—that might work on some of the issues identified. So I think that what the Senate does with this Report, accepting it or not, is not nearly as important as what we can—as what we can work with with the Dean and the Provost on, you know, “What does this Category need? What would be the best thing for it at this point?” And so I really see that that was a very important step that got added last year. That's my view.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, and my understanding is that we can accept the Report in essence. The Senate is saying, “Yeah, the LACC is doing its job. Here are the way it's supposed to be doing its job.” And then you go to the next step, which is, as **Betty** said, the LACC meets with Deans, Provost, faculty who were involved in the Committee, and says, “What can happen here?” The alternative—I mean, I always wondered when you put these, “Why don't we ask the Senate to approve it?” but the rationale I heard for that was, “Well, if the Senate ‘approved’ it, they'd be endorsing all the specific Recommendations, which they might not want to do. They are just accepting it, saying, ‘Go ahead and do this stuff.’” If the Senate rejected the Report, they are in essence saying, “The LACC hasn't done its job. Try again.” That would be my guess of it—my take on it.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: So, is the motion on the floor to “accept” the Report or “receive” the Report?

Funderburk: It was to “accept.” That's what I heard.

Smith: Oh, then I should have said “receive.” (laughter all around)

DeBerg: You were counting on the difference between “approve” and “accept,” instead of “accept” and “receive.”

Smith: Yeah. That’s right, damn it. (laughter all around)

DeBerg: Gosh, darn it.

Smith: Can I amend my motion?

DeBerg: Who seconded it?

Funderburk: Just about anything seems to be possible.

Bruess: I seconded it. If you want it

Smith: Yeah, I want it to be “received.”

Funderburk: Yeah, I got it—so that will be reflected in the Minutes? Correct, Sherry? The motion is to “receive” said report. (She nods.) (To Dr. **De Nault**) Is there anything you would like to say at this point? I mean, it’s been somewhat one-sided so—I’ve distributed your e-mail to everyone, which I think everybody got a chance to see.

De Nault: Well, having been a Senator for many years and the Secretary, I don’t want to take a lot of time, but 1) the LACC Category IV Review Committee was a committee of the LACC, not a committee of the Senate. The Report from the LACC Category IV Review Committee went to the LACC. It was not a Report for the Senate—you can have it, I don’t mean that, but that was not the intent. According to the guidelines on the Provost’s website, the LACC, if it wishes to present Recommendations on curriculum, is first to consult with the appropriate faculty who might be affected by those Recommendations. To the best of my knowledge, that has not been done. What you seem to have received is a critique of their Committee’s Report, not what I would call a set of Recommendations on

how we might improve the LACC Category IV, and therefore it's kind of a difficult situation to discuss, because the Report—the material that came to the Senate-- doesn't appear to me, or the rest of my Committee, as well-thought-out “We want this to be done.” “We don't think that should be done.” “This should be changed.” “The hours should be increased.” Whatever the Recommendations. And I think the Senate, as being a Senator for many years, deserves a set of well-thought-out Recommendations that had been vetted by the appropriate faculty and Departments and brought through the process and then presented to the Senate for your consideration. So, my recommendation is it should be returned to the LACC because it is not really a well-thought-out set of Recommendations. It is really a critique of a Report that they don't like, which is fine. They don't have to like it or dislike it, but it was a Report of many, many man-hours and a couple of years of very-detailed study on the specific classes by people very, very interested, and I think it's fairly well accepted that's not a good scientific term, I--I understand, but that there is a great need for a better understanding of science by our society, that there is a tremendous problem with the understanding of science and how it works, what information it produces, what information it doesn't produce, and for the public and our graduates to be as schooled in that as possible. And I think that should be our focus. And I don't—what is before you, as one of my colleagues said, it's kind of a petulant critique, and--and I think the Senate deserves something well-thought-out in terms of Recommendations of “This is how the LACC feels that it, the Category IV, should be improved.” And I would think that at least as a courtesy they should at least discuss and have some communication with the Committee that formulated the document they find distasteful.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Can you identify specific Recommendations from the LACC that you felt were petulant or poorly thought out, whatever? Because the truth—I mean, my understanding, and I think I had some input into here, most of our Recommendations were basically reactions to the Report you submitted. We weren't generating our own thing. We were basically responding to the Category Review, which is what the Procedures say.

And—and a related point, the Procedures specifically say that this comes to the Senate. This is the way it's supposed to be done. So, say—objecting that this would—you were writing this for the LACC, no, you were writing for the LACC who is a Subcommittee of the Senate and is going to report and pass it on to the Senate. That is just standard procedure.

De Nault: You are absolutely correct. The LACC reports to the Senate, but our Committee was not designed to report to the Senate.

Smith: But this Report, and the Procedures that govern it, say that it will be going—it will be forwarded to the Senate with the LACC's comments and Recommendations, which is exactly what happened.

De Nault: The LACC has never met with the Committee in any way, has had no communications with the Committee. Therefore, what you have received is their critique of the Committee. This is not a document that has been vetted by both sides.

Smith: The Procedures do not call for that.

De Nault: In here there are specific Recommendations that are erroneous. There are Recommendations, for instance, "The LA can't support da da da da da" We have "learning outcomes" that was not part of our charge. I could read you our charge, if you would prefer.

Smith: But did you read the procedures for Liberal Arts Core Category Review Procedures which talk about "outcomes assessment"?

De Nault: Yes. Correct, it was supposed—no, it was not the term "outcome assessment" in our charge, Sir.

Smith: "Analyze Student Outcomes Assessment Data."

De Nault: Our charge said we are supposed to analyze Student Outcome, yes. Not—Student Outcomes completely, but not—this one says "learning."

Smith: Well, 'cause this—this is—these Category Review Procedures govern that. Your charge is one thing, but

De Nault: But—we did talk about “Student Outcomes.”

Smith: So, did you analyze Student Outcomes Assessment Data?

De Nault: We analyzed—yes.

Smith: And how come there—there’s no report of that analysis in your Report.

De Nault: We have on page—if you look through every single—we analyzed every course in the LACC Category IV very specifically with regard to core competence, catalogue descriptions. We analyzed with respect to instruction, grading, how achievement is analyzed. What you

Smith: But that’s not “Outcomes Assessment Data” as that term is normally used on this campus and others. Outcomes Assessment Data is students do certain assignments, they take certain tests, they do certain things, data is generated as a result of that, and it is analyzed, and that analysis is included in the Category Report. And I don’t see that in this Report.

De Nault: Part of the analysis you refer to has been developed in the last 2 years. It’s not

Smith: So, is it—is it available? Could it be appended to this report?

De Nault: Well, probably, but I don’t think I or anybody else is going to do that, Sir. We have spent 2 ½ years on this.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

De Nault: At some point, even a “thank you” would be nice.

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

Peters: Professor **De Nault**, before you were able to be here because of class we were trying to get a sense of the timeline of—of the Report, and we learned that the Report was originally due—it was expected to have been delivered in the Spring. It was finished in December 2010, and then there are certain things that are supposed to be done. For example, the—the Committee is supposed to meet with the Subcommittee of the LACC to talk about their Student Learning Outcomes Plan. The Committee is supposed to present a rough draft to the LACC. Did tho—did those things happen?

De Nault: No. Do you want to know why?

Peters: Ok. So some of the feedback--you might have gotten that feedback.

De Nault: Well, there's more—there's more to the story than just what you said. The Committee was formed. We were formed with no Chair. There was no direction to that Committee. The Committee operated independently for a year gathering data from courses. We communicated among ourselves. We developed what we considered a much better assessment of individual courses that included areas the LACC hasn't really emphasized, such as oral communication, the use of mathematics in the classes, which we feel is very important in all LACC courses. The Committee operated kind of without a leader. Nothing—we were floundering. The Dean of CNS, at that time, asked if I would chair. I said, "Well, ok, but we need to get things moving." And he agreed that some of the aspects would not be in as great a detail as some would like. We worked then. We got together, worked very diligently. The Provost's—not the current Provost's—Office established a LACC Review Committee. They sent out questionnaires. Our Committee felt at that time it's duplicating what we have been doing, and there wasn't much point for us to be spending all this time doing what some other Committee has been charged to do. We also were supposed to have a liaison between the LACC and our Committee.

That individual—I forgot the last university—I forgot [who]—he was in the Department of Industrial Technology. After he left, I asked the Dean for a replacement. We discussed with the Head of Industrial Technology, and then we—it was revealed at that time it was not our choice of who would [replace]—this was the LACC liaison. The LACC was to get us a liaison person. That never happened. We were then told, no, we needed to finish. I had surgery on my hands, and they were confined to casts, and I [was unable to write]—very difficult to proceed, so there was about 4 months, 5 months delay because I was the secretary and—anyway, we then proceeded. We gathered the rest of the information in—as rapidly as we could. We spent a great deal of time. We took all of our discussion to Departments for feedback. We discussed with every single instructor in the LACC. Compiled our stuff. Compiled our Report. Our Recommendations had a great deal of internal discussion of those Recommendations. There was lots of different people with different personalities, different ideas, and we presented that then to the LACC. The Chair of the LACC at that time asked if they could have a pdf which was provided, and that was the last we heard. That was almost a year ago, and there was no communication from them. We had expected that we would be asked to sit down and have some sort of a dialogue on our Recommendations. We had some Recommendations we felt were probably going to be questioned and would need to be discussed, specifically requiring a laboratory experience in all the LACC Category IV courses. There're economic implications of that Recommendation, the staffing it issue, etc. We also recommended that senior staff be predominantly teaching the LACC Category IV area for a variety of reasons. It was not part of our purview to look at Capstone. That was specifically removed from our [charge]—but we did feel that we should at least make a comment that we felt Capstone should be returned to its original intent, that technology was getting a short shrift, and that technology is a very important part of our life here today and our students'. And the interaction of technology and society was important in the original intent, and that had kind of gotten lost. So those were areas that we expected discussion. We also were open to a discussion on the outcomes of LACC. It was the feeling, if I can paraphrase, I don't like to put words in others' mouths, but that the prism presently being applied to analysis of LACC courses was a prism of folks like us who have years of life experiences

and that an 18 and 19 year old doesn't have those experiences, and therefore we really needed to focus on preparing students with a background so that as they faced those experiences and had those opportunities through life, they would have tools in their toolbox to be able to take advantage of them. And that assessing that, asking an 18, 19, 20 year—a youngster to make some of the assessments was not really appropriate. The place that needed to be assessed was later on. How does this affect when they are in a job, when they are in a work experience, when they are retired, etc. So those we were ready to discuss, eager to discuss, but no discussion took place. I don't know if that's enough timeline. I could go get details.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Well, first off, I—I fully appreciate you folks have done an incredible amount of work. By the time I'd gotten two-thirds of the way through there, I was actually almost astounded by that. I mean, clearly you folks are all great empiricists. You folks have been doing the science for years, and that's there. I think—I think what we're really looking at here is a transition and maybe some difficulties of communication over the past number of years. I think we're reaching a point as a university where folks would like—I don't know that they are going to be successful in this—but they would like to somehow measure a student's capacity to do something. And I—I—I do agree that asking them their own opinion, "Are you a brilliant physicist at this point?" "Sure, why not?" You know, that—that's a—that's—that's a difficult measure for me, as well, on that. I don't know if there are really good measures out there, but I think if there's one item on this 1-9 that I—I really find easy to swallow—some of the others I'm—I'm not sure—but it's number 9. I think at this point rather than having folks looking around for who did what wrong, say, "Hey, this is where we're at right now. This is where we'd like to be." I think we should appreciate the fact that you folks have done a lot of work. I think part of the problem here is folks weren't communicating on that, and as a result, you guys did a heck of a lot of work, and then you kind of got nailed for it, although they do give you a little bit of a compliment right up at the top, and then they switch gears on you. I think right now trying to find a cooperative group

between LAC folks and between folks in the sciences not to—not to dwell on this, but to “what’s next?” You know, if we really do need to have measures that HLC will—will approve of and will value, what are the best ways to do that? You’ve got a lot of great minds in your Department and in the other Departments that are in there that—that look a lot at that, so maybe this is a time of a shift. It’s not so much “this was wrong.” It’s just “this was what it is,” and now apparently folks want something a little different. So I—to me going on on who did what wrongly—to play the blame game—really has no point, and we are going to be really hard pressed to get to a point where we’re coming up with some good metrics, and I’m hoping we’re doing that through all the Categories, because I think this is challenging in every single discipline. Maybe in part this was the victim of bad timing. You guys happened to get this done, and we knew we needed a transition. This was clearly not in the direction we were wanting to go—kapow! That’s what happened there. But I—I—I, for one, appreciate that a heck of a lot of work had to go into this, but I think now what we really need to do is look at that number 9 on there and say, “Hey, let’s get the coordination going.” Let’s get some really bright folks sitting down. Let’s say “What’s a different way of doing this?” Not that this is wrong, but what is a way we can look at students?

Funderburk: Any comments from anyone?

Heistad: I just want to underline what I had said earlier which is the fact that at least the intention of the LACC was, in fact, to bring this document to the Senate followed by this conversation that you’re describing, not at the level of a Coordinating Committee but at the level of the Liberal Arts Core where we could actually meet with the Provost, meet with the Deans, Department Heads, members of the Committee and have a conversation about—you know, that particular conversation could reprioritize some of the ideas. It could result in someone standing up, as has happened in the past. We have Bob **Dise** who is coordinating Western Humanities. We have Brenda **Bass** who has been coordinating Category V. Sometimes people at these meetings stand up and—and, you know, say, “This is what we’re going to work on.” So, I do think that it is—that has been the traditional protocol, is that that discussion happens in the company of the

Deans and the Provost because we understand that the LAC doesn't particularly have the teeth to say "yes or no" to this and that we need the support of the Administration, and so that would be the natural—that's what we saw as the natural next step. It was not a step that we were looking to skip. It was simply a step that we saw, perhaps, at a different moment in the process than the Committee did.

Funderburk: We shall con—Senator **Degnin**.

Degnin: Just a question. So, if we do go onto the next step, what will be the involvement of the Committee that submitted the original Report? Will they still be involved?

DeBerg: They'll be at the meeting.

Degnin: They'll still be involved then?

DeBerg: They'll be at the conversation with the Provost and the Dean.

Degnin: Good. Ok.

Heistad: There are times when those meetings have to be kind of divided out. For example, we are going to be getting ready to have the Category I groups together, and it—it doesn't make sense to have the mathematics folks come the same day as the oral com folks, so it—it can depend, but in this particular case it can be members of the Committee, any faculty, you know, we have—they are open meetings.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: Did I hear you say it was an open meeting?

Heistad: Yeah. I think that all LACC meetings are technically open meetings.

East: I would encourage you to widely publicize it because my personal belief that—that the person—the people who—who are often given the most—the greatest chance to speak are those who should speak the less, (laughter around) when it comes to general education kinds of things. I don't want a mathematician telling me what math needs to be taught because just like a computer scientist, a mathematician tends to teach mathematics for their major, just like a history—historian tends to teach history for majors rather than for non-majors.

Bruess: **Phil**, there's no difference. (laughter all around and more talk about history, interrupting the speaker)

East: I think artists should not decide what's to be taught in the art class. They decide how to teach the goals—to meet the goals that are being requested that they—to be met by the general audience, and so we should—should pay attention least to science for science, math for math, I'm sorry, quantitative techniques folks for quantitative techniques. There's a CS class in there that counts, too. (light laughter)

Funderburk: Senator **Roth**.

East: We should pay attention least to the art folks for art classes, to the history folks for history classes, etc. because they come with notions of—about how to teach “specialists” rather than “generalists.” And—and—and that's a mistake we make in our Liberal Arts Core or general education kinds of courses.

Funderburk: Senator **Roth**.

Roth: Just for the record that many of us, myself included, you know, content physicists, who—who do really have a genuine interest in the non-major aspect of—of—of the LAC, and so—so I think vetting those of us who are interested should be involved in these kinds of things, because there's a lot of exceptions to what—what you are saying.

Funderburk: And before I recognize anybody, caution for drift of topic. And I saw Senator **DeBerg**, Senator **Peters**, and Senator **Smith**.

DeBerg: Well, I believe this might still be on topic because it's about Student Outcomes Assessment in the Liberal Arts Core, so I just want to say that I think one of the things that we need to kind of agree on as a faculty as we move into really difficult Liberal Arts Core discussions, beyond this one, is that in my mind Student Outcomes Assessment Data is about the best evidence you can use to make an argument for anything having to do with the Liberal Arts Core. I mean, you can't simply assert that this works and that doesn't and that we need this or that we don't need that, unless you have some evidence. I mean, that's just basic scholarly argumentation is that you need evidence for your assertions, and I think in Liberal Arts Core arguments Student Outcomes Assessment Data is like the kingpin of evidence to use in making a Liberal Arts Core argument. That was one of the problems I had with this where it's the number of assertions about the Category with no evidence.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: And kind of building on what **Betty** has said, I just wanted to say that—that by—I didn't—I wasn't intending by the earlier questions to—to try to find out who was to blame. What I'm more interested in is figure out—trying to figure out where Procedures broke down, regardless of whether any individual was responsible. That's beside the point. But where Procedures may need to be tightened. It sounds like the kind of thing that the LACC might already be considering to make those links clearer, make those liaisons clearer, so that hopefully the process can continue in a more orderly basis like Senator **East** was describing earlier. And just one last thing, that—I know that there are faculty who don't like Student Outcomes Assessment, who may think we can't gauge the learning of students in our classes, who think that grades are sufficient, but the fact is that our accreditors disagree with that and our legislators disagree with that.

Gibson: Absolutely. Absolutely.

Peters: And so that added to it is we can't afford to have that attitude, and people who—I know the LACC is committed to doing more Student Outcomes Assessment, and the Assessment Academy is in place to try to get that up and running, and if faculty don't take the lead on this, then it's going to be imposed upon us.

Gibson: Absolutely.

Peters: And if learning outcomes are imposed upon us by our accreditors or our legislators, we have lost control of our curriculum.

Gibson: Absolutely.

Peters: Ok, so faculty have to get out in front of learning outcomes and—and design good quality Student Outcomes Assessment or else we will lose control of our curriculum, and to me it's that simple.

Gibson: And could I just add, we had two Senators at our last Council of Provosts meeting talking about Student Outcomes Assessment and future legislation. (various voices clarifying that the two Senators were Iowa Senators not UNI Senators)

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

Smith: Yeah, again picking up on the Outcomes Assessment, I mean, I was disappointed at the level of Outcomes Assessment that was in here, but I understand you—you didn't—took a different tack. In a way I would have been more disappointed if you'd done something that in a way was more obvious which is to say, "Did the students in the Geology course learn about rocks? Did the student in the Meteorology course learn about clouds?" That's not what we need for Assessment. What we need for Assessment here relates to the general goals of this Category which are, "Do our students understand fundamentals of science that we think all UNI graduates should have? Do they know what a theory is? Do they know the relationships between independent, dependent, moderating, mediating

variables? Do they know about the difficulties of measurement? Do they know what experimental design is?” Those are things that all these courses should in some way be addressing, and that’s the stuff that should be assessed. Now, it would have been a real challenge for your Committee to put together a mechanism for doing that, but I would argue that’s what has to be done going forward, and it hasn’t been done really in this Category. It hasn’t been done in many other parts of this Program, but that’s what we need.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**. (who declined)

De Nault: I think our Committee would agree with you. The problem is 1) we felt that the goals of the—as you may notice on our Report—when we started to look at what we wanted the students to come out of the Category understanding at 18 years of age is one of the reasons we started with the statement of the goals so we’ll be clear on exactly what we felt students should come out. And that, of course, was completely rejected by the LACC. We still feel that the goals of the Category are flunky, poorly worded in terms of being able to give an Assessment. Without specific, well-thought-out, articulated goals, assessing that becomes even a greater problem. So, I think before you can set up an assessment mechanism, you need to have well-thought-out, articulated goals. Otherwise, you know, you got the train, but you don’t have the engine.

Smith: Well, we did have goals, but we tended to have the very abstract level. We need—I would argue we need to get—take that—the high-level goals and get operational down—operationalize them down much more specifically into particular things that apply across the sciences but that we want all of our students to know.

De Nault: I think we tried to do that, Sir.

Funderburk: Ok, do we have any other questions or comments on this? We have a motion on the floor to accept the report (several voices saying “receive”)—receive the Report (light laughter around). Bad chair. Bad chair. (more laughter around) Any other comments? If there are no

comments or questions, all those in favor of receiving the Report of LACC, please say, “aye.” (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Any abstentions? (one heard) Ok, then the Report is received, and thank you very much. Thank you also, Professor **De Nault** for joining us for this discussion, a very important discussion.

NEW BUSINESS

Funderburk: New business? Unless there’s new business arising, I would love to entertain my favorite motion of the day.

ADJOURNMENT

Male voice: Move to adjourn.

Funderburk: Thank you very much. Motion to adjourn. Second? Motion needs a second. Also, thank you Siobahn **Morgan** for this work and for coming in when you are no longer tasked with the thankless task. And also for Dr. **Heistad** for coming in when you are, in fact, tasked with this thankless task. I didn’t hear a second, so you have to sit until somebody

DeBerg: Second.

Funderburk: Thank you very much. Dr. **DeBerg** seconded. All those in favor, “aye.” (ayes all around) Opposed?

Wurtz: Ok, I’m going to oppose that motion just to see what happens.

Funderburk: Because you won’t win. Ok, thank you very much everyone. See you on the 12th. We will be having a meeting that day.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Administrative Assistant, UNI Faculty Senate